

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

## Meeting Minutes October 4, 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 4, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.

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

A’Esha Goins, Chair

Kema Ogden

Bryan Scott

Tina Ulman

### **Chair Goins 00:03**

Good afternoon. Thank you for being here. It's October 4, 2021, 1pm. And we will be calling the Subcommittee on social equity, diversity, and inclusion to order. I'm going to start with 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 .As one of the most diverse places, it is important to recognize and appreciate the use of Southern Paiute land and as a part of its mission to be a welcoming and inclusive place to work and learn. Thank you. We'll start with public comment. We're going to ask that you limit your public comments to two minutes. State your name come up here. If you wanted to give public comment. We will have public comment again at the end of the committee hearing. This is the time for public Oh, I suppose the roll call. My apologies.

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

\*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**

Now, public comment

**Ron Baker 02:07**

Oh, yes, no worries. Hello, I'm Ron Baker. And what I can say is I have my hand in a few different areas of the community, cannabis community and industry have been around for a while. And at this point, I'm just willing to help out in any way I can, as far as education as far as history, play around on the cultivation side, retail production. So, I'm willing to help out with any information. Facts are out there. I know last week, the vape pen, and you know, some of the vape pens having more than probably about 30 to 50 hits per cartridge. So, it's kind of hard to you know, have a vape pens personally, I know they have smaller amounts, like the disposable ones, so maybe like about a point one. And then also for the pre rolls, they have those different brands, one of them is called Baby J's. And it's maybe about point two or part three of air. So smaller amounts would definitely as I call it, micro dosing would definitely help out with that. Of course, that's after we handle the fact about people bringing in their own material, stuff like that. But yes, micro dosing and non-smoking and smoking consumption lounges should definitely be on the table because edibles are definitely going to take over and more people are going to move away from smoking, you know, so you have to worry about the smell and everything like that. It's just more and more and more so you know, main dishes, beverages, and stuff like that, that people can consume. But at this point, my name is Ron Baker, and I'm here for you guys.

**Chair Goins 03:46**

Thank you for your comment.

**[Unclear] Thomas 03:47**

Thank you. Hello. My name is Barbara Tompkins. I'm owner of a trusted vendor education in Illinois. Also, I'm a consultant that has been through a couple of years of process. As far as social equity in Illinois, originally started my business here. In the bottom you are one of the person licensed to process. Got a lot of my education in Nevada, I took it back to Illinois, quite successfully. I have a lot of knowledge as far as the social equity component how it didn't work. So, for example, the veteran component action landed Illinois in a lot of court because you had to have a veteran on your team in order to have a perfect score. So, we're also attached to a group that has a perfect score, which was SBIL. So, we pretty much had a lot of success in the Illinois market. I'm just trying to come back here. It's a couple components as far as like the consumption, lounges, big opportunities with that, and I'd like to legislation as far as the micro dosing on site. So, there's different things that I feel like the social equity component can provide a lot of opportunities, we build neighborhoods in a disproportionate. Thank you for allowing this.

**Chair Goins 05:24**

Great, thank you for your comment. Do we have any persons online waiting to give comment?

**Sara Tajalli 05:38**

No public comment

**Chair Goins 05:44**

No, ok thank you. All right, we have a lot to cover today. So, we're going to move to item two. I think we made good headway last meeting. And so, we're going to continue with some of the things that we discussed, trying to finalize some items. One on item two, were identifying areas that were disproportionately affected by policing. What I will say

\*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>

is Sara and I called every organization we could think of that could and should have access to this information. It seems that no one in Nevada has asked for this type of information, I just find that extremely difficult to believe. However, what we were able to do, because we an organization here in town, cannabis, CAIC did work on a bill that would criminalize, I shouldn't say that. But that would allow those young people under 21, to be able to sell their records, if they were had cannabis. Issues from, you know, from police or from juvenile. And so, we did have are those. What I do have in hand, and all of the members have in hand is a couple of the studies from juvenile justice services, and there are some top tier referral zip codes, there are 10 that they have identified. And so, I don't think that the information is conclusive. However, it is a place to start, to say the least. So, I'm going to just read the zip codes. And then what we're going to have to do, I think, is allow a little more time to see if this information can be identified, and then how we can get it identified. And then if not, that, we need to think about maybe how we can identify disproportionate areas, right. And there are other criteria. And so, we'll discuss that. Thanks. Member Scott, we have a little bit of information on some of one of the other states that have used a criteria, and we'll discuss that now. So first, the top 10 zip codes we have is 89114. I was kind of surprised when I saw this. This is a 2019 study. And the top tiers are 89115, 89030, 89121, 89110, 101 108, 015, 106, 031 and 122. So, what I will say is the zip code that surprised me was 89115.

**Member Ogden** 08:58

So, this so this is from the juvenile justice services for like the for offenders

**Chair Goins** 09:03

We would call them offenders, yeah. So, referral. So, if you were an offender, and they would refer you to the detention program, these are where the most referrals, the zip codes, the most referrals will come from. So, at the police pulls you over you so let's say this is how it works. If your youth and the police kept you in an action that is breaking what they would consider breaking the law, I'm tiptoeing around my language here, that they would consider breaking the law and once they identify you, as a juvenile, you they refer you to the juvenile justice system. So that's what these are, are referrals. Does that answer your question?

**Member Scott** 09:49

And so, so charities don't actually reflect incarcerations just the fact that that police may be made contact with these juvenile offenders.

**Chair Goins** 10:00

Yeah, possible offenders and they were booked in some capacity because that's the only way that they can identify where they come from. And, you know, it's probably important to say that. So, this report has not this is a peer report, I have not altered the data. But I think it's important to say that the reason why I pulled this report originally for that organization, is because what we were trying to do is identify the disproportionate ethnicities that were being detained that use, right. So, if you see these numbers, I mean, you know, it's still

**Member Scott** 10:43

looking at the map on the computer Chair, and it looks like a 9115 is kind of your Nellis Air Force Base. I grew up in North Las Vegas. I know Dayton, I know, three hours. North Las Vegas. 890189031 is also not

**Chair Goins** 10:58

enough. Yes. 89101 is downtown. And that makes sense. So then, you know, as you were pointing out 89115 Is the reason why I say that I was a little surprised, is because I was under the assumption that that area had mostly Air

\*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>

Force use. However, I made a phone call to a friend, and I know that lives there. And he said, Why the hell would you think that?

**Member Ogden** 11:27

I noticed there? Yeah.

**Member Scott** 11:31

This is racial majority ratio majority says White is 21.76%. Hispanic is 71%.

**Chair Goins** 11:40

So that's the areas that and the unemployment rate is 11% 11%. There

**Member Scott** 11:44

you go, that fits within your

**Chair Goins** 11:45

fits. So, the question originally was, can we identify the places? And obviously we can. So, this, you know, I'm stuttering a little because I had a conversation recently. And they were like, I kid, you definitely don't want to say the police is over policing somewhere. So, I'm tiptoeing around the conversation of over policing, and just saying that these are areas where we have identified persons that are disproportionately affected by policing.

**Member Scott** 12:26

Madam Chair, that you know that they pulled the Colorado information for their for affirmation of eligibility for Social Equity licenses for marijuana, and they say that an applicant resided for 15 years. The applicant has resided for at least 15 years between the years 1980 and 2010, in the census tract designated by the Office of Economic Development and international trade as an opportunity zone, or designated as a disproportionate impact in area and disproportionate impact areas defined as a census track in the top 10 15% of the following unemployment school dropout rate poverty, the number of individuals receiving public assistance,

**Member Ogden** 13:06

I think that's how we should do it because it goes hand in hand anyway.

**Chair Goins** 13:12

I like that. Yeah, I like the language keeps us out of trouble. It's, it's simpler for seasons like that. I agree.

**Member Scott** 13:22

And you'd have to do a study. Yeah, in order to make to make the determination that fits it. Not over police, but one that police activity is higher in those contract Metro, the sheriffs would have to assist with providing that I'm thinking. But this may be kind of tried and true.

**Chair Goins** 13:42

And we know that it'd be current as well, because since as we've just completed the census. So, here's one of my concerns is that because of the pandemic, I don't know how thorough the census is, because I know that they weren't able to collect all the information that they were hoping to collect. And so, will the numbers be true? That's I'm going to be honest, that's a concern of mine.

\*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>

**Member Ogden** 14:08

We can suggest that they take a few years, like more than just don't just look at this year, but maybe look over the past few years to compare because COVID is going to change him unemployment numbers and everything. Right now.

**Member Scott** 14:22

The problem is we're growing so fast, you know, we're still going through redistricting now. Exactly. As we have to before January. We're relying on those census numbers, Madam Chair, that even though they may not be I don't know, it may be an argument to be made that they maybe weren't complete given the pandemic. But those are the numbers we have to rely on for redistricting. So, we have to rely on the

**Member Ogden** 14:48

Census and compared to that kind of,

**Member Scott** 14:50

well, those numbers have crept up since 2010, or 2011. So, they probably wouldn't be as accurate.

**Chair Goins** 14:58

So, I want to make sure that everyone I know since I'm sorry, every 10 years and so what we will be doing is taking 10 years since. And definitely the state is in a very different space today than it was 10 years ago. And so, but I do hear you, Member Scott, the senses are the senses, and that's the information that everyone is using. What do you think Member Ulman

**Member Ulman** 15:21

question? Are any of those zip codes in Northern Nevada? I'm not familiar with them.

**Member Scott** 15:27

They are not all either in the southern.

**Member Ulman** 15:31

Okay. Yeah, that's just what we pulled? Or did we do any analysis of northern Nevada?

**Chair Goins** 15:39

Well, well, we can do these zip codes with the heart, they would just be what we're looking at. But we absolutely can pull the Juvenile Justice Services for State why these numbers are just as it relates to there was a study done, does it make sense to use this information? Is do we see this as accurate information? The Cannabis Compliance Board when they would be pulling this, can they use these statistics? Does it make sense?

**Member Scott** 16:07

Madam Chair to Member Ulman's point, I do see because I'm looking at the Reno zip codes, and none of them are on this chart. But it maybe makes sense to use kind of what the criteria that Colorado use, because it doesn't necessarily talk about those police areas. But it does talk about if their opportunity zones, if they meet the unemployment school dropout poverty, which we wish someone could extrapolate means they're really kind of the over policed areas. So, we may be able to use those criteria rather than using by zip code, since it doesn't affect.

\*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** 16:45

I agree. I feel comfortable steering a little bit away from over policed areas just based on some of the conversations that I have had over the week. And with that being said, I think if we discussed because Member Ogden had said last week, we should be looking at those persons with that are in lunch programs, or maybe Pell Grants. You know, that was some of the conversations that we had, I would be willing to say, taking away from what we know, they've done I don't know, I don't think this program is active yet. I know that these are the these are what they're asking, but I don't know if it's active. But I liked the unemployment rate is more than 120% of the national average. I really like that because we could, we could extract that easily.

