

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

## Meeting Minutes September 27, 2021, at 1:00pm

The Nevada Cannabis Advisory Commission’s Subcommittee on Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion held an in-person meeting at the Grant Sawyer Building 555 E. Washington Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89101 on September 27, 2021, at 1:00 p.m.

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

A’Esha Goins, Chair

Kema Ogden

Bryan Scott

Tina Ulman

Member Ogden and Member Scott were present in Las Vegas. Member Ulman was present via Zoom. Member Harris was not present.

### **Chair Goins 00:20**

Good afternoon. This is the meeting for the subcommittee for social equity, diversity, and inclusion. I am Chair A’Esha Goins, and we are calling this meeting to order. I first want to do a land acknowledgement. And 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. I'm going to call roll. Committee member Kema Ogden.

### **Member Ogden**

Present

### **Chair Goins 02:08**

Committee Member Tina Ulman

\*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** 02:15

Here

**Chair Goins** 02:19

I am here. We have a new committee member Bryan Scott. and absent today will be Senator Dallas Harris.

**Member Scott**

I'm here

**Chair Goins**

And we're going to have an introduction of our new member. Mr. Bryan Scott Oh, I do need to do I guess I should read the list. Um, public comment. We're going to open this for public comment. Please keep your comments to two minutes. And if you would just come here state your name first and then have your comment.

**Katree Saunders** 03:05

My name's Katree Saunders. We've been in the cannabis industry probably since 2008. Helping things from medical to retail. And they changed a lot to exclude felons. Fast forward a few years after I helped open Source Nevada works at the Dispensary Nevada, work at Silver Sage. That means that I still advocate for cannabis patients' rights for people who have been vastly affected by the war on drugs like myself, I got set up by an undercover DEA agent, because as a sick patient in 2010, I think 2011 We all got indicted under Operation Chronic Problem, in that I helped over 100 patients stay protected from getting prosecuted for the federal government. I'm in the process, I lost everything, my car, my job, my kids, everything that I've worked so hard for then rebuilding, they change laws to exclude felons from working in the industry. So, I find myself back at square one. When reasonably in the past two months that I landed a position with Marshawn Lynch's dirty brand wants to help with marketing to launch that. I've sat around while others social act, attic secrets of Washington struggle in the process. I'm still homeless because of things that I've seen being affected by the drug war, not only on a federal level, but also at a state level. And when I speak out about it, I feel like my voice is trying to be drowned out in the process and nobody wants to really implement the things that are owed to people who have been suffered by the war on drugs. There's no black ownership and black communities that have been affected by the war on drugs, no black cultivations, no labs, no delivery companies. What is owed to us and those who have been most affected by the war on drugs is definitely ownership of everything that isn't the existing operation. We shouldn't have to wait for another legislative session for these things to be rectified. I wanted to also speak into regards to the funding that just got passed to help with some of the issues, I think that there needs to be community-based education and programs implemented. Moving forward. And I also sent those to Xavier Blum recently, and I can also forward you guys a copy. Because I really don't feel like you guys are getting the comment of people most affected by the war on drugs, you're just getting like corporate people and people who've already been the industry, and not really getting input from people like myself. And when I do try to show up, I get pushed to the side, like, I don't matter. Like, I deserve ownership, my kids deserve ownership, my mom's house was raided. They're just things that need to be brought to the forefront. And I'm tired of being pushed to the side. Like, I demand justice, and I demand more, along with the more apps being voted on This Week in Congress, I think that it's important that I stand up for the voiceless, and can help to affect change. So, I'm just here to help and be a part of conversation.

**Chair Goins** 05:53

Thank you very much. Any other public comments?

\*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>

**Sal Ali** 06:22

My name is Sal Ali. I spoke here last time. I wasn't really planning on saying anything this time. But after she spoke, I just wanted to say something. What she's saying I think is kind of true, because I don't necessarily believe that there needs to be any sort of legislation legislative session that happened or new legislation to come forward, in order to start offering more opportunities for minorities and for social equity under the current program the way it is right now. There's a lot of things that can be done, where we can still offer ownership to people without having new legislation come forward. So, I just want to second what she's saying. And that maybe these discussions going to start happening more, you know, I know right now you guys are discussing social consumption. And truly appreciate that. But you know that there's, I believe there's a way that ownership and things can be offered, and more opportunities can be offered to people in the community without having to create legislation.

**Chair Goins** 07:43

Thank you for your comment. Will there be any other comments public comments that we also offer an opportunity for public comment at the end of the committee hearing. But thank you for your comment. And I know how difficult it is to stand up and say your piece. So, I really appreciate you doing that. And now moving on to item two introduction of our new member Mr. Bryan Scott.

**Member Scott** 08:05

Thank you, Chair Goins. Pleasure to be here. My name is Bryan Scott. I am the 23rd and first African American city attorney at the City of Las Vegas in 119-year history. I am the former State Bar presents the bar in Nevada 2016 17, former president of the Clark County Bar Association into the five I have been working in advising Las Vegas City Council and planning commission on Cannabis issues since 2014. We said Las Vegas passed a consumption ordinance in 2019. The state asked that we hold off on that on implementing ours until such time as the kind of compliance board came into being to get a more regional approach to the handling of cannabis consumption lounges. It took us about two and a half years to put that cannabis consumption ordinance together, we had a series of meetings now move town meetings with stakeholders, but also cannabis patients we had with the public. And we developed a really nice ordinance to talk about cannabis consumption. I was the diversity Chair for the State Bar of Nevada in 2014. And this is something near and dear to my heart with regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion. I've had an opportunity on a number of occasions to be on DEI panels. And so, I'm pleased that Joel welcoming to this panel and so I will hopefully be able to give you some good input of my perspective. And I welcome the opportunity.

**Chair Goins** 09:44

Absolutely. And we thank you for having us. We thank you for being here. We appreciate you being here. I always say service is something that everyone should do. There's so much packed so much joy from doing it. So, we're going to move into It's the item three. And I just before we start this, I just want to give the disclosure that I know I'm so nervous today. And I'm nervous not because of the meeting, but because of how important this is not to just my community, but to the state abroad. I wasn't as nervous last meeting because I knew that it was just a conversation. And I really wanted to see what everyone was thinking the agenda has been put into place based on some of the conversations we had last meeting. And I just want to just say that don't take this job lightly. And I don't think anyone here does, and we're considering it all. And today, we will be having a conversation on some things that I hope we can move forward to suggested to the Cannabis Advisory Commission. And that moves me into item three, where we'll be discussing the criteria for social equity applicants, I want to just remind the committee that some of the things 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>

we'll be suggesting today will set the precedents for applications moving forward. So, as we're thinking about this as relates to social equity with the consumption lounge, because this is the first time equity has been described in language, this is the ground for what could be in the future. And so, I want us to be thinking about that, as we're putting as we're making our suggestions. So, with that being said, some of the criteria is for social equity applicants, let's start at what we think a minimum threshold should be, as it relates to the applications for consumption lounge. So, I just want to kind of expand on that a little bit. As we're building out, as we're thinking about what the application can look like, what who that applicant is, I want us to consider what the minimum would look like right? What are we saying you to be a social equity applicant as relates to because I have the printout. I'm going to read the language specifically. I was like, Man, this was a lot of work was making that I don't have it. Can somebody give me what you're looking for? I'm looking for the language from the NRS.

**Member Scott** 12:47

Section. Yes, here.

**Chair Goins** 12:50

Section nine funding I did put it up in

**Member Scott** 12:53

Social equity applicant means an applicant for the issuance or renewal of an adult cannabis Establishment License for an independent cannabis consumption lounge, who has been adversely affected by provision of previous laws, which criminalize activity relating to cannabis, as determined by the board in accordance with the regulations adopted pursuant to section 11 of this act. Such adverse effects may include without limitation, adverse effects on an owner or officer of the applicant.

**Chair Goins** 13:19

So, as we're talking about adverse cannabis policies, and owner, they said owner, applicant,

13:31

Yep, or officer of the applicant,

**Chair Goins** 13:32

Or opposite. So, I know, last meeting, member I did was very strong about identifying who the owner applicant officer is and what that would look like in the application. So, let's start there. If that is okay, all right. So, let's when as we're relating to the owner, applicant, and officer, what do we want to say is the minimum requirement for an owner?

**Member Scott** 14:03

I would assume they have to be over 21. Okay. Yes. Would they have to be a resident?

**Chair Goins** 14:08

So that's a question Do they have to be a resident? Or would they

**Member Scott** 14:13

Have been would they have to be rather than the United States? I did review your YouTube video. Remember, Ogden said, I agreed with her with regard to the 51% ownership or at least the majority stakeholder interest in the in the

\*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>

industry or in the in the industry. I did like the fact that I know for some of these applicants, they'll have to require partners, and they may have meet me. So, there may be a threshold amount of money that you want them to least have available, because the type of business like this would be expensive to run and operate, at least initially. And one thing I share I had a question about was because we're dealing with persons who may have been affected by prior criminalization of marijuana, would they have had to if they were incarcerated? Would they have to have that record expunged or sealed? Would that be a necessary requirement? You think that would be something this committee would be interested in doing? Or what were your thoughts? I

**Chair Goins** 15:34

For the record, my apologies if that's okay. It's just for housekeeping rules. If you have discussion items, please make a note of them. And there is availability for public comment at the end of the session. So just for housekeeping rules to what you're saying this date. So, the policy does disenfranchise those persons with cannabis policies. And we're going I hate to be I'm stuttering, because I know that this is something that should be done. And this is work that we'll have to do. But as the conversation goes, right now, there isn't, you'd have to be 10 years out of your cannabis infraction for you to be considered for this application,

**Member Scott** 16:30

Right? If it was a felony, if it was a felony if it's a misdemeanor,

**Chair Goins** 16:34

Misdemeanor, then we I believe we could make an exception, I'd have to look, look that up.

**Member Scott** 16:40

I know for the Municipal Court Chari that we have, if there's been a decriminalized law for cannabis consumption, there's already on police on the city of Las Vegas is reasonable court website, a button or hyperlink, you can push for decriminalized crimes, and you can apply to have your record sealed.

**Chair Goins** 16:59

So, I'm going to I'm making a note to ask that question later. However, right now if they're 10 years out of it, they should be able to apply. So, and we that was so are we saying that that would be the first criteria for owner? Owner only a Member Ogden?