**Member Ogden** 17:41

Going into was just so you know, right now, the unemployment rate. There's people unemployed that have never been employed before. Different now. This is a totally different time. So, where people were doing well, you know, six months ago, they're employed, you know, so they're not normally would be counted in this situation, but they are now. So, I just want you to, you know, just keep that in mind. When we're looking at unemployment rate, I don't think it's going to be the same. And a year because people are going to start going back to work, hopefully, hopefully.

**Member Ulman** 18:17

Would it be easy to identify Title One schools and what zip code they're in, and then also use that as a metric?

**Chair Goins** 18:25

Well, we talked about that as a metric last meeting, and we moved away from it. That was one of the things that we brought up. And we moved away from that. I think and I think, and I think what we need, and one of the reasons is because he gets all variants, we're talking about schools, you know, there's all those type of things. I think what we want to move is further into how we can use the census track. I think that's a safe place. Because those numbers are the numbers.

**Member Scott** 18:55

And then Madam Chair, I don't know if Commissioner Ulman or Member Ulman has this that I sent to Sara

**Chair Goins** 19:01

this morning. Yes, sir. emailed it. Oh, did she Okay. Thank you, sir. You did email me. The information from Member Scott.

**Member Scott** 19:13

Thank you. She just made it to

19:14

you. I just sent it to you, but I can send it to the other members.

**Chair Goins** 19:18

Oh, yes, please. My apologies.

**Member Scott** 19:20

Because number oh, man, if you look at the information I got from Colorado, page 10 of 12 kind of lays out the eligibility criteria of the eligibility criteria and talks about that.

**Member Ulman** 19:33

Yes, I did like Colorado's variables here.

**Chair Goins** 19:44

All right. So, what do we think about the SNAP program? Yeah. 20. I agree with you Member Ogden. Maybe the unemployment rate at this junction is maybe not that'd be the best way to identify because especially in Nevada because of where we at with the casino, so maybe that's not the best way. But I think the household SNAP program that's a yes for me.

**Member Scott** 20:19

What what's one variable? Like say, I know that, you know, counseling careers always talking about the fact that we're five has a 15% unemployment rate, even before the right so I think maybe that SNAP program can also be one of the criteria, that someone shows that they're eligible for the social equity life. So, I think that program as well as unemployment, and all the other ones we talked about would be ways that an applicant can show that they're within these particular areas.

**Chair Goins** 20:49

Well, I think what can happen is CCB can identify that based on the census tract. So, the census track will say, because if I remember, I had to pull some information that's recently. So, I remember, it can be sorted, where they can look for this, this and this, and that will be the zip codes statewide that would fall in the one of the criteria, because it's not even all of the criteria. Okay, so just for conversation, because no one they're not reading what we're reading. It says a poverty rate of less than 20% 75% of more 70 parts. 5% or more of the children participate in Federal Free Lunch Program. 20% of the households receive benefits under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, which we know a snap, and the average unemployment rate is more than 120% of the national average for at least two consecutive calendar years immediately preceding the date of application. Yeah, that's really good. And

**Member Ogden** 21:58

we might want to extend that so maybe three years or a year, it's only been two years, almost COVID. Now, yeah.

**Chair Goins** 22:04

I like to actually help at least three hours.

**Member Scott** 22:19

So, I'm not sure what did you think about that first part about the high rate of arrest, conviction or incarceration related to the sale of marijuana? That topper?

**Chair Goins** 22:27

That's what I'm trying to get away from? Oh, are you okay? Yeah. And the reason why I'm trying to get away from it is because we'd have to pull the study. Yeah. Okay. So, if we can just do it based on because the CCB has to make this component of the licensing application available within the next three to four months, right. So, what we don't want to do is put them in a situation where they have to push it back yesterday or something, push it back, we want to consider how they can do this swiftly. Right. And stay within this timeline.

\*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>

**Member Ogden 22:56**

I mean, the good and the bad part of all of those who usually the whole run hand in hand anyway, ya know, it'd be covered to some degree,

**Member Scott 23:03**

and it'll be nice. Down the road, you see a need for adding something on, you can probably add this so they could probably do a study in the interim.

**Chair Goins 23:12**

I agree. And I think there's even a conversation to be made that this opens the opportunity to say, hey, this is something we should have identified. This is a study that needs to be funded. Let's get this study on the records. Because it you know, it's still bothersome to me that it doesn't exist, but that's neither here nor there. And

**Member Ogden 23:29**

then when we talk about expungement, and all these things that are still trying to get worked out, you know, this would fall on that end anyway. Because when programs come together for trying to take someone from the black market into an illegal market and incentivizing that type of situation in programs, this would fall into that study and like why is important? Just think is to go there to illicit market. Thank you. Yeah, I like it.

**Chair Goins 24:02**

I like it also. So, I think what will ask, what will suggest is, what we're talking about is item two identifying areas disproportionately affected by policing. We're going to move to say that we're asking that we identify a poverty rate of at least 20% 75% or more of the children participate in a federal free lunch program. 75% of the area 20% of the households receive benefits under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, which is nap and average unemployment rate is more than 120% of the national average for at least three years. Three consecutive calendar years. Yeah. I like it. I like it. That's clean. They can pull the data. I think that's fair.

**Member Ogden 25:01**

without any waiting or pausing, I can pull this

**Member Scott 25:05**

measure and measure the most important part that have been measurable.

**Chair Goins 25:10**

Agree. And then that will bring us back to one of the things that because it says resonance timeline to qualify, that will bring us back to being five years having to be in these areas. I like it.

**Member Scott 25:31**

So, do we want to with those criteria, those four criteria you reference, do we? So, we don't want to do anything with regard to unemployment or school dropout rate or public assistance? Well, these are events only through SNAP, yes. Is that Well, or is that?

**Chair Goins 25:51**



So, you don't have because what they're doing is I, I want to make sure that we're saying the same thing. Yes. What they're saying is one of the following, you have to fit one of the following criteria. What we're saying is, we're identify these are the criteria is to identify the areas that persons must reside in to be considered a social equity applicant. Okay, I gotcha. All right. So, I just want to make sure that we're saying the same thing. Make sense? All right. Yeah. All right. You have any questions? Member Ulman?

**Member Ulman 26:24**

No, I agree with you.

**Chair Goins 26:27**

All right. All right. That wasn't too stressful. Move into item three, and soon as to work with social equity applicants. This is. So, when we talk about social equity applicants, we are always discussing how this looks financially. Because we know, I don't want to assume a social equity applicant doesn't have access to funding, I'm never going to assume that. What I will say is that the numbers across the nation have proven that money is a barrier to entry into the cannabis industry. And so, what we want to do is create a scenario where these licensees, these potential licensees can attract investors and current operators to do business with these lounges. What we don't want is we don't want the current licensees who are established businesses to feel like these independent licenses are going to be their competition. So, I'm just the elephant in the room, I'm just going to sit in on the table so that we can address it right. Um,

**Member Scott 28:01**

I think they'll always be competition just because they're going to do the same. They just happen to be an independent Laos versus a one that's tied to a dispensary. So, I think there will always be that feeling of competition. I think the independents love to be a little bit more unique in what they offer in order for them to be successful.

**Chair Goins 28:21**

I agree. What I don't want is to create a scenario where the owners feel like they have to swallow him up or step on them or come for him. Right. I don't want that. And it's these conversations, the regulations, and how we dialogue about our suggestions is how they will position themselves in business. And so, what I want to do is have a dialogue about how can we incentivize the current licensees who will be in management agreements with these social equity applicants to provide products or either to allow delivery? How do we position these social equity applicants so that it makes their business attractive?

**Member Scott 29:09**

And that was one thing we brought up that I was a little confused about? I don't know if the attorney for big was on the other line, but I didn't believe that an independent can be owned by someone who currently has a dispensary license. So, because they have the ability to have those other lounges that are connected to them. I didn't think that one of them could own an independent I thought he was just strictly independent and not hung by any of them. So, there wouldn't be a partnership an opportunity to partnership with dispensaries that come from either upstate or somewhere else that they get that partnership, right.

**Chair Goins 29:51**

So, the partnership is implied. Right. The regulation says that that license that consumption lounges licensee should have a management or should have an agreement with one of the retailers to provide Oh, cannabis, either the sale, if there's going to be a sell component, or the delivery, if there will be a delivery component that's not this committee,

\*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>

I'm not going to make that decision. What I will say is, we want to position this licensee, this applicant to be attractive to those owners so that they will want to provide delivery or sales or whatever. So, and Member Ogden has brought this up, we're never thinking of how to position it so that it is a value to those current owners. And this is the time for us to do that. We want these owners to want to end desire to do business with our equity applicants. So, this is the conversation for that.

**Member Ogden 30:57**

Okay, I got a question. You just said, I think he just said that they saw how it's written. Now they actually have to have a contract every whether you be a social equity license or regular licensure, from a dispensary owner, you have to have a contract in place with it just one retailer or as many retailers as you do that have a license, a contract, whatever, maybe one of many

**Member Scott 31:22**

pharmaceutical dispensary will have their own license their own for their own right. I'm just trying to get the minimum assumption. Well, because one, they could be next door to it. Yeah, they can't have it. The one between them believe that they can be next door, and they would imagine they would supply their own

**Chair Goins 31:36**

right. One or one or more. Yes. So, Member Scott, the there are three licenses available. Right? There's a retail license, which is the dispensary retail license, right? Those dispensaries currently can have one retail license, then there is the independent license. And the social equity license isn't necessarily a license, but I'm going to use it for that in this conversation, so that you can differentiate one from yet okay. So, what will happen is those independent licensees, according to the regulations, will have to have an agreement where they will receive product from the owners of the dispensaries now.

**Member Scott 32:21**

For the for our guests, the people that are in the consumption labs would have to order from that

**Chair Goins 32:27**

exact Okay, gotcha. And it would either be delivered or made sales may be provided later, but either way, the middle person is the dispensary that will be doing business with that person. Okay. And so, what we want to do is position those licensees, those consumption lounge, S II applicants specifically so that those owners find this relationship attractive. Yeah, makes sense.

**Member Ulman 32:56**

So, I think, um, you know, with the amount of consumption lounges that we'll have, versus the amount of dispensaries that they could partner with. The social equity applicants and independent applicants will have a lot of attractive offers. So, dispensaries can be their main supplier. Right. And I think one thing that would be attractive, and I don't even know if this is more of just a business decision between them, but spreading out the terms, or let's say you have a large dispensary that can help in some way provide like, kind of like a creditor where they are giving them really, really generous terms for like six months, or just working with them on the financing. I think one way that could help and make it more attractive to the independent lounges on who to work with. But I do see you know, if I'm a dispensary like, I'm definitely going to want to service as many of these as possible and be the dispensary of choice. So that's just one idea, but I don't know if that would come from us, or if that's really up to the to the dispensaries and how they want 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 34:24**

Well, it's always up to the dispensaries. It's always up to the current licensees how they want to do business. What we and I agree with you Member Ulman, I do realize that because it will only be 20 licenses may be right and 10 will be assays that that will make them attractive, sure. But that doesn't mean that they won't try to swallow them up.

**Member Ulman 34:46**

Yes. So, so we can come in is like some kind of price gouging. price gouging standards or regulations, making sure that the tax access between the dispensary and the lounge, the independent lounges are at a certain level, so that consumers are able to purchase real, you know, reasonable prices. But how do we make sure yeah, that they're not taken advantage of, and price gouging comes to mind.

**Member Ogden 35:23**

I think if anything, you know, we've got to look on both sides of this, you got to look at what isn't in it for me, as a dispensary. You can't, you can't just always say Give, give give, people have to get stuff back as well, it has to be in a Senate on both sides. If anything, it should be a tax break for someone doing business with a nonprofit or a social equity applicant or whatever, you know, it needs to be treated kind of like that. Yep. So, give the dispensaries this. And if that's who's that's where you need to give the incentive to, because they're going to pass it through to the social equity person as well. Okay, so they if they give this break to them, then they get their break as well. So, both sides, right? I'm not saying you only give it to them, but because they're able to get better prices to you to your example. If they show that, you know, they show a discount that was given, maybe they can write that off. If they show a certain amount of incentives given or contracts or certain length of contracts with XML, they get an incentive they get a tax break. I mean, that's where you're going to hit people where it counts in their pocket.

**Member Scott 36:36**

And suddenly there's allowances when people promote certain dispensaries that they have contracts with. Absolutely.

**Chair Goins 36:42**

Yeah, yeah, of course. And Chair, I

**Member Scott 36:45**

was, you know, just just coming from the aspect of the locals where we did all the licensing and everything. A lot of the dispensaries don't have the room to have another like, something attached to them. So, you wouldn't find a lot of them being attached to a dispensary. So, they may have to rely on these independence to do what they can't do, because they're landlocked, doesn't allow them to be able to have it.

**Member Ogden 37:08**

Nor can they get something right next door. I mean, you know, who has just some sitting there? Yeah.

**Member Scott 37:13**

And we also have to consider too, because they're going to be so few places where these can be placed, given the fact that you have the distance separation from gaming, from church ruins, churches, from synagogues, home parks, from residential, I mean, there are going to be very few places where these can be placed. And so, it may be incumbent upon the dispensers to have to rely on these independents, to have for their customers.

\*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 37:41**

So, I don't disagree with any of that. I agree with Member Ulman, we have to be thinking about if there's already a clause in the regulations where the price of product will be reviewed by the Cannabis Compliance Board, but I do believe that we need to remember our guns point, we need to provide some incentives for current owners so that they stay competitive and less than compared to flying. And I also believe that what Member Ulman said is we want to make them attractive. We you know, we want to that's what we're here for. Right? We're here to think through all the places where we can provide sustainability for our applicants, and I believe positioning them to be an attractive licensee is another place we can provide some form unique form of sustainability without to what you're saying Member Ogden without making it. You giving them something, but also this has got to be yes, it has to be symbiotic. We have to pass some synergy there.

**Member Ogden 38:55**

So, because we see it already. Oh, no, we see it with Why won't the cannabis industry help, you know, nonprofit? Because they don't get a tax write off. They don't There's nothing for them and outside of, you know, feeling good.

**Member Scott 39:10**

I'm agree with Member Ogden. I was just indicating that because they're going to be so rare. Yes, they will be attractive. I think their rarity will make them attractive.

**Chair Goins 39:21**

I think so too. But I also believe that there's a space for the licensees to raise the price and position them so that they can't win. And that's what I don't want. So how do we look at incentives for the licensee to do business with the SAE applicant, so we can't mess with the taxes? Because the Cannabis Compliance Board doesn't have authority of that.

**Member Ogden 39:43**

Well, we can say recommend that they take the taxes that they already collect. And you know, well for other things like programs and grant support services for incentives and things like that throughout having their time and license. You know, as a social equity because we talked about that last time, I can keep someone from wanting to switch this out or sell it. And it's not a social equity license.

**Chair Goins 40:11**

So, I know because each jurisdiction and each body of regulation has their own authority, and the CCB doesn't have authority over taxes. However, they do have authority over license. And maybe one of the things that we could suggest is, if you do business with a social equity applicant, you get two months extra on your license up. So instead of having to renew in February, you will renew in April or

**Member Scott 40:41**

Richard. Again, I'm not the lawyer for the board, but protection issue with regard to that, because I think that if I'm a non-social equity, they're already getting a break by having priority. Why are they now given? Again, I'm playing devil's advocate, getting a break from how because they get a priority, because they're already social equity applicants that you're going to get probably the application that priority. So, you're giving them more of an incentive by doing this. Again, this is, again, I'm I wish we had the lawyer of the line but thinking about from a perspective of an equal protection claim that they may say, I'm not being provided with the same benefits.

**Chair Goins 41:27**

\*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>

But I think that's exactly what we're talking about. If I am saying to if I'm saying to the licensee, if you do business with this social equity applicant, and you build this relationship for however long it is right, then what we're willing to do to incentivize you, the owner is as a member, I couldn't have said, we're going to discount your licensee fees just like we're discounting them. So, then what it does is it positions that owner to say, keep this relationship solid. value to us. Gotcha.

**Member Ogden** 41:58

Yeah. I mean, instead of paying \$100,000 fee, you know, maybe I can pay 90, you know, because I showed over the years that I've supported this program. And here's how because it has to be measurable.

**Chair Goins** 42:11

Yes, absolutely. So that original application is 100,000. But I think the renewal is only 10. Right? But what they could say is because you're in relationship with the social equity applicant, your renewal is fine.

**Member Scott** 42:24

And so, what do you I mean, I use what do you envision that relationship looking like not because again, the customers that come in, since they can't buy it from the lounge have to buy

**Member Ulman** 42:34

from the members got they can buy candidates about

**Member Scott** 42:38

No, because now they can buy from the lounge, because allows them to dispense? Yes, no. What's the last thing?

**Chair Goins** 42:45

Hold on? Hold on? Member Ulman, go ahead.

**Member Ulman** 42:50

Yes. So just to clarify how the bill works is they are able to buy single serving use cannabis from the Lounge, which would be coming from the dispensary. And they are not able to leave with the cannabis. So just like a bar, but yes, they can buy that in the form of a consumption or an edible. One thing that I was going to ask you, you're going to I don't know, I don't know this information, if you do, but talking about the taxes from the cultivation to the dispensary, and then the dispensary to the lounge. Who makes that consideration for what percentage of tax should be? Is that the CCB? Is that us?

**Chair Goins** 43:34

Well, that was this. That's the Department of Taxation. And as a matter of fact, you know, Justin BROSCO, that was something that came up with legislation in Parliament taxation actually came out and had a conversation about it, they are the source that channels that information. It is a collaboration between the CCB and Department of Taxation because it has to all you know, kind of flow into whatever system they're using at this point. However, department taxation always is the person who is setting tax.

**Member Ulman** 44:03

Okay, so would we be able to recommend attaches to, you know, for both of those transactions, so let's say it's 1%. But for social equity applicants, it's point 5% to go you know, from the cultivator to the dispensary, to the lounge. So,

\*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>

I think that tax those taxes right there, we'll determine quite a bit of what type of product and how much we can get it to the social equity lounges. But it's we're talking about high tax for both of those transactions. That's worrisome.

**Chair Goins** 44:48

I believe so let me stay on task and then I'll answer that okay. Because I believe the regulations say something different, but I want to go back to Member Scott. So, Member Scott, the new regulations for the consumption lounge did create a designation that the words say that the consumption lounge may have sales. So, Words matter.

**Member Scott** 45:12

And the problem with that becomes because these would be privileged licenses through the locals, I'm assuming no one who's a social equity applicant? Well, depending on what their background is, they may not meet the qualifications for a privilege license, given their background, if they're able to sell because if you're able to sell the civil servants, you're going to require the same background investigation, as we would require for a dispensary owner, the background, so they may not meet those qualifications is what I'm concerned about.

**Chair Goins** 45:49

That's what we're all concerned about. However, these applicants absolutely will have to meet the same background requirements as any other applicant. And that's the reason why the 10 year that is the reason why from last week, we said that there had to be a 10-year buffer is because that puts them in the space where they should qualify as a regular applicant. Back to one of the things Member Ulman was saying, as it relates to the regulations? Yes, there is a space where what were we talking about taxes, right? So, we absolutely can ask for we can ask whatever, right, we can ask for whatever. But the regulations, if I remember correctly, the taxes will be applied on the end, not in the beginning. And the only time the only reason why we're having this conversation is because if it is a delivery, then the sale will be completed. If the sale will be done at the dispensary, I vaguely almost remember that the regulation says that taxes will be applied at the end sale. So, it won't be tax. Good. However, I do want to point out that it does say May sale it doesn't say will. So that is at the discretion of the CCB. That is absolutely something we could put in as one of our recommendations that we recommend that the social equity applicants have the ability to sail. I think that is definitely a component of sustainability. And so, we can add that as one of our things. My concern

**Member Scott** 47:39

was, I don't know if you'll get the staff when they're when they're concerned that begins to give an approval or at least a recommendation or approval. If the person's got some issue in their background because privilege licenses are very hard to get, and they shouldn't be because they aren't perfect licenses. So, I'm just afraid that you know, people may be setting for failure. I think the main data relate to the dispensary or dispensaries owning it. But I don't know. I haven't read the legislation lately.

**Chair Goins** 48:09

We're not setting Anyone up for failure. Very clear. What they need to know just

**Member Scott** 48:14

in terms of the buying from the dispensary or the from the lounge. That's a part I'm concerned because it requires purchase license and again,

**Member Ogden** 48:22

requiring the service which you're saying though, just purchase period just single

\*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 48:27**

Oh, anything yes purchase period. But what I will say is to Member Scott's point this is a privilege license, yes, period. Yes, the requirements are the requirements are the requirements, the only thing that we are doing is we are trying to attract a specific applicant, but they will still have to meet the requirements for a privilege license.