**Member Ogden** 17:23

Um, yeah, but that's not the I don't I think that there should be other ways to get in and social equity, as well. But yes, I would say convictions prior nonviolent convictions are something that we should look at and see how to roll that in. I agree with Mr. Scott that, you know, it needs to be addressed. To decriminalize, and those, expunge those records. But unfortunately, that's not in place yet to that level, and we have to keep moving this along. So, they don't wait for that. So, but yes, I would say and are

**Chair Goins** 18:07

We are saying and Member Ogden, please feel free to engage in the conversation. So, are we saying that that person has to be their records have to be sealed? Is that part of it? Well,

\*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 18:24**

I definitely don't think that should be the case. I mean, we just heard from somebody who has a felony and wants to get in the industry. And if we make that rule that will just prevent folks that have had a felony from getting in the industry. So what justice are we doing there? I mean, if we can make these new rules on this new license, let's do it. Nonviolent being the key but you know why? Why wait on some logistical thing to let somebody enter the industry. So, I would say no, just nonviolent felony or misdemeanor. And then just going back to your original question Chair Goins criteria for the social equity applicant. I wanted to add the applicant has lived in a community disproportionately affected by federal or state policy for more than three years. And the other criteria is have an immediate family member, mother, father, brother, sister, child, or spouse who was also affected by unjust cannabis policy, which in turn affected their life. So those are we

**Chair Goins 19:35**

Sorry, are we talking about owner applicant and Officer across the board because right now we were actually discussing owner so are we talking specifically about owner we want to say we're thinking three years you have to have lived say it again? And a disproportionately an area disproportionately affected?

**Member Ulman 19:53**

Correct.

**Chair Goins 19:55**

Okay, I'm really thinking more like five. So, I'm going to I'm going to be out And as I was thinking being a little stronger, I agree with what you're saying Member Ogden, I was thinking five years. And the reason why I was thinking that, and you guys feel free to dialogue with me, is because Nevada is a very transient state. And I think to show that you are a member of this community in this state, you should have some tenure here. And I think five years says you have tenure, I think three years says to me,

**Member Ulman 20:28**

What are sorry, Chair Goins, not how long they've lived in Nevada necessarily for these criteria. But how long they've been in a community affected by the war on drugs or so not necessarily Nevada, because, you know, they could be from LA moved here when they were 10. And lived in a community for their childhood,

**Chair Goins 20:49**

Almost pushed back on that. I definitely want them because these licenses are set up for Nevada, right for our residents. That matters to me, I think that should matter to this committee. But I along the lines of what you're thinking, absolutely. Areas disproportionately affected, but in Nevada, because then it puts stress on the cannabis compliance board to verify those persons in other states that were in disproportionately affected areas. I wouldn't want to do that to the cannabis compliance core.

**Member Ulman 21:22**

Just to clarify, there's two separate scenarios. So, the first scenario is criteria for social equity applicants, right? Yeah. Now, the three pillars that I mentioned. And then the other question down our agenda is residency. So

**Chair Goins 21:38**

\*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>

When I'm talking Yes, but Member Ulman were on the same conversation, I'm talking about criteria. To say that you are a social equity applicant. If we're talking about lived in a disproportionate an area, I would want it to be five years that says you're a resident of Nevada, that has lived in a disproportionate

**Member Ulman** 21:57

Area. Got it? Okay. So, I also agree on the five years for Nevada residency, but for living in a disenfranchised community. My input was three years. Okay.

**Member Ogden** 22:10

What do you don't take somewhat, I think what she says, and maybe what you're getting at two or three, gentrification was like people, yes, those neighborhoods? Yeah. And they're not necessarily a social equity applicant, but they moved into this new, you know, upcoming community that has been disproportionately it hasn't more of a history of that. Yeah. So, you can put a time frame on that was what I think is what she's Yes. And I get to yes. Which I agree, I agree, because I have seen that as well. Yes, I agree.

**Member Scott** 22:44

With these criteria, think there have to be measurable means to figure out how to go about it, you only have a limited number. Yes. How do you determine what areas are disproportionately affected? That another area? And I'm referring to do you use that to be declared that by some entity, but how do you make that determination? If you've got 10 of these? Yes. How do I determine if this person here is in this neighborhood, this person in this neighborhood? How do you determine which is the more disproportionately?

**Chair Goins** 23:13

That's an excellent question? And I actually have an answer to that because I've done some stuff.

**Member Ogden** 23:18

And I had some suggestions too. So okay, so

**Chair Goins** 23:20

As it relates to this point, right, because we've agreed on one point, so we're talking about disproportionate persons affected by the war on drugs. And this paperwork says the proof is that we look for those over policed areas. And that is, there are studies done on that that's not a lot of work. So, what we identify is, in the last 10 years, these are the areas that have been over policed. And then that's how you determine that those persons were disenfranchised, because over policing directly comes from the War on Drugs. So that's easy to identify, and other states have done that. So, that's possible. I agree with Member Ogden that people, that's the reason why I'm saying five years, because I agree that people have been watching us and watching the rhythm of what's going on. And they moved here or have residents here knowing that this was coming ahead. And I think holding that five years says, Yeah, you may have been watching the river, but you missed it by this month. Right?

**Member Scott** 24:33

So, what would that look like on an application? So, you fill out this application, you name your age, you got where you live? So do they make a statement indicating that their area was more policed than others are disproportionately affected by others and therefore, they should identify those

\*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** 24:51

Yeah, already? Yes. And those will be like she said in a zip code or area map mapped out but there are other measurables within, you know, to prove certain things, you know, like, any eligibility process? Yes. Which is what I suggest? And I'm sure you have a list as well, so

**Member Scott** 25:16

And how much weight would that be given to this type of talks about scoring? Yeah, you know, the state got a little in trouble with this initial state. What type of weight would you put on to that particular portion?

**Chair Goins** 25:31

So to members Scott's question, one of the things that I'm considering, you know, as we're talking about criteria, because I want to stay on point, I'm considering how that would be a part of the pass/fail, because then what we're doing is we're just qualifying the persons to move into what would be, however, they decided to sort of represent, however, they decided to sort those applicants, this will be part of the Pass/Fail. So, you would have to identify that you are, and let's just put this down as we're moving forward. Does everyone agree that five years of an area have disproportionately affected by cannabis pass cannabis policies? We all agree on that? Okay, great. Yes, Sara, are you writing that down for me? Or do I have to write that down?

**Sara Tajalli**

I'm taking notes.

**Member Scott** 26:33

And I'd be cautious about putting the word unjust. And then we just put like you said,

**Chair Goins** 26:38

Yes. So, I'm going to put in five years here.

**Chair Goins** 26:45

Okay, and then moving into the next minimum threshold. So, what we're seeing is, these are qualifying 10 years prior out of a nonviolent felony or misdemeanor five years, living in an area that was disproportionately affected area, you know, these as one or the other. You don't have to have all your

**Member Scott** 27:05

Sorry, for interrupting you up to 10 from filling in misdemeanors, or you want to do 10 for felony and misdemeanor or something of that.

**Chair Goins** 27:14

Threshold for misdemeanor. So, 10 is you have to be 10 years out for you have to write but misdemeanor could be any. Yes. And I'm thank you for pointing that out.

**Member Ulman** 27:23

I have a question on that. So, is that in our current bill that it has to be 10 years from your felony?

**Chair Goins** 27:31

\*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 in the bill. It is the statute of limitations as it relates to the state of Nevada

**Member Scott** 27:37

Is 13 years return.

**Chair Goins** 27:41

So, it's not something I'm saying what the policy says is, it's like the law of the land.

**Member Ogden** 27:46

Yeah.

**Member Ulman** 27:48

So, there's nothing we can do in this committee to make that erased. So that okay, I think

**Member Scott** 27:58

Threshold for stealing, right? Yes.

**Chair Goins** 28:01

I wait, you know, never Oh, man, I you know, I chased that bill, up and down, pay tickets flights the whole night trying to get that change. And, you know, unfortunately, I would love to sit here and say, I can't I don't want to wait till next session. But the unfortunate part is, it is a part of legislation. And it has to be changed in legislation. But it absolutely is something across the board everyone is looking at, and just missed it out of session this last, you know this in at first, but I don't think we'll have a hard lift in 82. So, um, I think we're moving along pretty well. I'm kind of proud of this. All right, minimum threshold. So, let's think of Member Ogden had a criteria that she wanted

**Member Ogden** 28:55

Just measurables like he said, you know, something that I have here is attendance in the underfunded school that needs you, obviously, in an area that zoned for that type of receiving a Pell Grant for higher learning, possibly living in an economic disenfranchisement area, which we talked about, which would be determined by zones and what not. Receiving public assistance is a possibility. Maybe I know in some states they do you victim of gun violence or physical violence, proving that as a as an obstacle in your life. That's something to consider. And you know, obviously the prior convictions which we talked about, so and, and loss of housing possibility.

**Chair Goins** 29:54

I want to start with I like all of those. Thank you for mentioning them. And yes, we're reading from the same playbook, which I love that. Let's start with school. You brought that up? Because I was considering that I actually did a little bit of homework and what they do call those disenfranchised schools as Title One. Yep. And so, if we're considering you have attended a title one school in the state of Nevada.

**Member Ogden** 30:29

If that is one of your children are enrolled in one school in the state of Nevada, okay, children, because you know, yourself as an adult, you might be in a mansion right now, across town, you know, that doesn't really matter where you grew up, not for nothing.

\*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** 30:38

So, you're saying if you've attended school has to be within X amount of years if you have currently. So, I graduated 1984 from Rancho, right. So, Rancho may be a Title One school, I don't know if it is now or not. But I graduated blah blah years ago, right? So, I would not be eligible

**Member Ogden** 30:57

No. No We're not talking about you right now or anyone like you. That's the example

**Member Scott** 31:09

So, if you're X number of years out of high school, because like you said, even though they went to school, they may be in a better position now.