**Member Scott 48:51**

Okay, that's a very invasive process in terms of ever requires, you know, where the sources of the money came from where you don't name 10 people you knew from third grade? You know, it requires quite a bit. Yes, I

**Chair Goins 49:06**

absolutely am aware because you know, when I went through the process that you had a pastor come to my church and talk to my pastor. So, I absolutely know how invasive the process is. But it goes without standing. That's the process. That's not something that is up for negotiation. We're just trying to identify specific applicants that will meet and get through that process. Back to incentives to work with social equity applicants, I like that. So, two things. We absolutely can make recommendation to Member Ulman; we can make recommendation for a percent. I just need to clarify what you're saying there. But I want to make sure that I kind of bring up what Member Ogden said as relates to offering those perks. Since working with social equity applicants, that member contract being so much, you know, so many amount of years, if we're going to say that that social equity applicant is that social equity is the SAE partner with the CCB, for however many long that however long that is that this relationship is at least half that timeline. So, if the SEC license will be that licensee forever, then this person has to have a relationship with this person for this amount of time for

**Member Ogden 50:37**

a person I don't say. And the reason I say that is because let's say I'm doing business with you, I'm a social equity, your social equity loud, but you don't you're not good, right? Are you going to force me to be in a contract with that person for a year just to get mine? No, as long as I'm doing business within that social equity ramp, right? Whether it be you, you whoever, because let's face it, we're not trying to give people a leg up and be terrible, right? It's not fair to the dispensary owners that want to do that. They don't, they shouldn't have to go down a level. Right. So as long as that as long as it's just any social equity.

**Member Scott 51:15**

And I agree with Zoom it is that we shouldn't probably go too in depth into the nuts and bolts of their agreement. As long as we've decided there can be an agreement. Yeah,

**Member Ogden 51:26**

I'm agreement and then a year, whoever, how many ever, but there doesn't need

**Chair Goins 51:31**

to be a timeline. If you are working with a social equity applicant, and you are working with that applicant. Even if you get another applicant, there doesn't be a timeline, because that's how you qualify for the Senate, or whatever. Yeah, and I would lean in to say that, you know, this is me, really thinking about my SC applicants in that sustainability, you absolutely need to make that relationship work, because part of it not working has to do with mentorship. And so, if you're going to lean in and be in partnership, you should help them make that work. But

\*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>

**Member Ogden** 52:01

I don't think it needs to be on the responsibility of a dispensary owner to mentor just it should be the state as well. I mean, look, I bring programs in place by living we have enough to contend with as a business owner in these times. And a dispensary that is super, highly regulated and have a lot of compliance. There's a lot going on there. So, the next thing I got to do is make sure your business is successful. I don't really think it should fall on the dispensaries to do that. But yet,

**Chair Goins** 52:28

hey, look, if they support programs,

**Member Ogden** 52:30

and they support the social equity, that's, that's all that's enough. You know, I mean, I don't know what you mean when you say mentor, but we got to get into that a little bit.

**Member Scott** 52:43

Colorado Chair has like this accelerator program, they have like an almost like a mentor like Member Ogden was talking about, have somebody there to help them be successful. Because get even give someone the license or the opportunity to practice or to be in business. That doesn't mean they're going to be great, because they may not have any business acumen at all. So at least it needs to be somebody there to give them the education and the opportunity.

**Member Ogden** 53:07

I mean, workforce development programs, apprentice's programs, and all of that should be other states where it's within the state, they provide the funding for that, and in the programs, they put it together, you know, I don't know of any dispensary run around helping, you know, I can't get someone to go to feed the homeless right now. So, you know,

**Member Scott** 53:31

they have their own businesses to contend with. They shouldn't have to be burdened with someone else's business program. So

**Member Ogden** 53:37

if there's reporting you can support there's just different ways I think

**Chair Goins** 53:40

so, do we think that if that is one of the components that we want to look at, if you get in the partnership with an SC applicant, and you maintain partnership with any see applicant for her met for a time of two years?

**Member Ogden** 53:59

I think it should be year to year because

**Member Scott** 54:04

again, having them pen to somebody for two full years. A lot of businesses fail within the first year

**Member Ogden** 54:13



I would say like it's well count I was looking at I was looking at let's say for example though, I have a couple of contracts. I mean, I don't even think it should be a pool because how am I going to be penalized if you close down and then you close down? I'm going to Russian I got one month left in the year. I've been real good support I got rush out and hurry up and cover my last month. Yeah, that

**Member Scott** 54:33

sounds like that's going too far into the into the private contractual relationship between the parties. And again, I understand Chair of the year saying that at least they need to be held to some standard. I agree. But I don't know two years a long time. Just depends on the applicant and their business acumen. And if they're willing to listen to the dispensary person, some people are just independent. They don't want to listen

**Chair Goins** 54:59

how much time Are we

**Member Ogden** 55:00

do a time versus percentage of discount? Like, for example, let's say 80% of the year, they work with this, can they get that? Can that be an incentive? So

**Chair Goins** 55:09

you're thinking tiered

**Member Scott** 55:10

and what has worked with me?

**Chair Goins** 55:14

Contract.

**Member Ogden** 55:15

So, if let's say, let's say I'm not that great. I'm a dispensary and I'm not keeping up with my relationships. I get, you know, one month out of the year I need to get that's about as good as I should be able to get on a discount, whatever little, tiny fraction of percentage that may

**Chair Goins** 55:32

be. Okay, so what we're so what you're saying is, I like that so what you're saying is, for three months, you get 10% for 24 for five months, you get this amount and then so forth, and so on. Tear it out.

**Member Ogden** 55:46

Yeah, but I think the tear could be based on it could be

**Member Scott** 55:52

I guess my guess my concern is also that who's going to monitor this I mean, what entity or organizations don't make sure that these two are getting along that the lounge

**Chair Goins** 56:05

if you got a contract metrical show all of that? Well, yeah. Because the Yes, go ahead member.

\*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>

**Member Ulman 56:13**

So, when people are doing business, a lot of times they don't have contracts when they're buying the cannabis. And a lot of times, you know, you could have a lot of flour, and maybe you don't, so things go up and down, you have to find another supplier. There's so many different variables. So right now, I'd say most people do not do contracts with each other. And you want it to be a free market, you know, you want we want the social equity applicants to have great offers and maybe that mentorship program, I do think that's up to the dispensary on how they want to provide that. But if I'm in social equity winner, and I know that dispensary A is going to help provide mentorship with compliance accounting and systems and they write it down and mentor sure excusing, and dispensary B isn't going to do that. I might pick a and that's just you know, off of the management agreement. So right now, nobody operates and contracts too much. So, I don't think that's yeah,

**Member Ogden 57:14**

that's why the reason we were talking about it this way, though, is because she said it was written that way,

**Chair Goins 57:19**

all regulations already like that. So, although there are contracts, the regs already written that there has to be a contract for

**Member Ogden 57:26**

this for the lounges. Now, now, now there's going to be a handshake. Now, dispensaries are not it's not in there, it's not in there like that. That's why it's, that's why they haven't had to. But this is different. So that's what we're looking at. And we've already said that we don't need it to be where they are only in business with them is to be honorable, if your

**Member Ulman 57:49**

contract is supposed to entail, because we don't want to put any of these applicants in a position where now let's say they're, they're buying from a shop who's a vertical and that, you know, all of a sudden, they don't have flour, and now they're

**Member Ogden 58:01**

getting into the contract. And for that between the companies that's between the dispensary, and then whatever they put in there, we just want to know that there is one and it's for a certain length of time, in order for everybody involved to get whatever discount we've set, or whatever, incentive. That's it.

**Chair Goins 58:19**

I agree, Member Ogden, Member Ulman. I agree with you also, we don't want to get in the weeds of that. Supply and demand is going to be the key to that. However, we do want to incentivize those who have the supply to partner with those who will have the demand and make that attractive. And I think where we are right now, is considering those partnerships, and what it looks like, as a relates to maybe a tiered system. And I like the tiered idea. I think it's fair, I think the minimum should be three months. I mean, damn, you can, you know, any relationship, you got to get past 90 days, you know, I'm saying even

**Member Ogden 58:58**

\*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>

if it's a month, a month contract after the, you know, you know, you just show that you've been you've tried this for three months, and hey, that's where you get your, that's where your initial incentive starts

**Chair Goins** 59:09

agreed, and from there, and I know, as relates to sales, specifically, that will show up in metric. So, we don't have to worry about how is the CCB going to be able to track that that it will be there? Because it'll be going from this dispensary to this lounge and that will be in the METRC system. So

**Member Ogden** 59:28

it can know percentage B and not where we set the amount, but percentage of time like for example, you know, added 12 months, three months is what percent you know, so that's all just percentage.

**Chair Goins** 59:38

That way, we don't have

**Member Ogden** 59:41

to monitor it that way. It just it the math is what it is. So, like if you do it that way. If it's one month,

**Chair Goins** 59:50

there's not one now it won't

**Member Ogden** 59:51

be because we will have a minimum right, so you do four months, and some of those 4.5 There it is, you know you take that math out of it. Here, that's what your discount will be or whatever. And that's where they get. That's how they figure out what they pay and their next registration

**Chair Goins** 1:00:07

fee, how I get one thing notice that I've

**Member Scott** 1:00:12

tried to employ, like,

**Member Ulman** 1:00:17

I have a comment I was reading Vermont gives \$500,000 business development funds for social equity applicants, definitely curious where they got that money from. I know in our original meeting, I had suggested that we increase the daily limit to two ounces or an ounce and three points 3.5 grams, or a concentrate or seven grams and I would love to see that additional money going for social equity applicants, but um, I think you know, possibly something to be said if you are a current dispensary cultivation or production, and you are able to possibly make a donation or create some kind of grant where they could apply do you get a benefit for that?

**Chair Goins** 1:01:14

Name play.

**Member Ogden** 1:01:15

And that's another thing is like, you know, there's still some things that have that once it's rescheduled, and things like that happen, it may help a lot of this because you can't do right now. It's not structured for dispensaries to give anything and get anything back; we'd have to restructure tax stuff like she said earlier. Right. We try to keep saying something as simple as these fees or something. Other incentives that we can recommend for programming right now what they haven't structured is they take they have taxes they take, and they use that for programs throughout where they deem necessary, we can recommend that some of this money that they already pull from the taxes go to these programs and that's something new though like creating a whole new tax a whole new Oh, that's

**Member Ulman** 1:01:59

not what I'm saying. That's not saying create a new tax increase the daily limit that's one to get more taxes in and then have those going to fund for actual reform and social justice. But if dispensaries actually gave or excuse me, any cannabis company, not just dispensaries, was able to give a grant or a scholarship. I don't see it as pay to play I see it as there was never you know, all revolving loan funds set up and no thought process of how we're going to get tax dollars to social justice. So, if you are a cannabis company and you can donate five \$250,000 scholarships, is there something that you could somehow you could benefit just an idea might not work. But again, I saw Vermont and you know, that's I don't know where they're getting that money from but \$500,000 is definitely a way to start the business strong. My computer's frozen screen

1:03:43

I think there's a problem with the connection. We'll get them reconnected. Okay. Thanks for your patient member I'm and we're still trying to get them reconnected Thank you? Can you hear me connected?

**Chair Goins** 1:07:25

Oh, great Member Ulman, can you hear us?

**Member Ulman** 1:07:31

I can hear you.

**Chair Goins** 1:07:33

Okay, we stopped you didn't miss anything. But I wanted to take us back to we were talking about funding and social equity applicant programs. And so, what without reviewing everything that I said what we were going to do is make a suggestion that component of the licensing fees for social equity applicant excuse me for the consumption lounges, let me be very clear a portion of the social equity applicant fees go social, let's use lounges. Go back to the SAE applicants for program. So that is money that hasn't been allocated yet. We can say we'd like as you said, 1%. I don't think that's enough, I'd have to do the math on that. We'd like 5% of the total licensing fees to go back to an SEC program, we could make that

**Member Ogden** 1:08:32

suggest I would suggest a minimum and then let them go up a minimum of five percent that way, you know, they might we don't know how much is going to come in. And then you might think we should have said 10 You know, and we don't? Yeah.

**Chair Goins** 1:08:44

So, when I say minimum of five

**Member Scott** 1:08:46

members got Yeah. I agree. I was saying that. I also think that if we're going to be able to make suggestions of where this money goes, I'd like to see some type of education. Colorado has a really will move to Colorado they have an education back to starting at sixth grade to talk about marijuana and the effects and everything else like that they even had like game that they created almost like a quiz game.

**Member Ogden** 1:09:19

Cool. Some of this stuff here. I think the education needs to be focused on sustainability of their business because very specific to social equity applicants and what they're getting in order to. So, I agree with that is needed and I think they should use that money in the whole totality of the tax and break that off. Yeah,

**Member Scott** 1:09:40

for some equity here.

**Member Ogden** 1:09:42

I think the incentive for people being a social equity applicant and maintaining that throughout time is some of the programs that I'm talking about like work, workplace development, apprenticeship programs, things of that nature. are in bet are going to help them with the business going forward in order and then you know, maybe even allowing people who as another incentive for someone who works closely with social equity companies allowing those to maybe participate in some of those programs for their business. That's another incentive. If I if I support social equity applicants throughout my year, then I can send two or three of my input whatever number of my employees to learn to workplace development, as well. So those type of programs are some of the stuff that I think we should encourage them to put in place.

**Chair Goins** 1:10:40

I agree. So, we will make the suggestion for a minimum of 5% to go of the consumption lounge fees, licensing application fees, I need to write that

**Member Scott** 1:10:59

ensure was there any, I guess, thought as elements that would actually be or? That's not our realm?

**Member Ogden** 1:11:05

It depends on how many applicants there are and all of that

**Member Scott** 1:11:09

all. That's our lane.

**Chair Goins** 1:11:13

Okay. I mean, if I had to estimate, let's see, I know the numbers were, we had, excuse me, the Cannabis Compliance Board had received 49 inquiries for retail consumption lounge. So that's 400,000. Wait, no, because it's 100,000 person, so

**Member Scott** 1:11:33

Oh, so it is 100?

**Chair Goins** 1:11:37

It will be Yeah, so that's fair. Right. So that so there, you know, there's some money there.

**Member Ogden** 1:11:44

So, some of the other programs that I think that if we generalize here some of the things that I think that money should be looked at, and they are, is it okay to go into now or

**Chair Goins** 1:11:56

no? It's not okay to go into that. But we have identified an investor and car current owner incentive. And so, with that, we'll move on to Item four, which is diversity consideration. And so, I just want to point out that the consumption lounge specifically, you know, there are 10 applications available. And because of what we are required, what we are suggesting, as a requirement, I believe that we will have women's veterans and LGBTQ I and a plus persons that will apply. However, I definitely want to have the conversation about these three criteria. And, and this, you know, as I'm trying my hardest not to do the as a black woman thing, right, but I'm a black woman, it goes without saying. So, one of the things that I'm always thinking about when I am looking at the iniquities of persons disenfranchised by the past cannabis policies is who those persons usually are, right? People I talked to the, you know, men and women, I'm, I am thinking about that person, particularly when we start talking about women, veterans, LGBTQIA+, as we go into the equity applicant component, we move, I find that most places move away from those disenfranchised persons by the war on drugs and move into something that is a little more comfortable fit as it relates to diversity. And so, my concern with that is, when we are talking about social equity applicants, we're always talking about that person who was disenfranchised. And now there is a business that is flourishing, and making money off of those persons and their lives, and their livelihoods and their generations of trauma. And so, I want to give that as it as were moving into this conversation. I want to just kind of give that as a disclaimer, and then talk about diversity considerations as a tiered idea. So, as we're talking about this as a tiered idea, and we're thinking about women, outside of what we've already identified, how do we want to qualify women because what I know to be true, this isn't, you know, something that I heard I know to be true. There are businesses that identify as women owned and the husbands run the businesses. So that is what I'm always thinking about when I'm thinking about women in the business world, you know, owning businesses. And so, with that being said, when we're considering women, how do we want to qualify them? As a social equity applicant? I have nothing to add to this. So, I'm leaning on you all,

**Member Ogden** 1:15:19

wouldn't they? Right now, when they when someone has to apply for a woman owned or minority owned business. There's already criteria for that. Are you saying you don't want to, because of what you've experienced, you don't really want to go to a strictly that criteria? Because it's very intense to do that.

**Chair Goins** 1:15:37

We can we

**Member Ogden** 1:15:39

know why we would change the route alter it. I mean, it's not, you know, they structured this already.

**Chair Goins** 1:15:45

And we can do that we can just use the criteria. But my question is, how are we considering them in the application process?

\*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>

**Member Scott** 1:15:54

Well, just like when we talk when we had the discussion about how much for the SAE person or SCA person own 1%. And so, we always get back into that conversation as to the person may need, the woman may need a partner involved, or there may be several women involved, or I don't know, what's the current criteria indicates what consider what's considered to be a woman owned business, we probably need to look at that and mimic that like,

**Chair Goins** 1:16:27

well, I will say, I think that that is as member I could have said, that's already that has already been qualified. So, we don't need to. We don't need to converse that what we need to be talking about is how does this stack? How do these persons stack next to our S E applicants?

**Member Ogden** 1:16:46

Do they also you're saying like basically, with this person, just because it's a minority woman owned business, she automatically is an SAE applicant period, none of the other stuff needs to apply?

**Member Scott** 1:16:57

That's what I'm asking you to meet all three of

**Chair Goins** 1:17:00

them. Right, which they would already meet, right?

**Member Scott** 1:17:02

They could be they could be all three of them. So that's a little harder. I think.

**Member Ulman** 1:17:08

I kind of understood it as there's almost three buckets, if you will, they're social equity applicants, which we've established have been adversely affected by non-violent cannabis policy. And we know that's going to be you know, a small narrow down, then there's the diversity applicants, which maybe never were affected by cannabis policy. But were left out of the first two license rounds, when Nevada became legal. And then there's just everyone else, which probably means you're super rich, and you're going to apply for the independent lounges. So, for this group of diversity applicants, which I foresee as a large group of people, I think it's important that we differentiate they're not social equity applicants, they're diversity applicants, meaning they've been left out. And I think what that is, you do have to establish some monetary metrics, because you don't want a veteran, a woman and minority own woman, somebody that was a caregiver, that's a millionaire getting this license, they can go apply for the independent license. So, I do think in this case, with diversity, we put a criteria for income.

**Member Ogden** 1:18:30

Well, we know the social equity applicants are going to their first you know, pieces, financial, you know, some of it to some degree, right? Because we all know that there are certain criteria to be that and a lot of it is underserved areas XYZ, which means you most likely need the support of financial support. So, the discounts on fees make sense there things like that, where they wouldn't for this applicant, because you don't like you said to your point, it doesn't necessarily mean that financially struggling so that I think there's already a benefit a separation there if they don't get the discount with the fees and things of the upfront PCE.

**Member Scott** 1:19:14

\*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>

This one's a little bit more difficult. I know the gentleman the second gentleman just spoke during public comment, reference, Illinois, and their veterans' programs. I did look at that and see what that

**Member Ogden** 1:19:25

program they just had veterans. They haven't. They just basically they just got an extra point. On their application. Yeah. And a lot of people did, and a lot of people tie. Gotcha. And so, and even if you tie didn't mean he got it because of the veteran. Oh, no, no, it went they just had a veteran on their application. Oh, gosh, you know, that was or whatever. Yeah, I was like two points. I believe this is some small amount.

**Chair Goins** 1:19:55

So, one of my concerns is the SC applications. There are 10 of them. Okay, for this particular licensing process, and we're talking about the consumption lounge process, there are only 10 applications. And so, what we are proposing is there may be a tiered process where these identifying markers take precedence. And then these identifying markers take secondary or they're equal across the board. And there's some kind of pass fail, that happens, or, you know,

**Member Scott** 1:20:35

I agree and Member Ulman then she talked about the fact that this is a for diversity, equity inclusion for those persons who were adversely affected by past policies. If these groups can identify as that, then they would already be here, they would already be here. Yeah. And so that's why I'm a little concerned about getting into this realm. about us getting involved in this realm when the first part is what we're charged with doing. So

**Member Ulman** 1:21:07

we're trying to do both, right. So, the whole point is that if people did not if they got to not have an opportunity to get into this market, they do now, I'm looking at New York, I'm looking at New York's language here on that email you sent over. And I think they've done a great job at identifying those diversity applicants. So again, people who aren't millionaires, but people who didn't get a charge. So, minority owned business, women owned business minority women, they put disenfranchised farmers, I would say, caregivers, licensed caregivers, and then veterans. And that's why I'm saying like, if you meet one of those categories, but you're rich, you're not going to be in the diversity and social equity, equity pool, you'll be in the independent pool. But let's say you meet one of those categories, and you make less than \$250,000 a year. Your diversity applicant, you did not get a chance to get in. And that's what we

**Chair Goins** 1:22:15

also. But I also think that to what you're saying Member Ulman, which is what me and Member Scott are saying is, that is a reason why we set up the SC applicant tiers, right. So, if you're not a person from a non-violent, then you live in an area for five years that is has been isn't a poverty level, is it? You know, you could be a woman or a veteran or LGBTQI that would live in that area. Another criteria would be.