**Chair Goins** 31:14

But yeah, so and I think that there's space for that, right. So, as I was considering this, to what you're saying, because we don't want to punish the folks. Here. Yeah. Hear me out. So, let's take me, for example. And in full disclosure, I don't really personally like brick and mortar. So, this isn't an interest of mine personally. But in the interests of using me as an example. Um, when we're talking about Title One schools, and I graduated, I'm not going to tell you what year I graduated. I'm not going to tell you how old I am. But if we're talking about a person who's graduating, I'm thinking along the lines of, they would be 31. Now, so 10 years past, that 10 years before, that would be 2008. Because I did the math 2007-2008. And you were in a Title One school from 2008 to 2018. Though that year, that age bracket, that person would relatively be 31 to 41. Let's say all right. Now I am, I'm past that age bracket. Let me just say that now. However, I was raised in a from a family that we were poor, I come from a family of five, you know, and it just so happened that I scraped, scraped, and made my way out. Clawed my way out, right. But my sisters and brothers aren't in the same space that I'm in. They didn't have the same drive. They didn't you know what I mean? I was the person who, you know, living off 21st Street hood chick, I was in gangs, I was that girl. So, I just made it out with the skin of my teeth. Should I be punished? Because I was able to claw my way from that lifestyle. I think that there's a space. If you lived in Nevada, I think there's a conversation to be made. That says, we know that you were from a disenfranchised community during this time, and you made that congratulations. Here's an opportunity.

**Member Ogden** 33:19

Well, I think I think you're it's that's a fine line, because some people, the point of this is to help the people who couldn't normally get in, probably could right now. Okay, and someone like you could now your sister and brother, they probably couldn't supply us with one of these criteria. So, I'll say it, is that to meet and kind of open the door for someone depilation. Okay. And I don't that's what we're trying to avoid. Yes, absolutely.

**Member Scott** 33:49

And that's why I think that you have some exit criteria and as clear as possible, and be as miserable as possible, start going into areas that are kind of cloudy and gray. You're going to wind up where? What does it mean, one of the criteria, I think, on the application was that you can attribute it to the state. Yeah. And what does that mean, you're one of the prettiest dispensaries have to say, but what the criteria was that you contributed to the state? Does that mean that you gave money to the state that you your work experience has been that you've given to save your taxes? What did that mean in terms of you giving to the state, and that represented different things differently? I think that if we don't want to go down that same road with this, I think we have to have really measurable clear criteria. So again, I

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

don't know how many Title One schools there are in Nevada. I don't know how many Title One schools there are but again, I think you're still you're making the pool smaller and smaller and smaller. So, I think we have to maybe

**Member Ogden** 34:57

We have to be like 100% below poverty level to be Title One, right?

**Chair Goins** 35:03

There are five Title One schools right now. Or what level school high school is what I was considering High School. Title One, there are five Title One schools right now.

**Member Scott** 35:14

Out of forty-some schools? Some schools are making the pool so small that no one will be able to make the stand.

**Chair Goins** 35:20

That's why I was trying to broaden it a little, right. But Member Scott member and, excuse me, Member Ogden I agree with you that may be too broad. But then and thinking about it holy, how do we narrow it down to open the pool? Right. I think speaking schools and Title One schools into consideration I think is valuable. Right. Know what I you know, according to my statistics, nobody has done that. But I do think it has value. But what is the age bracket? Yes, please.

**Member Ulman** 35:57

Thank you. Sorry, Member Scott. I agree with Member Ogden about the title one schools. I think that is a great point. And I would just ask, would that also be five years? Or we should probably put a How long did you attend that school and to your point Chair Goins without looking at somebody who came from a disenfranchised community. And they could be older, we heard from a gentle gentleman from California public comment who was older than me, maybe in his 50s. And now he seems to be doing better, but could at some point in his life have been disenfranchised, and should get this opportunity. So, I think it's you know, the goal of this committee is to include folks that were left out of the first round. And that really includes a broad range of folks. And we have our social equity applicants who were making sure like any time in your life, if you had been disenfranchised, or disproportionately affected whether you were from one to five, five to 1010 to 15, you got the short end of the stick, right? And if you are now doing well, which we see so many examples in our community in Nevada, of people who are now doing well and giving back to their community, why would we ever want to punish them for doing the right thing. So, I think that it should not be a certain criteria for that so that we don't leave out folks that maybe are older, maybe have done well and come up, really giving everyone an opportunity who didn't become a license holder, and ensuring social equity applicants have that opportunity, I think it really, really sucks that you cannot apply for this. If you've had a felony for less than 10 years and five years for misdemeanor that's going to cut out a lot of people. So, I think we need to be careful. You know about how restrictive we are. Because then what happens is we'll forget about a bunch of other people. Case in point caravans like yourself or someone like yourself.

**Chair Goins** 38:08

\*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>

So, I do want to point out that we did Thank you. Member Ulman. I do want to point out that we did say misdemeanors would be anytime as a misdemeanor, the unfortunate part of the 10 years is that is just the statutes according to the state. So, I just want to repeat that. So that everyone listening understands that. And what we are doing right now to what you were saying is we are building out of criteria thinking of it as so that we're not isolating a minimum amount, but expanding it out and how we can do that. So that because it's not just us doing the work, right? We're just making recommendations, the CCB has to look at this and say, is this possible or isn't it right? And so, as we're thinking about that, what is going to work, not just for the community at large before the CCB to be able to uphold it.

**Member Scott 38:59**

And one thing that you're going is that these types of businesses may be considered a privilege licensed businesses under the under the under the city or the county, that person would have to qualify will not qualify for privilege license under any circumstances because of the negative secondary effects that that are deemed to be around alcohol, marijuana, or cannabis gaming. There are certain criteria that every applicant is you know, has to go through. And so, I don't know if a felon would ever meet any local jurisdiction standards to get a proper license. Because you have to understand these are going to be businesses that not they don't sell cannabis, but they will be allowed cannabis to come in and through the delivery service. Because I know when in the city's ordinance, we don't have didn't allow people to bring in their own they had to either go through a delivery service that delivered because there was always this, you know, we're not calling black market, you have illicit market. So, you don't want to come from the illicit market. So, you want to make sure that, if it's coming from a licensed dispensary, it has to be delivered. So that's why I'm a little afraid of doing the felon issue without having it expunged or sealed. Because you won't meet the

**Member Ulman 40:13**

Kid, I have an idea. So, what if we identify somebody like the young lady who gave public comment and were able to help get her record erased, so that this doesn't stand in the way of somebody getting a license? Can we do that?

**Member Scott 40:29**

Well, depends on how long her the conviction was, or the last intent of your conviction was right.

**Chair Goins 40:35**

Yes. And I want to just kind of keep us on target here. And I'm not saying that that's that this isn't important it is. But we have established that there is a criteria, there is a statute. And at this point of conversation, we there's nothing we can do about that right now. So, the best thing to do is to move forward so that we can continue with the criteria to be able to have these applications available in a timely manner. Right. And I know that the CCB has a time that they want this done. So, I want to move the conversation back to as we were talking about one of the criteria being schools. One of the things Member Ogden did mention was Pell Grant. So, I'm going to look a little bit away from the title one conversation and move into You said if they've received a Pell Grant, I think that's brilliant. That's easy to show qualifying right? You can just, I got Pell Grant here, right?

**Member Ogden 41:35**

Due Diligence. Alright. Yes.

**Chair Goins 41:37**

So, here's a question. How many years?

\*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** 41:52

Everybody I'll be looking at. So, I mean, like, it has to be measurable. But it has to be something that we think is going to Member Ogden. You mentioned during that last week about you want a successful and sustainable business. Yeah, you have to make sure that the criteria that you're going to set forward, I've got to make sure that those businesses are successful. Again, I'm a little afraid that if we put all these criteria on them, the dispensaries are going to get the

**Chair Goins** 42:20

Member Scott, I'm the that is at the forefront of my mind as we're dialoguing. And that's one of the reasons why I am pushing back a little on something right, hence the five years? Because you're absolutely right. We want to make sure that we are attracting those social equity applicants that are members of this community

**Member Ogden** 42:41

And can open up and sustain Yes. People have to understand that, yes, you may have all these things, but you could if you had if you can get a license right now,

42:53

Could you open up right?

**Member Scott** 42:55

Could you maintain,

**Member Ogden** 42:56

Maintain it? Could you afford do this, regardless of a brand or whatever? Solo Yes, and that's

**Member Scott** 43:02

Going to be one of my other criteria is the experience I know we pronounce Pelegrin. But the experience part is going to be key thing is, what amount of experience you have with business or cannabis or,

**Chair Goins** 43:12

But I wouldn't want that to be a social equity criteria.

**Member Scott** 43:15

But again, if you want it to be sustainable, either have partners or partners that are in the business realm or in the cannabis realm. I think all of us know that unless you're infinitely wealthy now, you're going to have to have equity partners that are going to be involved, and you may be the equity person and the applicant, but you're going to have to have some kind of partnership behind you.

**Chair Goins** 43:38

You're moving a little. Yeah, your

\*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 43:42**

Stuff is all regular application stuff. Yeah. And even the scoring, that's to Rarey. Like, you know, depending on what all is an application outside of the social equity piece, you would know, you know, what the total score would be until they get everything in there and what Wait, this would be against that, you know, things like that are kind of like wish we would

**Member Scott 44:03**

Have the application for the dispensary or the, you know, the so I will we can take a look at it, because that would maybe give us some criteria, a Chari that

**Member Ogden 44:12**

Well, they didn't have it in there before, like they didn't really this is, well, maybe you have to put that part in there. Still, it's not in there.

**Chair Goins 44:22**

But what I'll do is I will, to Member Scott's question, I can ask the canvas compliance board to give us a suggestive application. And I got to be honest, it's going to be very, very confidential. Matter of fact, what I'll do is I'll ask them to give it to me. And then we can see what that's kind of, you know, where already is.

**Member Scott 44:53**

And I have access to them as well. Just because of the process when things go through the province of dispensaries, production facilities and the grow houses. You know, we got we had access to all that because the license I mean, that's going to be another issue we have as well in terms of the siting of these locations because let's stay on the application and they'd be easy for us to say which criteria that we liked. Yeah, and which criteria we didn't like. And the criteria we liked, we could, you know, easily recommend that to modify it. And then the ones that went to diversity, equity, and inclusion, we can add those to the application. So, they just have

**Member Ogden 45:35**

Nothing.

**Member Ulman 45:36**

Yeah. It was just fair. But

**Chair Goins 45:41**

Let's so let's just talk about right now let's talk about how we feel about the Pell Grant. And using that as a qualifier, it doesn't have to be you know, this was no, so

**Member Scott 45:53**

Just because Chair, I just think it's just so again, I got Pell Grant when I was, but again, we have to do we have to scope we have to do something near that school, but I can't get the 21. So, five years out of school, if you're 17, then and you're just barely 2122 At five years. So is that what we're looking for the younger.

**Chair Goins 46:13**

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

So, we're not necessarily looking for younger and inexperienced, there's not an age bracket separately, to be able to age to 21, we are qualifying them, and we're looking for criteria that will open the application so that we're not searching for people, because that's always in every state. That has also been an obstacle you've been to screening. And so, it hasn't been opening up, right. But also, being able to say, hey, we know these persons come from an area that may or from a lifestyle where they struggle to live, right. And the Pell Grant quick could qualify that. And so maybe we move past that right now, which is fine, because, you know, let's move past that. And then let's talk about one of the things Member Ulman pointed out is that we want to ensure that a person what as we're talking about a criteria for a misdemeanor or a felony of a can pass cannabis policy, that we're also considering those closely related to someone who has been affected by those past policies, do we consider that as a criteria? Can we agree on that?

**Member Ogden** 47:24

What?

**Chair Goins** 47:26

Yeah. Five, close Related. Related would be your sister, your brother, your mother, your father, that's close related.

**Member Scott** 47:43

We use it. That's it that determines the close relationship you have. So that doesn't include your grandmother, or your aunt to know your, you know, other aunts and that kind of thing. So that's, I guess I'm a little concerned with that, because that's not the actual social equity applicant that it happened to. And if the whole purpose of this is to give those persons who were directly affected, I mean, yes, your childhood? I think it's that person that was admiral who spent the time incarcerated, the person who fell I mean, yes, I know, people say that the parent, the family spends that time as well, but it's the actual person, I think we just get a lot of people abusing it. If you don't set a criteria that's based upon the person and not someone's going to relate it to me.

**Member Ulman** 48:38

Yes, thank you. Um, I definitely think that if those immediate family members were affected by the war on drugs, and maybe we make it a little bit more restrictive and did a certain amount of prison time, right, know if your son got caught with a dime bag, and you know how to do some community service is that being disproportionately in franchise, and it affects your whole life? Probably not as big as if your father or mother, brother, or sister, especially parents did prison time for cannabis policy. So, I definitely think you are affected if you don't have a parent in the home. And especially if we're looking at the 1980s or cannabis and drug policy, in general was so heavy and you don't have a parent in the home for 10 years, you should absolutely be able to be a social equity applicant. The other thing I just wanted to add is, you know, if you don't qualify, whatever, if you don't qualify for Social Equity, our other bucket that we have here is our diversity applicants. So maybe that's the person who has come from a disenfranchised neighborhood or had a parent or child affected and now you are doing better. So, we have to remember, you know, those folks too. So maybe you don't fit in this bucket, but you fit in this bucket

**Chair Goins** 49:59

And we will. And just to what Member Ulman just mentioned, there is a space that we will dialogue about that as a second portion criteria. But right now, we are focused on those social equity applicants. And I also agree with Member Ogden to say that I believe that those family members, the reason why I believe I think this way is because also, the CCB can absolutely easily identify that, because you can bring paperwork that says, My child, my brother, my

\*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>

sister, my brother, so as I'm considering I have a ginger in my stomach's a little nauseous, as I'm considering this car as a criteria. I'm also considering how can the CCB quickly identify that this COP this information is factual?

**Member Scott 50:48**

I guess I'm concerned with the fact that you're presuming that that person is close to that family. You I think we're not close to so even if it is your mother, father, brother, sister, if you're not close to those people, they just happen to be incarcerated. You're I guess you're getting the benefits

**Member Ulman 51:07**

You would have to say how they your life was affected by them going to prison. And like I said, maybe we put something more specific and meet in the middle so that if it wasn't you directly affected and your direct family member was, they had to serve prison time versus just getting probation. But then then that brings us to the question, well, maybe they got probation, they're still in the system, it still affected your life. Obviously, there's a whole road we could go down. But I do feel

**Member Scott 51:36**

That's the problem because of the fact that like I said, I know when we looked at these applications, when he first started, how do you choose one from the other? I mean, how do I determine that you were more adversely affected, because your sister was in it versus you being more effective did your brother was an again, we have to get to look at the end of the road, you want to get people that are going to be successful and be sustainable, but that were somehow affected. That's why I think that the person themselves, these new person, because you're running into so many, what is the mismatch that you're making it to that it's not quantifiable for you to defend in court, if you get sued, and some of them didn't get one of these, you're not going to be able to justify that criteria to a judge. So just simply not going to so one

**Member Ogden 52:18**

Of the things that I think that when it comes to scoring, because you kind of going to that route, and I get it, but it's when you prove certain things like this, it's either you get the five points, or you don't like you do qualify all of this. You were affected your family member and you qualify. And yes, this it doesn't necessarily, you know, it definitely shouldn't be in an area where you Okay, well, out of one to five, you get three, three and make you a social equity applicants

**Chair Goins 52:53**

And I want to checkmark Yes, I want to bring this back to that. And thank you, Member Ogden for bringing that up. We are literally just talking about the criteria to qualify you as a social equity applicant, scoring, scoring, this is pass fail, right? If you're 10 years prior from a non-violent felon cannabis related pilot infraction pass, many of you have a misdemeanor from a cannabis infraction pass.

**Member Ogden 53:23**

Right. So, as you're concerned more of the scoring on this, or is it more about just because there are I agree as well, with both of you right now I'm kind of because there is I'm always looking for that manipulate, right? Because I was part of that process. I know what happens, right? And I get that. But if it's a pass fail, it's as if it's not part of the scoring, which should not be because there is room for manipulation there in that. But if that's it, then maybe it's not you know, it's not that complicated if it's a pass fail,

\*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** 54:00

But I remember that remember one of your one of the first people that spoke after your meeting indicated with 1000 people that apply for this. Okay, so yeah, yeah, it's a sister I haven't talked to in 10 years was somehow adversely affected by marijuana conviction. And we hadn't thought through so I could put that down as Okay, yeah, my sister who I talked with 10 years was affected by it, therefore, I got to get five points for that.

**Chair Goins** 54:25

So, Member Scott, this isn't points this is Pascal. This is however, however, based on your conversation as we move further into the application process, right because we are still talking about what this could look like. We absolutely could have them qualify and quantify what that looks like in their work.

**Member Ogden** 54:49

Yeah, but the quantified what would it matter if it's a pass because she didn't matter what week

**Chair Goins** 54:58

Because the applications they'll have to go through, how would they sort them from to get the 10 applicants, right? And then how does that look in scoring process?

**Member Scott** 55:08

Yeah, but I think you will. But again, you want to make it more where you get this been a qualified applicants rather than this many qualified applicants, because you're never going to be able to read that down to 10 because it's social equity. Are there 10 of them? 10 of them. I mean, again, we got hundreds of applications for 12 spots. And so, people don't realize, too, that there's, once they get to this part of the application process, there's what I'm calling off key. So, we just need to make sure that we have relatable, quantifiable criteria that we can back up

**Chair Goins** 55:48

Every record, and I think that identifying a person as a personal close relative is easy to identify.

**Member Ogden** 55:59

But I think his concern is well is the floodgates, you know, you don't you know, does what we do matter to you?

**Chair Goins** 56:06

Do we really think, well, it should matter because we need to think about it all. So yes, so then maybe, for conversation's sake, then maybe we identify that we can say, it's your it can't be your husband, but it has to be your sister or your brother, or you know what I mean, because there's also, yes, immediate family wants immediate family,

**Member Scott** 56:31

That that's the thing where at least it's a close enough familial relationship, that you may have been adversely affected that they've been around.

**Member Ulman** 56:40

\*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>

Yes. And again, we could put something on there. That's a little more strict. Did your family member do prison time? If they didn't do prison time? How were you affected? Maybe not as much. So, Member Scott, how do you feel about?

**Member Scott** 56:54

Just because you didn't do prison doesn't mean you weren't adversely affected

**Member Ulman** 57:03

I'm for it. You are the one that's not.

**Chair Goins** 57:05

But I do. I do hear where you're coming from Member Ulman. And in that consideration. So, if we're going to say, and this isn't, we're still going to logging, we're going to say that immediate family affected by the war on drugs, specifically as relates to cannabis policy. What we could do is say we could give timeline and we could say within the years of this and this. So, this way we're minimizing how that looks. So, for example, I am I have a brother who has a cannabis misdemeanor, and his misdemeanor was from 1993. Does that qualify me today? Me as a person that was disenfranchised. By the past cannabis policy? Standard? Yes. Right. Well, that's what I'm after

**Member Ogden** 58:18

A year timeframe with between this and this,

**Member Scott** 58:20

Okay. And again, these criteria also have to be they can't be arbitrary. So, we have to figure out some definitely some nexus between what we're doing and what we're trying to agree on. So again, we have to have, again, if why is, you know, two years versus three years versus 63. Okay, great.

**Chair Goins** 58:41

So, my so my suggestion would be to say that we are taking those persons who are directly related to us and consideration paths prior to 2007 teen Wait, let me think

**Member Ulman** 58:58

The only thing Chair Goins is we know that there was a period of time where the war on drugs was extremely strict, but you could still be disenfranchised this year. If you were in front of a judge who felt a certain type of way. I've already done a great job at funneling it down to nonviolent cannabis offenses. Funneling it down anymore could limit how many people are eligible.

**Chair Goins** 59:29

While we're what we're talking about, specifically, Member Ulman is relation. We're not talking about persons.

**Member Ulman** 59:38

And we've already narrowed it down to the relation to the person who had a nonviolent cannabis offense. So, I was going to

**Chair Goins** 59:50

\*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>

Go ahead, I'm sorry. I was

**Member Ulman** 59:52

Just going to say, if we put a year's around it, it could limit it even more and then we'd leave out somebody who was maybe affected you know, again, Last year.

**Member Ogden** 1:00:03

So very complicated if you go down this route,

**Member Scott** 1:00:08

This would be a different story if you had unlimited amounts of these Yeah, yeah. You cannot put a criteria that this a moral on this project. So again, I don't I don't agree with the brother, sister mother father thing I mean, I think it has to be the person who was an immigrant to be affected, because again, that's the person who has a stake in this, that's the adversity affect the person directly affected by the policies

**Member Ulman** 1:00:37

At unjust policies

**Member Scott** 1:00:38

It, again, you have 10 spots, you have to consider that you have to funnel it down, so that the people actually having to do this work and actually go through the applications have the ability to say, oh, that doesn't pass, then you have to give them that ability to do that without these kinds of just, you know, gray areas that they have to be subjected. So, I

**Chair Goins** 1:01:02

Agree with Member Scott, I do agree that we're you know, we have to be limited because the licenses are limited class, I also want to lean in to say, I am thinking of ways, and I want us all to be considering ways we can open this up. So that we're giving more opportunities. So, the reason why we're considering immediate relation is because we're trying to open for more opportunities, right? And if we're going to consider immediate relations I do. I do agree with Member Scott again, which just let me go on record saying I'd not like agree with some kind of way about that. I agree with Member Scott, again to say, we want to figure out how we're going to identify that, minimize it so that we are offering the right people the opportunity, I believe that there is a conversation to be had about that. So, let's give it just a couple more minutes. If and then we'll move on.