**Member Ulman** 1:22:48

But that's a social equity applicant. We're talking about diversity applicants. So, who are

**Chair Goins** 1:22:53

you but there are no diversity. So just so that we're all clear because I want to make sure that we are comparing apples to apples, there are only SE applications available only SE licenses available. So, what we are considering right now,

**Member Ulman** 1:23:08

\*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 should that's what we're deciding, or we're recommending, because again, this is a social equity, diversity, and inclusion. So, what we don't want to do is not include all of the people that are either in the middle, right, you're not rich and you don't have a charge. That's a lot of people we would be excluding.

**Chair Goins** 1:23:30

I would I'm going to lean in a little differently because the regulations call them social equity applicants, they don't call them diversity. Yeah.

**Member Scott** 1:23:40

And they have to be even though maybe diversity in Berkeley

**Member Ulman** 1:23:46

right now,

**Chair Goins** 1:23:48

but consumption lounge,

**Member Scott** 1:23:50

right. But you have to show that you're adversely affected. So how one of these, one of these groups so you think veterans were adversely affected? No. As a result,

**Member Ulman** 1:24:01

they would be considered the diversity applicant. Right. But

**Chair Goins** 1:24:05

Member Ulman, I hear exactly what you're saying. And I will agree with you that there is a distinction between social equity applicant and diversity Acklin applicant. I absolutely agree with that. The unfortunate part is we are specifically talking about consumption lounges right now. Assumption lounges identify social equity applicants, and that there are licenses available for social equity licenses, diversity,

**Member Ulman** 1:24:35

I definitely disagree on how that how the bill reads, that's why we're having this subcommittee. But where would you say those diversity applicants so all the black and brown folks who don't have a charge where do they fit?

**Chair Goins** 1:24:49

They say that only black and brown people have charges that

**Member Ulman** 1:24:54

the applicant, right, so who don't have charge and who aren't millionaires That's the diversity applicants. So, if you aren't

**Member Scott** 1:25:06

section doesn't have the word diversity in it. Now, Section nine says adversely affected by provisions of previous laws which criminalized activity relating to cannabis as determined by the board in accordance with the regulations adopted. Absolutely. So, diversity isn't even in that section not

\*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>

**Member Ulman** 1:25:23

it is not why are we talking about it? I don't have a charge and aren't millionaires are dipping on included?

**Member Scott** 1:25:42

Again, if they're not referenced in Section nine, if they weren't adversely affected by previous lawsuits criminalize this activity.

**Chair Goins** 1:25:50

The reason why I am bringing it up is because to your comment, we absolutely are a diversity, equity, and inclusion subcommittee. And so, I want to make sure that I am given space for dialogue. I'm not the ruler, I'm just the Chair. And so, if there is a space where the members believe that these persons should have the same relevance as SP applicants, I want to offer that conversation I specifically said I have nothing to offer. In regard to this. However, I absolutely want to offer the opportunities for the committee to weigh in if they feel differently.

**Member Ogden** 1:26:35

Yeah. So, see that we put SEP in there or you don't, either and you slide them in there, and we give them, but they fall in the same category, and they have to meet the same qualifications, or they don't. That's really obviously heard.

**Member Ulman** 1:26:55

Public comment from caregivers. And that's another variable, with which we've also seen from some other states that have put caregivers in this, but maybe they were never charged. You know, we're My question would be where do those people fall?

**Chair Goins** 1:27:15

Again, we are talking about specific how the regulations are written that this isn't a decision I'm making. This is a decision that was made from some legislators, and it's in the language says social equity applicants now, you absolutely can make a suggestion that you want caregivers to be considered in the social equity applicant component, we can that we can have that space to put that but right now, what we're talking about is women veterans, LGBTQ IA, do we want to add them in the SE component of this conversation? Yes,

**Member Ogden** 1:28:01

disabled veterans, you know, have typically been added. I think that's important. Especially if because there is a process to verify disabled veterans.

**Member Scott** 1:28:16

But again, like, if we're reading section nine, and we're testing meaning, and we're going to read section nine, they have to have been adverse. They have to be adversely affected by provisions of previous laws with criminalized cannabis activity that and so if they don't fit within that section nine, we're stepping outside.

**Member Ogden** 1:28:39

That's a good point.

**Member Scott** 1:28:40

I just again, I just because again, I think some of those persons will be women veterans, and they'll do well. So, I just think that if we stay just

**Member Ogden** 1:28:51

not going to get any extra points for that. That's what we're determining at this

**Chair Goins** 1:28:56

point. And I'm okay with that. Because then it makes it because one of the things we have seen nationwide is, this is those extra points where people are being sued, right? If we make it black and white, and transparent, you either fit or you don't fit, then you fit or you don't fit. I mean,

**Member Ulman** 1:29:17

I think section 12 refers to diversity, Member, Scott, if you have that available,

**Member Scott** 1:29:23

we're only I'm not but I thought we were only done was nine that 12.

**Member Ulman** 1:29:28

Well, we're dealing with the whole bill. But

**Member Scott** 1:29:32

yeah, but I don't think that's our chart. So, are you saying that Member Ulman, are you saying that you're going to get extra points? No, these things. I'm not saying. So, what do you say?

**Chair Goins** 1:29:44

Do you think it should be tiered because we have to make a suggestion. So, let's make a suggestion based on your passion. I want to make a suggestion. What would be a suggestion on how we wait women veterans and LGBTQI a plan Yes,

**Member Ulman** 1:30:00

yes, and minority owned that doesn't have a charge. That is the other folks we're talking about. So how do

**Chair Goins** 1:30:08

we? Sorry? Yes, go ahead.

**Member Ulman** 1:30:11

So, if this is a lottery, you could have multiple entries where social equity applicants have the most entries into the lottery, then you have based on merit, then you have a system. So, let's say you are a Nevada resident, minority, female veteran, that would get you a lot of entries. I mean, we

**Chair Goins** 1:30:41

establish, we established earlier that we wouldn't have stalking, that sounds like stalking. So, let's say

**Member Ulman** 1:30:48

\*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>

it's not stalking. It is the lottery already is. Lottery already is just a crapshoot to if you get it or not. But if you've been disenfranchised, you should have more opportunities to get like a merit-based system, but in a lottery sense. So, you'll have the most balls in the lottery. If you are again, minority women veteran, you'll have the most. So that's how I see you could definitely get a better chance of winning the lottery. If you've had more issues, or you no more injustice or left out.

**Member Ogden** 1:31:36

To me, some people would argue with that. I mean, how you went to jail, and then I'm a woman better and I'm just saying that's

**Member Scott** 1:31:49

a franchise, right? And then the good women veterans are easy to prove. How do you Yes. LGBTs? Because how personal do you get with that question?

**Member Ogden** 1:32:00

cuz how can how can that be verified?

**Member Scott** 1:32:05

I mean, that's a problem. I quantify quantifiable, measurable. I agree. And I just think we all if they're going to have to start, you know,

**Member Ogden** 1:32:15

exactly. So, you know, not for nothing. But, you know, you can make that up really if you want.

**Member Ulman** 1:32:23

But, you know, if somebody is, what gender they are, what race they are, if they've served in the military.

**Member Ogden** 1:32:29

Oh, no, no, no. You don't know what someone's sexual preference is. You know, that's, that's

**Member Ulman** 1:32:34

the gender they are. So, we know somebody if

**Member Ogden** 1:32:38

they identify with. So

**Chair Goins** 1:32:43

let's talk about women and veterans. Okay. So, we absolutely can identify women in how you have to qualify as a woman owned business. So, if we consider women as an applicant, how do we want to have that woman owned business qualify? If we put them in this pool? How do they have to qualify? I would definitely say they need to be a five-year resident that should be consistent

**Member Ogden** 1:33:15

lifting in their application process for minority owned business, women business owned it, there is a requirement already for how long you've had that business and locally. So that gives that already has a measurement of time and things attached to it. But

**Chair Goins** 1:33:31

But on top of that,

**Member Ogden** 1:33:33

I was, well, we talked about last time that this is going to be a scoring system, right? We don't determine that because we don't know all the different things are having an application. Would it be open for suggestion that women and veterans get an additional whatever points as opposed to not as a score variances? Yes or no, that's, that's fine or no.

**Member Scott** 1:33:59

I mean, if you're a woman veteran who was in jail for cannabis, you're

**Member Ogden** 1:34:04

the other ones don't get a point. It's just a checkoff like for social equity you either yes, or you are you aren't. And then if you are determined to be that then you get discount on this, you know, you get through the Senate. But there's nothing that we have in the point system for that, that I recall that we talked about. It's just a yes or no. Now women and veterans you can add you can suggest a point they automatically in some states and Chicago and Illinois, that's what they did. They you know, you got five points here, you got two

**Member Scott** 1:34:38

and so were the veterans, I guess was the veteran status, something that you could, you would give additional points depending on how long you were in active duty and just a veteran,

**Member Ogden** 1:34:52

disabled veteran.

**Member Ulman** 1:34:55

Get you if it's a lottery, that's why I was kind of saying that, like more balls in the lottery.

**Chair Goins** 1:35:02

But we're not talking about lottery. Yeah, we haven't talked about that on this floor at all. But we have not talked about lottery on in this committee at all.

**Member Ulman** 1:35:12

Okay, what I'm talking about it because I'm not understanding the differences in like getting more points, which is a merit-based system. Right. Doing a merit-based system?

**Chair Goins** 1:35:26

Well, we've talked about a pat, so we haven't talked about how the Cannabis Compliance Board will choose the applicants, we've only talked about pass and fail as relates to identifying qualified applicants.

\*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>

**Member Ulman** 1:35:39

Okay, so okay, I have an idea. So Kema, kind of spinning off to what you said. So, let's say based on points would determine if you're either in the Social Equity Diversity pool, or you're in the independent pool. And let's

**Member Ogden** 1:35:54

So that point so that, but because,

**Member Scott** 1:36:01

again, we're only charged with the social equity applicant. Well, now we're doing that we're doing Social Equity Diversity applicants as well,

**Member Ogden** 1:36:07

no, we're just going to, we're just

**Member Scott** 1:36:12

diversity in here. That's what I'm saying. I don't see. Well,

**Chair Goins** 1:36:19

what does it say in Section 12? Let's read. What does it say? Because I don't

**Member Scott** 1:36:24

want the part you're talking about because I don't see you. But I'm just glancing at it. But what do you see about some of diversity?

**Member Ulman** 1:36:34

So just saying on the basis of race, ethnicity, or gender,

**Member Scott** 1:36:41

what this section that you're referring to

**Member Ulman** 1:36:43

Section 12, what I'm reading is off my phone, but um, so 12.4, their criteria of merit established pursuant, to sub one for proposed independent lounges. So again, just to reiterate, like, right now, we are talking about pass fail, but this diversity applicant could be where, before they are put into a bucket, they we look at them, and if it's over so many points, right? Then they go into that social equity bucket, if it's under it's like, no, sorry, you haven't had very many hardships, and you actually weren't left out of the first round. But again, just finding a solution to where do those people fit minorities, women, veterans, caregivers? Where do they fit in these two places?

**Chair Goins** 1:37:40

Well, here's what I will say. I did hear you Member Ulman. And I'm reading section 12. Thank you. And what I want to point out is there is a diversity clause with race, ethnicity, or gender of the applicant, however, clause one and clause two, section 12, subsection four. Number two, but so I just want to, you know, I love regulations. My mentor taught me that the devils in the details. And so, I love to read. And I want to just point out that the way this reads is that there are two qualifying one is a social equity applicant. One is a diversity. And what we could say in this conversation is the diversity person would go to the other applications and not the 10. That will be set aside for SES,

\*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>

the way this reads, we don't have to consider diversity with the SEC. And this is, you know, again, what the other thing about legislation is always up for interpretation. It's, you know, I always say it's like the Bible, because we just say, how can you read this and understand it? Well, I was raised reading the Bible. So that was interpreting that too. So, someone else can interpret this different the way I'm interpreting it right now is the criteria merit established pursuant to these subsections. without limitations for proposed independent cannabis consumption lounge one, the diversity on the basis of race, ethnicity, or gender of the applicant, or the persons who are proposed to be owners or officers of the proposed independent cannabis consumption Lounge, which means an independent lounge to whether the applicant qualifies as a social equity applicant and social equity applicants have licenses set aside specifically for them. So, I could separate the two, I'm not obligated in this subcommittee to say that they have to be one. But we can

**Member Ogden** 1:39:40

I think that's a better idea because that's what it is.

**Member Scott** 1:39:44

For the entire stay hungry for the entire state. So, I mean, I don't know how much detail you're going to get into thank you for these lounges, so I just, that's the thing. We have to remember this you have to can we recognize it?

**Member Ogden** 1:39:59

Should we recommend separating women and veterans into the regular tier Absolutely. And saying that they get special consideration, and the point system is determined that this point system, whether it be a lottery or points, they

**Member Scott** 1:40:13

also, must be adversely affected? Well, no. Okay, so

**Member Ogden** 1:40:17

and so as long as it's minority women owned Yeah. And they have process disabled vets, they have a process. Yes. And if they qualify for those two, they get special consideration and their scoring process, whichever that is, because it will maybe score may Allah and the CCB can determine that process, because that's what they're going to do. Yes. And we just recommend that they get consideration in the diversity piece. I absolutely agree,

**Member Scott** 1:40:42

but not the other category.

**Chair Goins** 1:40:44

So, taking those 10 and talking about the independence of 10. Independence, yeah, I absolutely believe that we should make recommendations that women veteran and LGBTQIA+ have preference, or first pool or, you know, whatever that language is, first to

**Member Ogden** 1:41:03

Yeah, because I don't know how long somebody can tell me right now. And are we talking about, I just don't know what how you can, there's not a process to verify

**Member Ulman** 1:41:20

Maybe the LGBTQ are not included in the diversity. But when it comes to minorities, women, veteran, and caregivers, if they make and I say \$250,000, even though you're not considered rich, if you make over that, compared

\*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>

to this, you know, whew, how many applicants will have the independent lounges that are rich. So now these people that are diversity applicants have to go in this pool with, you know, tons and tons of other people. So, my suggestion would be is if we have these diversity applicants, and we are able to rank them, and if you have certain scores that are higher, you would go into the social equity pool. So again, let's say you're a minority women veteran, you are, and you make less than \$250,000. You are not comparable to a rich, white man who got all the licenses. So now you're going to be in the pool with them. Now, let's say you're just a woman, and that's all you got going for. Yeah, well, you might be in the independent pool because you really haven't had too much hardship. So, we could

**Member Ogden** 1:42:42

get special consideration.

**Member Scott** 1:42:43

This is so difficult, because you have how do you measure someone's hardship? or hardship versus your hardship versus Member Scott, I hate to harken back to the original dispensaries and everything else, the total system they tried. It has to be measurable and quantifiable. You can't just make these things up. And you can't just and subjective criteria that can't be measured. Because you

**Member Ulman** 1:43:17

can't measure you can measure if somebody was a what race they are, you can measure someone's gender, you can measure if they're a veteran, and you could confirm if they were a caregiver. My recommendation for an idea is that if you did not get an opportunity to get a license, and that we know who is right, we know who got license and who did it. Where do those people fall? And if they've had a heart, if they've had meet certain criteria that we would establish, then they might fall under the social equity applicant.

**Member Scott** 1:43:58

But I guess you should compare for bikers, but I saw the applications for the people who didn't get the licenses. They were just as rich as the people who did get the license. So, I don't know if you can use that criteria because the state made the criteria you want to have 250,000 in cash looks, I don't know how many people clean. I just think we have to get out of this realm of trying to do it. Again. We have we're charged with a certain charge. And we're trying you're trying to put too much into one small bag and so

**Member Ulman** 1:44:32

I disagree I think if we

**Chair Goins** 1:44:37

if we wait, I'm sorry. Go ahead Member Ulman

**Member Ulman** 1:44:44

If we put all the diversity applicants into the independent lounge bucket, they are now competing with a one's more applicants.

**Member Ogden** 1:44:55

Yeah, they get a special consideration. We are giving them something for being but not just going in and I don't think

**Chair Goins** 1:45:02

\*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>



she heard that. So, Member Ulman, what Member Ogden is suggesting is that for women and veterans and you said caregivers, I have that written down minority as

**Chair Goins** 1:45:17

well. Yeah. Okay.

**Member Ulman** 1:45:19

My, like Minority Owned Business.

**Chair Goins** 1:45:23

Yeah. Cuz there's no minorities in dissent. And minority business owners qualified minority business? No, that's fine that they're given some special treatment, or a special press iteration. So, what we need to decide is what does that look like, right? In the independent application process. So now we need to discuss what we want that to look like so that these applicants weigh heavier in the independent licensing versus just everyone else. So how do we want that to look? Maybe this is a scenario where, you know, maybe this is a scenario where to what she has said regarding a lottery, maybe this is a place where we can say these persons get more entries in the independent application versus, you know, that would lead the CCB to get sue for sure. Well, how would they happen? For me? That's

**Member Ogden** 1:46:30

what I mentioned earlier, though, they are determining the process of scoring, whether it be Oh, yeah, because even after that they have to. So, either it's going to be score, it's going to be lottery, we, just, our recommendation is that the x group, this group in this group, or whichever groups we determine, are in the diversity piece, they get special consideration in the scoring or lottery process, whichever they decide and keeping it that clean, because we don't have, we don't know enough information about that process. If because it hasn't been determined yet.

**Chair Goins** 1:47:00

Right? Exactly.

**Member Ulman** 1:47:02

We can make we just decide what works.

**Member Ogden** 1:47:04

That is, they'll get that special consideration in the regular licensing, what's it the independent licenses? That's where they get it? And they don't fall into a social equity piece or any of that it's separate?

**Member Ulman** 1:47:20

Like, what kind of special consideration? I mean,

**Member Ogden** 1:47:24

once again, that depends on their scoring, how they're going to score. We don't have to get that detailed unless they unless we do. But from what I understand is we can make that recommendation when they either they are going to score it or they're going to do a either they're going to score or they're going to do a lottery. We don't know yet,

**Chair Goins** 1:47:40

but we are absolutely. If you are yes, if you are suggesting an amount of preference, that's here.

\*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>

**Member Ogden** 1:47:49

I think there's just too many unknowns. That's I'm saying I don't think we should.

**Chair Goins** 1:47:55

I think we definitely so special preference could look like oh, well, we could say is left to the discretion of the CCB. So, what we can say is these diversity applicants, which will be women, veterans, caregivers, and minority qualified business owners, should be given special preference that left up to

**Member Ogden** 1:48:18

the CCB. And I'm going to challenge the caregivers because I think that's really broad, but it's up

**Chair Goins** 1:48:23

to you could have to have a caregiver license. But yes, you will.

**Member Scott** 1:48:31

Find caregiver, mother when she was ill

**Member Ulman** 1:48:36

be registered with the state. Yes.

**Chair Goins** 1:48:39

So, there is a caregiver license. That is like a medical marijuana license. And what she is saying is, if you are a caregiver, you also should give preference, what I will say is a caregiver needs to be quantified. So, let's say you've been a caregiver for three years. But why

**Member Ogden** 1:49:01

would a care like ended just for me? Because I don't know, why would a caregiver need this special consideration?

**Chair Goins** 1:49:10

Because what we're saying is this caregiver has put has been in the space where they have grown and supply product for an ill person or and which makes them an important piece of the cannabis industry itself. And I'll agree with that, because I do come from the cannabis industry and I know that there are caregivers who really, you know, this is they have helped in been in a space where they have consistently been a part of this marketplace, and kept it kept the medical component of it wouldn't ever be that same person. No, no, not even No, not saying literally,

**Member Ogden** 1:49:48

but that someone could argue no,

**Chair Goins** 1:49:49

I'm arguing it. No. The person who was a caregiver has a medical marijuana caregivers license.

**Member Ogden** 1:49:56

I knew it was a specific thing, but they might do it because like what Once again, that might be your mom, you got one to get the Go get her stuff because she can't get into it.

\*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>

**Member Ulman** 1:50:04

They're part of the legacy market is really how we have to look at them. Right. And we were able to

**Member Scott** 1:50:13

I just don't agree with this line because just because I just think you're going too far afield of your charts

**Tina Ulman** 1:50:25

I think I heard from two gentlemen in public comment

**Member Scott** 1:50:37

She interrupted me. So

**Chair Goins** 1:50:38

my apologies, my apologies. Let's bring with him. Hold on Member Ogden. Member Scott first then Member Ulman, my apologies.

**Member Scott** 1:50:47

I was just going to say, Chair. We're just too far afield of where we're going. I mean, I understand what member Holman is saying, and I understand what, you know, I don't know exactly where we're going with what she's doing. But I just think you have one charge. And I'm looking at the Colorado information about some social equity licenses. They don't talk about any of that stuff in this. And this has been a proven system that's worked for quite a while. So again, instead of us reinventing the wheel, like we did with the smoking ordinance, and all the other stuff, the Indoor Air Act and all the why don't we get something that's a proven system and follow it rather than trying to go so far.

**Chair Goins** 1:51:24

I'm going to I'm going to comment on that. But go ahead Member Ulman.

**Member Ulman** 1:51:29

Yes, Member Scott, my point being here is that the folks that are caring were caregivers, providing cannabis to patients in the traditional market should be considered. And we were able to hear from two of those folks. And there's probably a lot that are falling, that have been servicing, the cannabis community did not have an opportunity to get a license. And those I mean, you might not know those folks, but they are they feel they were left out. And for those folks who follow the rules, or licensed caregiver, we're doing it right by the state, we should absolutely consider them. And I will just notate that Michigan actually considered them. So, we're not getting off topic. These are things that are variables that other states have actually put into their regulations.