**Member Ogden** 1:02:08

Yeah, but at this point, I agree. I agree as well. Yeah, there's too much too Oh, yes. For this process right now. And I could qualify, and, you know, we all qualify tomorrow. But my point is, is like, what my point is, is like I agree with him, I think we need to stay focused on making and allowing the people who are also going to be, you know, going through this process, picking the people who fall in there allow them to be successful is because it's very difficult when you start putting these gray areas and expanding it out to

**Member Scott** 1:02:51

Admit, those people who are looking at applications have to use their own interpretation of what are you more interesting, effective than you? Okay, well, then I'm going to give it to her since she I believe she's boring at first.

\*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** 1:03:04

That's okay. But yeah, just about just something to think about. Since we it's all clarified now that you can't have a felony for the prior 10 years. And we just heard again, from a young lady who had a felony who couldn't apply. Now, let's say she has an adult child who wants to apply, whose mother was in prison, and now we're telling her no, you don't qualify for Social Equity applicant, I just want us to ponder that.

**Member Scott** 1:03:30

Why the child can apply, right?

**Member Ulman** 1:03:35

Child you don't want the child to apply.

**Chair Goins** 1:03:37

Now you really want to have what we're saying? What we're saying is we need to consider what those what that timeline what that how we're going to qualify that. That's what we're talking about right now. So, what we're saying is, yes, immediate family. How do we qualify that so that it's not so broad that anybody could like these to sit? Can apply? Right, but that we are offering it to those persons who have been affected. Is the person that we want to apply right?

**Member Ulman** 1:04:08

Instead, what do you think about they had to do prison time?

**Chair Goins** 1:04:13

Don't like that, and I'm going to be honest, I don't like it. And I can hear my community screaming in my ear right now. Like you can't hear them. But I absolutely can hear them saying, A'Esha you better not? And the reason why is because, one, we can't. You can't weigh that on a person's plight. You can't weigh prison time as their plight because some people living in their home are in prison, right? Just because it's, they're afraid to go outside. There's bullets all around them. And, you know, I don't I want to make sure who have heart attack. I want to make sure that as we're using words, having this dialogue that we are considering those communities that right now are still being over policed for what we say is a war on drugs that has ended so I want to be very my I full of that when we're considering all of this. But along those lines, there does need to be a criteria. I don't think that's it. But I think one thing, don't

**Member Ulman** 1:05:11

You don't think the family member should do prison time or you do think the family members should do prison time?

**Chair Goins** 1:05:18

I don't think

**Member Scott** 1:05:21

I really think that should not be your criteria. I don't listen, what I guess what does that give you that? So, the person does prison time is more adversely affected in the one who didn't?

\*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** 1:05:31

Yes, if your parents or your time there was not a parent in the home, because you were your parent had to go to prison, then you were adversely affected. So, and the reason I say the prison time is a meet in the middle. So that way, we know how are they adversely affected? Well, if you did prison time, you got screwed.

**Chair Goins** 1:05:54

Right. So yeah, but I also think that a person who is there's got to be so let's think of it this way, let me shift gears, we've, we've identified that an immediate person qualifies, maybe what we should be saying is an immediate family members that lives and the over police areas and the going back to what we've said about areas that are disenfranchise,

**Member Scott** 1:06:24

Again, I was in Las Vegas, where what would that look like? Oh, no matter what was that area,

**Chair Goins** 1:06:31

In Nevada. That area? Where would it be?

**Member Scott** 1:06:34

In Nevada. What would that area look like? Or where would it be? Can we specifically say zip code?

**Chair Goins** 1:06:36

We can because there are studies that say that. So maybe the criteria is immediate family member that lives in an over policed area? In the last how many years? We said, Five, to be a resident? So, are we I mean, excuse me, not a resident, but you had to be living in disenfranchised community for five years? So, are we going to say the same amount that that family member has to have? Yes, yeah. To keep it all consistent.

**Member Scott** 1:07:14

Again, I don't agree with the family, and we're part of it, but I just, that's what you guys

**Chair Goins** 1:07:19

Do, I believe in the family member was part of it. Okay. And I think those persons, I think that keeps us fluid.

**Member Ogden** 1:07:26

I think I mean, I think I only agree with it, if we can get it narrowed down the criteria to be not as you know, wide open, it has to definitely be zoned in on what those family members look like, and how long we can say.

**Chair Goins** 1:07:43

We can say, right now.

**Member Scott** 1:07:44

So, it's like, that's, I just think you're going to have, you're going to have to put the state of this broad statement together, that my sister was incarcerated between the years of something and prove it. And again, again, it's easy to sit here now and say that that's the criteria we want. But when you look at the applications themselves, and there's this

\*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>

big that's the problem with this process is that we have to make them very quantifiable and really easy to make a yes or no Pass-Fail decision.

**Chair Goins** 1:08:13

So, Member Scott, I think that looks like this. It looks like sister brother child has been that was dis that was disenfranchised by the past policies, or has a misdemeanor has a felon for the past policies that currently has lived in them within the last five years. And these disproportionately disproportionate area nonviolent

**Member Ogden** 1:08:37

Drug, nonviolent, nonviolent drug, yeah, elation,

**Chair Goins** 1:08:41

Cuz that's easy to that is absolutely simple to identify. Because you have to have the records. You have to have your address recorded. I

**Member Ogden** 1:08:49

Disagree with that. Yeah, I

**Chair Goins** 1:08:50

Think that that's simple.

**Member Ogden** 1:08:52

I'm good with that, personally, as long as it stays like,

**Chair Goins** 1:08:56

Yeah, because that also holds you like. Yeah. And I think it opens it up bubble broader to those family members. Right.

**Member Scott** 1:09:08

But again, consistent with what we've already said, I just know that my office had probably 30,000 of those. And so, I just know that, that 30,000 Plus, and that we can that we could currently expand from our records is 30,000 of those. And so again, you're the criteria to me is too broad when you start bringing in Mother Father, sister brother.

**Member Ogden** 1:09:35

But they don't necessarily comply with like, there's still a whole application, right. Or they just,

**Chair Goins** 1:09:46

Yeah, all of that

**Member Ulman** 1:09:48

Evil then after the lottery, yes.

**Chair Goins** 1:09:51

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

And I think that stays consistent with what we've already said and opens it up to those family members and immediate Good, I'm going to identify this again, immediate is husband, wife, sister, brother, mom, or dad, because that's puts the children because, yes,

**Member Scott** 1:10:15

I'm just Googling with Third Degree content whenever they can, I will tell you what. But yeah, I hear what you're saying.

**Chair Goins** 1:10:26

But I think if we say that if we say all of those things, and congruent with what we've already said, then it holds us accountable to being consistent, but then also opening up, right. And so that's yes. Okay. I feel good about that. And I also feel good because that is four criteria. I think that's a good start. We have identified the only thing we have not identified is income level. We don't have to consider it.

**Member Scott** 1:11:06

But I but I think you're going to again, in order to be work, I keep going back to Commissioner audit, successful and sustainable, you're going to have something Yeah. Because again, these, again, I have to come from my experience of doing these since 2014, when we did all the dispensers, everything else. And then because of our own consumption ordinance, where, you know, the updraft system alongside, yes, we say, you're going to have to come with some, a partner that has some cash behind them, or you're going to have to cash So regardless, you're going to

**Member Ogden** 1:11:41

You can still do low-income criteria, but they got to get funding and show grant and things they can show their own. Because like you said, they're going to partner with people, you got to still show Yes, I'm sure the part of the application will still be showing, you know, a certain amount of finances and financial statements and funding, whether that be through a grant or some other process that we suggest, because that's one of the suggestions we had last time. From taxes. Yeah, not from the dispensary. That's too high. Yeah, exactly. So those are other barriers. So basically, I just, you know, you can still do low income, they just don't want to fund your business like anybody else are we going to

**Chair Goins** 1:12:26

Say? So, I want to just kind of lean in here. I don't date poor people on when people should be able to get these applications. So that I just want to state that for the record, right. But if we're going to talk about income level, I want to be very mindful of how this could show up. Because we're only talking about criteria, this is still pass or fail. We don't have to have an income level, I want to say that we don't have to, you don't have to make under 400,000, or whatever the federal level of low income is, I think that's like 50,000, with one child or something like that. So, we don't have to say that you have, and I don't I honestly don't think it's a reasonable criteria. Personally, I just wanted to address it for the record because I have it. And if we all agreed, we'll move past it. And we'll go on to have this look, because this is owners and I want to just kind of address it for application, excuse me, for applicant and officer. So, I want to just keep us on track. But this is for application, if we're all in agreement that we can move past in some level. You agree. You agree? You agree? Okay, great. All right. So, we just talked about social equity applicants as it relates to ownership. I want to talk about this as it relates to officers. And if we can, you know, try to, I know what I want to do anything really quick. But which brings me back to what Member Ogden said in last meeting, she said, you know. Officers should not have the same relevance as an owner. That is some BS. Did I say that? You did say that. And I

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

was very proud of you. So, I want to have this discussion. Now, as we're looking at applications. And we're considering what that looks like for the cannabis compliance board. Because we are just advisors we're just making, you know, offering them some advice. And owner would be the person that's on the air because I think it's important that everyone understands is that an owner would be the person that's on the LLC, they would be the person who was making the decisions, who was helping with the money who was saying, well, who's who and what's what, right. We're saying that but that has nothing to do with a managing contract.

**Member Ogden** 1:15:04

No, because that's also, yeah, no. So yeah, they have to have control. Because business control, okay. So that's why with the 51%, they have to have business control. And it could be more than one owner on, you know, when you set up your LLC, right, you sometimes you have two or three people on there, but the minority, the person who's getting the social equity piece, these did at least be the 51%. With all with business control.

**Chair Goins** 1:15:33

So, here's a question, because you just brought something up that I'm wanting to make sure that we talked about when we're talking about, excuse me, a social equity applicant, it could be multiple social equity applicants on a on an LLC. And what we're saying is, those applicants combined have to have 51%.

**Member Ogden** 1:15:53

Yeah, yeah, whatever qualifies them to be to be the social equity applicant, which is all those things, that still has to be 51% of the application,

**Chair Goins** 1:16:04

I want to make sure that I'm being clear because this is math. So, if we have three, social equity, excuse me, we have three persons on the LLC. Those three, let me say it differently, there's five people on the LLC, those three persons are social equity applicants, they have to the three of them have 51% of the applicant, if all

**Member Ogden** 1:16:30

Three are minority, social equity, have criteria and in combined equity, yeah. And if one drops, they lose their social equity status unless they have a person that's

**Chair Goins** 1:16:45

Qualified. Because words matter. And that

**Member Scott** 1:16:48

Can be the problem could be the very problem to the identified. It's like, that's what happened during the dispensary. And the other phase is that people got mad at each other, and they dropped out. And then they didn't meet their criteria, or they got mad. And this is before the time that you can actually sell your license. Or even if you die, and you start to stay on the license that you'd be we've been making criteria where maybe it's just one person, you know, rather than trying to do you get 10 people, and each of them have a 5% interest?

**Chair Goins** 1:17:22

Because we all 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>

**Member Scott** 1:17:23

Yeah, I think we all know, I mean, I think it maybe I don't know, but the person who's going to apply for this go have partners that may not be social equity. And so, they're going to require their funds, and this person is either going to be the straw person, or they're going to be the majority, and they're going to end they're going to run, that person will be the key employee, that'll be the person they go to if there's issues.

**Chair Goins** 1:17:48

So that's the criteria. That's one of the criteria. So now we have five criteria, for ownership.

**Member Ulman** 1:17:55

Assignment on that 51%, Chari, Goins. I agree. I said, 51%, I actually didn't consider multiple, as Member Ogden pointed out, and I think there's something to look at, when it's saying that, especially for sustainability purposes, let's say you do have three or two or whatever, multiple social equity applicants, and they equal 51%. Could that that business be more? Based on your that business model? Maybe they find they have those three people? So, I think it's important that 51% ownership, and then it's up to that business how that looks to them. Could be one person could be two could be five?

**Member Ogden** 1:18:43

No, I think I think what he said

**Member Scott** 1:18:47

In the beginning, again, this these whenever money's involved, people have a tendency to be not as nice. And so sometimes when you and I agree, let's partner up, then the money comes around, then we may have

**Member Ulman** 1:19:00

Are you talking about share? Are you or excuse me, Member Scott, are you talking about a social equity applicant and a non-social equity applicant partnering up?

**Member Scott** 1:19:08

No, if you put together five social equity applicants that equaled up to 51%, and then one of them fell out, you're now under the you're under the 51%. So that's why I said it's easy to have one person being that 51% owner rather than having five and six and seven, because, again, business disputes happen every day, and someone winds up dropping out.

**Member Ogden** 1:19:31

He's right to it at that it does have that happens a lot in both social equity and non-social equity that happens and he's right. If you have 10 people, I didn't even think of that. And all everyone has, you know, 10% just to make up this social equity piece, then one person drops and then everybody loses it. So, you don't want to set people up to fail that way., I've set the correction here to where one person and is required to be this person, let that one person apply for the

**Member Scott** 1:20:03

Group, and they can have 30 people behind.

\*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** 1:20:06

So that's where we're at

**Member Ulman** 1:20:07

You think it should be no more than two people. So, partners, husband, and wife,

**Member Ogden** 1:20:14

Just one person,

**Chair Goins** 1:20:17

I agree with that that. I agree one person is a qualified applicant, you can have as many people as you want on the application, but one person qualifies as the social equity applicant. And they have to obtain 51% How they work that out outside of that has nothing to do with us. But that makes this because I think not, I think I know that when you add more cooks to the soup, it gets all messy. So yes, that 51% One-person social equity applicant. Now, how does that look for officers? Well, let me say this, like? Do we want to consider officers? At no, no. Just want to remind the person, people that are here with us, we appreciate you being here. I know it's a tiring process to watch. Please keep note of your public comments and have them available at the end of the committee meeting? Um, do we want to consider officers as social equity? Let me say, let me let me finish this. Do we want to consider officers at as the same level of criteria for social equity applicants?

**Member Ogden** 1:21:53

No.

**Chair Goins** 1:21:54

Okay. All right. I agree. I just you know, what I mean,

**Member Ulman** 1:22:03

Came in last time, all the trickery came from officers, I feel like

**Member Scott** 1:22:10

You want to make sure these are going to be sustainable businesses. And again, there, there's a lot of kind of messes that can go along with

**Member Ogden** 1:22:18

Having too many people in, I wouldn't even put the social equity part on the board, like let them, let them let them rank the board piece as a board piece. However, they decide to do that, like, that's just,

**Member Scott** 1:22:33

You know, you mean, after the equity person has to No, no equity,

**Member Ogden** 1:22:38

Anything to do with this board. They just have,

**Chair Goins** 1:22:39

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

She's talking about

**Member Ogden** 1:22:42

Officers of their boards. So, you know, however, that's measured should just be based on whatever measurements they have in place for what they're looking for, for board members, but nothing to do with this. So, I

**Chair Goins** 1:22:55

Do just want to point out that the policy says that they should have wait if you could read the last slide. Please, Member Scott

**Member Scott** 1:23:05

Though such adverse effects may include without limitations, adverse effects on an owner or officer of the applicant.

**Member Ogden** 1:23:14

We can't recommend that it's just that they just don't have weight on this part.

**Member Scott** 1:23:20

It could be. It doesn't have to necessarily, or alright, owner or officer,

**Chair Goins** 1:23:28

All right. So, I think we have five criteria for applicants that we want to submit to the cannabis advisory committee to vote on. Do we agree? Yes. Oh, no, no. Okay, no, but congratulations. We are making our first we're making our first advice. What do you call it? Suggestion? So, I'm excited about that. All right. Now let's move on to minimum percentage of ownership to qualify social equity applicant, we said 51% minimum percentage of profits to qualify as a social equity applicant.

**Member Scott** 1:24:13

Hard to find, because profits are that's going to be kind of a private agreement between the parties. And so, I don't know if we can

**Chair Goins** 1:24:24

I came into the conversation because officers

**Member Ogden** 1:24:29

Yeah, so

**Chair Goins** 1:24:31

Absolutely. But to your question to Member Ogden's question, how come this is an agenda item, it's an agenda item because the bill read owners and officers. And so, because of that I wanted to make sure that we were having the conversation if we had chosen to talk about officers. So, since we have not, we can move past medical care sounds wonderful.

**Member Scott** 1:25:00

\*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 can imagine if I'm putting up if I'm the person behind the person who's applying for this, I should be getting the lion's share of the profits. But again, but again, is that going to be something we want to see is that something that you're going to be satisfied with as being a social equity applicant who's getting his or her his or her fair share of this industry, you want to see, because you're going to see a lot of people who probably, you know, are wealthy, and we're going to get to either just have a straw person in front, and that person is still not going to heal. That's why we're trying

**Member Ogden** 1:25:31

To set these criteria really well so that they can avoid as much manipulation as possible. But at the same time, I think to her point, it doesn't. This is not a I think it would be if this was a board member, how much what percentage of the business do they get? Or how much money do they get? Being on the board? And what does that look like? Suddenly, the board member gets 70% of probably

**Member Scott** 1:25:57

1%, equity, social equity applicant, you may only be getting 5% of the actual? Absolutely. Because if I'm putting up all the money, and I'm just, you and I are partners, because you're the social equity applicant, yes, I'm getting 90% of the money, you're getting 5%. So, you're still not really in the business. So

**Chair Goins** 1:26:16

A lot. So, we could make a suggestion for the application process that we're talking about, we can absolutely talk about the application process. For this item. Specifically, we could there is a space to say that we would like to make a suggestion that the CCB require that the 51% social equity applicant receives break of the profit, but you'd have to

**Member Scott** 1:26:41

Check that every day. Quantify that on a monthly basis, how much profit they're making, is that social equity applicant getting the lion's share of those profits? You'd have to check that every there's no way for you to audit that. Okay.

**Chair Goins** 1:26:58

But we wouldn't have to check it every day to what you're saying, Member Scott, because what she would require is that you will require a copy of the membership agreement, right. And in a copy of the membership agreement would say that this social equity applicant will receive this amount of profit, I don't care how much money

**Member Scott** 1:27:17

Once I got this, I would change the

**Member Ogden** 1:27:19

Agreement. Basically, you can keep it if you really need to be simple about it, it'd be the 51%

**Member Scott** 1:27:28

I guess, I guess you can't really look behind the curtain, you know? And then you leave the rest of them? No, that's going to be because no one's going to show you on the daily basis their profit splitting. And if I'm putting up all the money, that's certainly not going to give you.

**Chair Goins** 1:27:46

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

Yeah, I beg to differ because this is 10 applicants, and the CCB, absolutely right now, they check to see how much you're paying per pound. So why couldn't they check to see how much, and you know, I'm just pushing a little

**Member Scott** 1:27:59

Yeah, yes. At the sales heavily regulated, so they know how to come in. And they know what sales going out. This, there's no way to determine on a regular basis, that these lounges are making x dollars per day, and that you're getting our money, and you're getting x profit. So, can I

**Member Ogden** 1:28:19

Say what they probably are trying to see, because this is what's happened in other states, they want to get the operating agreement that you have on the back end, just to make sure that the manipulation is not happening, like the 51% that you've just described, and yet they're only getting five, right, they want to see that you truly have control, right? The company is written out that way and the operating agreement. So that's all it would take if they didn't monitor from that point on. Now, if you change the operating agreement right later, and they someone reports that and you didn't report that or make those changes, then you can but no one's

**Member Scott** 1:28:53

Going to know that because the fact is that these agreements aren't filed anywhere. The agreement that you and I have had for splitting profits is between you and me, no one else is going to, unless they're required to

**Member Ogden** 1:29:03

File. We're required to turn it in with their application.

**Member Scott** 1:29:07

The paper may not reflect what's actually happening in the business. But I think

**Chair Goins** 1:29:11

There's a space to say to what you're saying Member Ogden and Member Scott. I think, I heard you, Member Ulman, just one second. I think there is a space to say that we could hold those officers and those investors accountable to having an operation agreement on file,

**Member Ogden** 1:29:33

I think oh, no, you can't that's yeah.