**Chair Goins** 1:52:21

I'm going to agree to Member Ulman. But I also want to point out that Member Scott, Colorado social equity program isn't even two years old, they wouldn't be one of the ones that I would say is a tried and true however, some of this qualifying conversation is consistent across some of the other states. And so that is what makes the conversation relevant. You know, we're going to make the recommendation. Again, this is not the end all the chain of command is the subcommittee makes recommendations to the CAC; the CAC makes recommendations to the canvass compliance board. So, you know, ultimately, where I'm going to put it here is something that we need to vote

\*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>

on, if we're going to send that to the CAC. And we will be doing that on next week. So, do we have anything else that we want to add for diversity? To be given special preference for licensing in the independent lounges.

**Member Ulman** 1:53:32

I would just say we put, you know, some kind of cap on how much income they can make per year. So that way, you're not if you meet, you know, minority women, veteran, caregiver, but you're rich, you're not in that category.

**Member Ogden** 1:53:50

But if you go off of the minority business owner, application, there's a certain amount of money you have to make on that same thing, you know, you have to qualify for that your business has haven't had to do. So, it's a kind of a contradiction, if you look at it that way, because you still have to be somewhat proven successful, to be considered minority business own that designation. It's sustainable. So, all I'm saying is, if you're going to put a cap, you may want to look into some, you know, to work that so there's no contradiction there, what supplier on those applications.

**Chair Goins** 1:54:25

So, what I'll do next meeting is bring in the designation so that we can take a look at it and see if we all agree. And also, we veteran status can absolutely be verified. You're either a veteran or you're not so you know. Yes. That's not just a clarifying question. Yeah. So

**Member Scott** 1:54:46

the cap would be how much money you can make from the lounges or how much money you need to in order to apply

**Member Ulman** 1:54:54

your annual.

**Member Ogden** 1:54:57

I think, I think it needs to match whatever that was also specialty when it comes

**Chair Goins** 1:55:00

to Yeah, I'm going to bring in what the qualifications are, and we will look at it. But what Member Ulman, I believe what Member Ogden was saying is, she was thinking along the lines of just because you're a women on business. That doesn't mean that you should be able to qualify for special preference if you make over a certain amount of money, right, because I know women owned businesses who are million-dollar earners, and they are like, you know, they are qualified women owned businesses, that doesn't mean that you should be able to be an applicant is what she said.

**Member Scott** 1:55:39

You know, when I reviewed the YouTube video and Member Ogden was talking about successful and sustainable, right, you have to understand that some of this involves a certain modicum of success and have the business acumen that can make these work, you're going to have to be a little bit lenient regard to that, because you don't want somebody who's making zero money trying to start, I mean, and you want them to be sustainable and successful, I think that the, again, I'll wait for you to see the fingers that you're coming up with, but I you can't have somebody that's broke, try, you know,

**Member Ogden** 1:56:16

\*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>

kind of already mapped out on what they do on that application, because you do have to have a level of success. punish someone because it's more than just the money. When you're a minority owned business, sometimes you don't get the contracts because of racism and things like there's other there's other, there's other barriers, you know, so I probably won't agree with whatever that cap is on this piece. But because I will go off of whatever that application probably says more than more than likely, but

**Member Ulman** 1:56:47

I'm open to it didn't just begin my idea for the cap was putting in an income for what that person made per year. So, if you make over whatever we decide, you are in the independent license lounge, or you are in the independent category, if you make under a certain amount, and you can, I mean, you can still be successful know how to run a business and make under \$200,000 a year. So that does not mean that you can't own a business. I'm just saying if you are making under a certain amount, you could fall into the diversity category because you are not wealthy. I hope that's clear.

**Chair Goins** 1:57:27

Yes, that is clear. And thank you Member Ulman, we are we have reached the end of item four, we're moving on to Item five. And my disclaimer for item five really is we have one more meeting the witches the 18th. I don't have the time however, in that meeting, we will absolutely be looking at the things that we have discussed, we will decide which way we want to go if we want to leave that on the floor, or if we're going to move that to the CAC as a whole to vote on to be suggested to the canvas compliance board. So, our next meeting because we are on a timeline. You know, I know that the CCD really wants to use requirements. So and so we have to push through so that the next meeting that they're ready to go, so be looking for an agenda that'll be posted on the Cannabis Compliance Boards. The CCB website, on what the next discussions will be and what will be available, I'm going to make sure that we have as much documentation as we have Sarah and I, I really appreciate her consistency and her holding me accountable. And being a great teammate. For this subcommittee. She's gone above and beyond including doing the work herself. And anytime you have a person that is engaged in a process like this, you're winning and so I really do feel like a winner having her on my team and I truly appreciate her. With that being said, we are leaving. Yes.

**Member Scott** 1:59:19

The next meeting, we'll have a listing of everything that we kind of discussed in the last two or three meetings for you guys to for me, yes. And then we can kind of go through those.

**Chair Goins** 1:59:28

Okay. Yes, like and so the first meeting the meeting that what you did was it was really just a conversation right? So only the things that we will be voting on one you were apart, okay, so you but nothing is outside of that. But yes, on the agenda, it will itemize between semi we're going to structure it out. It will itemize where we are and then what we'll be voting on so everyone will know what's going on because transparency is really where the CC Be wants to be. And the CIC wants to mirror that. So yes, that is where we're heading. Any other comments? Member Ogden.

**Member Ogden** 2:00:11

Thank you, Member Scott, for your research. That was great and very helpful. Got us through that pretty quick. Thank you.

**Chair Goins** 2:00:18

Members, all members, any last comments? All right. Okay, then this is the time for public comment. As always, I'm going to ask you to state your name first. And you will be given two minutes. And one of the things that I tried to do

\*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>

is get you to your two, I'm really giving you a four and a half, I got tapped on the shoulder for that. I'm giving it to men and men, what I'm saying is, Okay, the last 30 minutes, 30 seconds. Now, I just want to say this, when I'm saying this is your last 30 seconds, I will I'm giving you the opportunity to close, I am not cutting you off. So, I want to make sure that when I'm saying 30 More seconds, that you're wrapping it up, and you're not, you don't feel like I'm cutting you off, because that's not my intention. So, with that being said, state your name, and then go ahead.

**Name Unclear** 2:01:19

So, a couple of things about leaving a social equity component that gets kind of mentioned, some of the people kind of mentioned it up with diversity, I think when you include the people that have been targeted these drug laws or whatever, that will be your diversity, that will be included. And that will be your females, that'll be everything you look for. In Illinois, they set up a social equity component where he was different communities, which was they use a SNAP benefits that use five of the last 10 years that you live in that social area doesn't have to be consecutive, but five to 10 years or an arrest. So those are determinate factors where you can determine those areas. And probably get like a true social equity. African, Illinois strange things happened with MSOs came in identified the people assigned them all up so many of our people that had a social MSOs in multiple State operates. But they do it, they identify the people, and they actually target them, and they utilize them to bail them out down the line. So, in order to create within your community to benefit in your community to correct people actually have to be the 51% faster. One of the things that I didn't notice you guys say kind of like you I want to benefit, the guy that got the license now. And in the sense, they had a problem because they have a monopoly. And it's almost like a monopoly is better protected. Illinois, for example, they have to put into a font, all the fees for the application fees go to the disproportionate people that's how you run that type of program, not all 5% of fees, all of those fees for the application, go to foreign 0% loans if you obtain a license, so we have loans up to a million dollars in our state, they range anywhere from 250 to kind of attack last year to a million dollars all created through their fun. So, I think a lot of things can happen through licensure funds, instead of taxing because you got to go to so many things with taxation, you have to find out ways how can I just do application fees is through district fees and education also has to happen for when people do get the social equity. Licenses, right. So that means that yes, these people that are wanting to now they are obligated to educate, right because they have nothing. Thank you.

**Chair Goins** 2:03:53

Thank you for your comment. Sorry. That's okay.

**Tim Eli Addo** 2:04:09

Good afternoon, Chair. My name is Timothy Addo. I'm representing Chemovarrio. And yeah, we're back at social equity and I just I just have some few pointers I wanted to include I'm still I'm still advocating for the fact that consumption lounges is still not a sustainable means for minorities to enter this industry we have and then looking back to her conversations about caregivers that's what some of us were and during the process we had to you know with, with topic within the scope of the of the rules of We were in a way you have to. Literally, we have to, we put our lives on the line is I don't know how any other ways to put this, we put our lives on the line, we started this industry in terms that ADC, supposedly legally that was planted in a cultivation facility how to be obtained from patients at one point close, we set up that system. Without that system, that wouldn't be the system that we can't really have. We are plant breeders in this industry. What this panel is missing those people that actually have experience in this industry that have in depth in depth, I mean, in depth, understanding about how this industry operates. Educate education is key when we're talking about sustainability for minorities in this industry. Please wait on when I'm done speaking, I appreciate that 30 seconds, acknowledgement. But it always interests me. So, 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>

**Chair Goins** 2:06:15

Thank you for your comment.

**Timothy McCoy** 2:06:25

Hello, my name is Timothy McCoy, I'd like to thank you guys for your time and effort on trying to make these things happen. I appreciate a lot of things. But for the social equity things I've just been from sheer location just been knocked out in that particular realm of you not living in a zip code or wherever it is downtrodden, you might be somebody who's a veteran, I'm a veteran, I'm a minority, I take a lot of the boxes, but because of don't live in an area code, zip code, where this is that particular home things are now on to the diversity category, we're competing against people with a lot more money, it's only 20 licenses, 10 and moving social equity. I thought this was supposed to be inclusion of more minority businesses because we are being disproportionately affected the most. And also, I have a suggestion as well as on the investment in who you can buy these products from. I personally think that all these consumption lounges should have the same opportunity to buy from the manufacturers, as opposed to distributors or dispensaries who will tax you again. So, your profit margins will be once you cut out the middleman, you've changed the profit margins. So, they shouldn't be able to be allowed to buy directly from a manufacturer. And as I said, the diversity women get a diversity mean, she gets the same as you know, I understand that you guys are a more of a minority, but nothing really actually. But I think that's something for discussion. We need to try to come together with more. You don't need to have a record in order to get us a social equity thing. You don't need to live in a bad zip code in order to get a social equity thing. If you qualify every other way. And you're all minority who we were supposed to be helping in this. I think that should be enough. As far as diversity as opposed to inclusion. Thank you very much.

2:08:48

Thank you for your comment.

**Chair Goins** 2:08:54

Are there any other public comments? If not, we are adjourned I see you guys on the 18th see you all on the 18th Thank you very much for your time.