**Chair Goins** 1:29:36

And I don't think that we are asking too much. I even to what you're saying, I can hear you lawyer. I can hear you. I have all my friends a lawyer sorry to hear your lawyer. However, I still believe that we should ask for an operating agreement. I do know that it can be changed. I do realize that I However, if there is some accountability,

**Member Scott** 1:30:02

and what percentage again, if 51% equity applicant, I'm putting up 5% of the money, you're putting up 95% of the money? That's, and so the so the profit agreements is what? You get the majority of the profits, and I don't have the money. What were you going to say 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 1:30:25**

Thank youhair. So I do think that there's so many different business models, that once someone is selected, and they are one of the 10 applicants, just as we've discussed, you submit your member or excuse me, your operating agreement to the CCB, the CCB, then looks at that to make sure that you're not getting taken advantage of, but how the business sets the profits up, or whatever investment they have, would be up to them, we just want to make sure that they are not taken advantage of. So, I think I would say that we don't put anything on this, let the market develop how it needs to. And we ensure that the 51% ownership, that's the most important part. And the opportunity.

**Chair Goins 1:31:16**

But the operating agreement is going to say how much it's going to be. And I think that's what we're talking about. Yeah. So, when it talks about an operating agreement, we'll say how much that social equity applicant's finances, or their take home, or their profit share would be

**Member Scott 1:31:34**

But Chari, I guarantee, unless I'm missing something. Again, if I'm putting up some of the money, I guarantee the operating group will not say that you who spent about 5% of the money is getting the majority share of those profits.

**Chair Goins 1:31:45**

And I'm not asking for it to say majority share. I'm asking for it just to just to see what it looks like. Yes. And I'm asking for it to say shares. So, let's be clear, I'm not unreasonable. I do understand that that social equity applicant based on these criteria is probably doesn't have \$4 million. I'm we're not dumb, and we're looking at all of it. Right. But what I am going to say is, I want to make sure that these applicants are share owners or profits. Right. And I want to see that in operation agreement not to say that it can't be manipulated, because you're absolutely right. But we do need to have some kind of minimum criteria of what the expectation should be. If the minimum criteria start at 20%, no less than 20%. I think that that's fair, because it puts that person 20% of the shares, or 20% of the profits, because it at least puts that person in position that they aren't just being manipulated for their name. If that is what I'm saying has to be their minimum amount, you know, they can negotiate up from there. But I, I believe it holds that investor accountable to that member to that social equity applicant, I definitely am not for letting the who let the market dictate No, no, no, that is why we're here. What we want to do is put a program together that is unique and different than any other state because we have been allowed the opportunity to do that, we have we know what hasn't worked? And we know what has, here's an opportunity for us to do what someone else didn't? And I say yes, let's define it, let's define what we want to see in an operation agreement within reason. So, if with social equity applicant came in on name only because I'm sure that that's going to happen, his name is worth something, her name is worth something, and what is that value? I don't want to put a value on a person's name. Because you know, personally, I don't even like people not to use both of my names, are you? My name is A'Esha Goins. Not A'Esha. Not Goins. Both. So, to me, it's very valuable. But for the social equity applicant who is looking for this opportunity. What is the minimum amount that we believe that that operation agreement should say? I would say 20%? Actually, I'm going to say 25.

**Member Ogden 1:34:09**

But I was going to go down actually. Yeah, because what's happening is, unfortunately, unless there's a funding source for people to tap into, you're going to have these problems, like he's saying, and you're creating a barrier, because what's going to happen is, you know, I'm going to partner with people, and they're going to say, you're going to get 20% of the social equity, but you might have put in at least 20% of the funding, because now I have, I'm required to give you 20% of this company, because you're not only the social and you couldn't do this without us. And we can't

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

do this without you. So, it's a partnership. When that happens, most likely, like we said, these, like these applicants may not have the money to do that. And so then now they can't even partner they can't even put a team together to do this because they don't even have that 25% of whatever or their business plan is, I just think I was going to say 10% personally but at a minimal, because of those barriers that I know I build people trying to do this exact structure, and why and all the reasons why and my juice, some people don't mind being this person that's we say taken advantage of, but to them, it's an opportunity for

**Member Scott** 1:35:22

the person that's there for name only. But

**Member Ogden** 1:35:24

it's still an opportunity for them, and they will not have it. And they'll still take it, even though we don't want them to have to take

**Chair Goins** 1:35:30

like that opportunity, if they don't get the money and they don't get any shame. A loan,

**Member Scott** 1:35:39

if you're going to look at the operating agreement, you've also got to make sure that that person has certain responsibilities and duties with the percentage saying on the decision, it doesn't really fit 12% of ownership, but then 20% of the profits, they don't match up. So, I mean, if you're, if you're an owner, you should begin to think about some of the problems. But no. Profits if you've only put 5%

**Member Ogden** 1:36:09

of the money, exactly. And kind of industry.

**Member Scott** 1:36:14

As far as I know, the CCB didn't have a lot of I mean, I know they didn't have officers to go out and start inspecting these businesses and doing all this, right. So, we have to make sure that we aren't putting too much of a burden on them to have to regulate this, this is something where we probably just want to, they want to they want to really get the person in for the quarter and then have the locals kind of monitor what they're doing on a regular basis, because they're not going to do the operating budget.

**Chair Goins** 1:36:41

I disagree. They absolutely should be asking for an operating agreement. They absolutely have and are hired; they probably don't have enough people now. But they have been put in a position to hire people to regulate these are these facilities. And I'm looking forward to that congratulations to the CCB. But I'm not asking for them to regulate how the funds are being dispersed. What I'm asking is for us to decide what that agree operate, what the minimum requirements of an operation agreement would be based on this person qualifying for this establish

**Member Ogden** 1:37:20

a minimum of 10%. Okay, you got to have a minimum and I can go up from there. That's my personal opinion. I

**Member Ulman** 1:37:27

\*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>

agree with that.

**Chair Goins** 1:37:30

Because I also want to just say this, and full scope is because if there isn't an operation agreement, and we don't have a requirement, when this person sells the social equity applicant, just like they came in with nothing, they leave with nothing. And so that is the full scope of what I want us to be looking at. And I

**Member Scott** 1:37:50

remember we talked about that at the last meeting I heard when I watched the video. That's another that's another issue with regards to selling. Yeah, so the whole point is to have social equity operators. Yeah, we want to sell it. I mean, they lose that status, there was

**Member Ogden** 1:38:07

a timeframe,

**Chair Goins** 1:38:07

right, like, two years. Yeah.

**Member Scott** 1:38:11

Keep it two years. So again, at the end of two years, if you get all the social equity applicants FOMO out, then you don't have any more equity, because balance the majority of

**Chair Goins** 1:38:22

social equity licensed, even without social equity person, right. So, what will happen is so according to the policy, right, according to White Legislation has been written, they have they can sell after two years and those that if they fail, and that establishment is no longer a social equity establishment, that license is still a social equity license. So, another social equity applicant can apply. And then the process starts

**Member Scott** 1:38:51

over but a person but you're saying other things never sell license, you're saying that a person who's not a social equity applicant can run the business until they decide to sell? Yes, but the whole point of it is to make sure that the industry is diverse. So, like after the first two years, all the social equity applicants funnel out and now you've just got the majority, you got people that aren't social equity applicants running these businesses forever. So, a couple of defeats the purpose of doing this, if you're going to only have one to two years minimum requirement for them to own it, they should own it in perpetuity, and they should own forever. And that's it. Two years, none of us equity,

**Chair Goins** 1:39:36

equity period, however, we're talking about selling specifically right so if you're talking about this social equity advocate is selling their license to someone that's a non-social equity applicant. That license still as a social equity application, licensed and can be made available. Now this is the big caveat. Right, if there are establishment licenses made, right, right, but that would stay in. So, for every applicant, excuse me social equity establishment, so that license will be available for new applicants. Now, I

**Member Scott** 1:40:11

\*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>

understand that, but I'm just saying that it doesn't seem fair to call it keep calling it that social equity. Two years, the person who was the only social equity advocate funnels off or sells his or interest off, they should not still be a social equity, the

**Chair Goins** 1:40:30

social equity is more than the license goes back. That's when

**Member Scott** 1:40:35

it goes back to the pot. Yeah. Oh, okay. But again, if I'm, if I'm putting on some of the money, and you said, leaving two years, I have no number to play investment. So, who are you going to get to invest in a business that's going to cost?

**Chair Goins** 1:40:52

Well, I don't sell in two years.

**Member Scott** 1:40:55

But again, we have this race. And the labs, I mean, the lab, the number of labs we had, and the number of production facilities we had, was far greater than the beginning others. And so, people sell because competition is greater, they're not making any money, you have a family issue, there may be a number of reasons why you sell in two years, some businesses fail in the first one, first two years, doesn't fail. So. But again, there may not be the money that was they thought was going to be there in the beginning, may not be there. And they may want to get out and, you know, cut bait mounts and pretty much good money off the bat. Because I have a question

**Member Ogden** 1:41:35

for you. Because I just don't understand something you just said. And I just want to make sure. So, you're saying to his scenario where a person, the social equity person is out for whatever reason, the people that are in it, or it still or someone bought it? Two years later, you're saying that that license goes back into the pot, but they still own it and run out this disgruntled lounge, but then the social equity license is available? Is that what you're saying? That

**Chair Goins** 1:42:07

means? Let me be clear, this is just one interpretation of the policy. Right. But according to the way I interpret, those licenses are always social equity licenses. And if that licensee that is a social equity license sales, right, then this person is no longer a social equity applicant. And this license is still a part of the cannabis compliance board as a social equity Establishment License. To operate? Well,

**Member Ogden** 1:42:39

they do have a license, but it's not a social equity one anymore.

**Chair Goins** 1:42:45

Yes, Member Ulman.

**Member Ulman** 1:42:46

Okay, thank you so much. Um, so I think there's two different scenarios. So, if they default or can't, you know, run the business, then it would go back into the pot app, which is what we spoke about last meeting. And then if they

\*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>

decided to sell after two years, they could sell to whoever they wanted to, I believe is what we discussed. And I do think so two things on that. If somebody wants to sell after two years, and let's say they have made a great amount of money or want to do something else, shouldn't stop them from selling that. And now they can make more money and continue to be a great business person. So, I think we have to be careful on that, I think they should be able to sell whoever they want to. Now if they did sell to another social equity applicant, we could possibly put some benefits in there, like reduce taxes, license, something to make it much more attractive to continue on helping other social equity applicants, but it only goes back into

**Member Scott** 1:43:47

You're only having treating social equity for two years. So, this person decides this business isn't for them, it's not making money and you sell it to whoever you want. That's not a social equity applicant, you've now destroyed a social equity. The whole purpose of this is to have a diverse population within this industry. You've destroyed that.

**Member Ogden** 1:44:13

Cuz, I think it's just a matter of interpretation like because yeah, I mean,

**Chair Goins** 1:44:18

It can be an issue for the next meeting.

**Member Scott** 1:44:20

just don't I mean, if we're going to have social equity needs to be in perpetuity, it can't just be there.

**Member Ulman** 1:44:34

Member Scott, by limiting that applicants, that social equity applicants to only sell to other social equity applicants, something to consider is would you then be preventing that license holder of the consumption lounge from making more money? Maybe he got a he or she got a bigger offer? But you're saying no, you can only buy you can only sell it to another social equity applicant. Instead, we make it attractive to try to continue this success of the social equity program, but we don't hinder that person to say, you can only sell it to another social equity applicant, now you're hurting them.

**Member Scott** 1:45:12

Because if you don't sell it to another person, you're now not You're not, you're now not diverse you have it's all purposes make the industry diverge, is going to be diverse for longer than two years.

**Chair Goins** 1:45:22

I agree. So, let's consider this there is a space where

**Chair Goins** 1:45:28

The policies suggest two years, we absolutely can ask for longer.

**Member Scott** 1:45:36

Again, the whole purpose is to make this a diverse industry, you can't put a time limit on that. And it has to be

**Chair Goins** 1:45:45

\*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>

we also don't want to pigeonhole these applicants into a place that may not be equitable for them, or it may not be sustainable for them. So when they open a business

**Member Scott** 1:45:57

I mean, that's something you think about when you open a business, you always think you're going to be, I don't think anyone go into business thinking they're going to fail. So, I think that people are going into this thinking they're, they're going to be successful. But again, we have to be realistic about the lounges. Unless you're, that's the thing we've struggled with at the City is, how do you make these profitable and that's what you have to be a really good business owner to make sure that they have some kind of hope to keep people there just added there's a bunch of different ideas that they people talked about over the last two and a half years, when we were doing this that the great ideas to keep people involved and engaged. But I just think you're if your whole purpose is to keep diversity within this industry, you cannot just say that person has to be there for two years, and they can funnel out 'cause I guarantee you'll have people that funnel out in two years, and you'll no longer have diversity so that you don't get that again, that you make it if you're going to be social equity, there's going to be a social equity license, it always stays that way. Meaning you have to then sell it to another social equity or equity person or entity. You're going to destroy diversity if you don't do it.

**Member Ogden** 1:47:11

I think you do have to protect it some kind of way.

**Chair Goins** 1:47:15

I like it. I you know, I don't want you to get the feeling that I'm not interested. I like it because it's fast sustainability. I am definitely for sustainability. I just didn't I wanted to hear all of what you had to say before I weighed in. I like it, I think it's I don't think he's going to beat me up. But I like it. Yes,

**Member Ulman** 1:47:37

one thing you could consider too is if we allow those social equity applicants to sell to anybody, and let's say they sell to a non-social equity applicant, there is actually a new license created, so that it doesn't go away. And you don't hinder that current business owner from doing what they would like to do and selling to who they would like. So that would I think, kind of solve that problem. Because I see your point.

**Member Ogden** 1:48:01

You have but then you can have but then suddenly, you have 40 Agree. Because yeah, but that's, that's, that's yeah.

**Chair Goins** 1:48:14

So why don't we say this? Because I think it's I do believe it's I'm going to mention I'm compromised right now. I do believe it's unreasonable to hold people hostage to a license, there's not. Number two, I think there should be an opportunity for equity applicants to buy that, right. So, if we, here's what I I'm thinking as a compromise, maybe it makes sense to say that these social equity, Apple establishments are in a 10-year cycle, right. And a 10-year cycle basically says that, within these 10 years, these investors and these members have to find social equity applicants to keep this in, in the social equity program. And then after that 10-year timeline, you can whatever happens to the license, and maybe we should say seven years, because

**Member Scott** 1:49:15

\*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>

whatever the verse, it's like, you just can't have it for because it's now a hot topic. I agree. So, you can't just say we're going to do it now. And then 10 years from now, we don't have social equity. No, me forever. And so, I think it has to be a situation where, again, they have to know that if you sell it, it's going to go to another so depending on what money they put into it or whatever, again, they can convert it to something else, but I just don't like the idea of having to put a time on

**Chair Goins** 1:49:43

diversify. The reason why I'm saying it as in 10 years is because it now this is most strategic on my part, right? I'm saying 10 years because it allows lobbyists and legislators to work on how this would look long term right and it locks the program in and while that's happening, that's the reason why I'm saying that timeline.

**Member Ulman** 1:50:04

When do you think if someone sells that the social equity owner retains 51% of the profits if they do sell?

**Chair Goins** 1:50:14

Well, that's social equity.

**Member Ogden** 1:50:15

Now you're getting into business.

**Chair Goins** 1:50:22

But I think if we lock them in for here's the reason I know the reason why I'm saying 10 years is because I think if we locked them in for too many 10 years, and they have to have a social equity applicant, then those persons who have been disenfranchised by the policy, because the drugs are now coming into a two years Fair, where they could be the social equity applicant that someone's looking for. Well. I'm not saying that we're not equity. Exactly.

**Member Scott** 1:50:50

This is the place they shouldn't This shouldn't have been in the new legislation dishes, you said, the plenty of these go for. Because otherwise, you're building diversity, you're getting people's hopes up the fact that there's going to be a system that's changed forever, because for so long, it's been the other way. Now, back into the 10. Year,

**Member Ogden** 1:51:09

I agree with you. I agree. I like the timeframe. And I see what you're trying to do. But it doesn't mean that's going to happen like that. Unfortunately, your outstanding, you do what you do because you care. And but who knows what's going to be around five years care. You might be president by the

**Member Scott** 1:51:30

Federal exit if we're putting a timeline on.

**Chair Goins** 1:51:41

Social, I'm going to I don't disagree. I don't disagree. I think it's hot out hard push it is. But I'm going to write that down. It's something that we bring to the committee as a suggestion. And hey, forever.

**Member Ogden** 1:51:58

\*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>

Social Equity,

**Member Scott** 1:52:01

maintains a social equity license forever. And if you can't find him, again, there's got to be somebody there that wants it. And if it isn't, I mean, I don't know what they're planning on charging for these licenses, whether they'll have a real whether you can even sell it because I mean, the license city you can't sell, because it shows that.

**Member Ogden** 1:52:20

And this is another question boards are aggressive another time or whatever but the case, but like, what's the benefit of being a social equity license holder later? Initially, there is, but there's no way we can get into those programs later. But there will there needs to be that conversation because what's the purpose of me holding on and trying to do this, I can just I can write. And so there should be incentives, put in place to keep those tax, you know, whether that be tax breaks this and that, because why would I care to get a social equity license? Yes. Right, even from you, like buying it from you and keeping that status forever? That should be a benefit to the owner to sell it that way. You're saying

**Member Scott** 1:53:02

there's many

**Chair Goins** 1:53:04

she said tax breaks, she was

**Member Scott** 1:53:08

a social equity applicant, now that there aren't any that person still get into that entity. So even tax breaks

**Member Ogden** 1:53:15

is definitely not right.

**Chair Goins** 1:53:17

So, let's talk about incentives on the in the next meeting, which is really soon. So, we'll talk about incentives for investors in the next meeting. Let's move on to item number six, which is applications fee reduction. And so according to legislation, we can offer up to 75% off of the current application fee, and I believe that QHPs like \$5,000

**Member Scott** 1:53:46

now knows that

**Chair Goins** 1:53:48

local licensing fee, well,

**Member Scott** 1:53:51

because we have the non-refundable. So even if you didn't get it, you still had been fine. You ended up getting get your five grand back this

**Member Ulman** 1:54:00

\*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>

weekend for us.

**Chair Goins** 1:54:04

This is the application fee to the cannabis compliance. However, according to the policy, it says we can wait up to 75% So the question is I would it says qualifications. This was my question. That's why it's on the agenda item. I think because we have criteria those persons should qualify for this, however, because this is these are social equity applicants. I do want to consider what second tier would be and the second tier would be minority and veterans right. Haven't not discussed that today. Right now. However, if we don't find enough applicants with these first criteria is how do we feel about offering this first social to equity applicant criteria, the full 75% reduction

**Member Scott** 1:55:06

I could hear my business licensing manager Darcy, in my ear right now right now say, Bryan, you know, we have to even though this is a, it's going to be a privilege license, we have to still do the same investigation, the same work as if this were not a social equity applicant. So therefore, you're the onus is really put on the jurisdictions to kind of foot the bill, for those that are paying the full.

**Member Ogden** 1:55:32

And mind you, I think that you're going to. I don't think I think you're worried about how many applicants you're going to get you think you're not going to have to worry about that there's going to be plenty of people with this criteria, you think you don't think so? I agree up. So that being said, to his point, there's going to be hundreds or 1000s of applications to go through.

**Chair Goins** 1:55:51

And the policy was written, I do want to this is, you know, policy policy, the policy is written to buffer that expectation to say that the current retail consumption licenses are paying 100,000. To what we would say, to cover that. So, with that in mind, Member Scott?

**Member Ogden** 1:56:21

Sure. Should it cover that?

**Member Scott** 1:56:24

Well, Colorado has had its ups and downs of their books, they have one. And so, they have a coffee shop. And so, I don't know how many applicants you'd get for this type of industry, other than the people who have dispensaries now, maybe you'd get the paint and puff, maybe you get a few of the other ones, but they want in all the years they've added. So again, getting these things off the ground are expensive, but I see what you're saying, because it's an impediment to getting into the industry that you have these exorbitant licensing or the application fees. But I think 75% seems a little extreme. But I'm going to say I agree.

**Chair Goins** 1:57:15

I say 75%. I don't want to leave here today and get a phone call. They say you didn't let number Scott I think 75% Member Ogden what do you think?

**Member Ogden** 1:57:29

I will say 50%. Okay, um, you know

\*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** 1:57:33

But now we have to discuss the tiers. There's a p has to be 5000. The fee is in the dataset. So, there's no changing.

**Member Scott**

Does the fee have to be \$5000?

**Chair Goins** 1:57:42

The fee is set in the policy, so there's no changing that number.

**Member Scott** 1:57:46

There's not change, so would you require the locals to also give that same percentage, because I mean, again, it totally works. Well, again, I hear I hear her voice in my head. So, require us to do that is putting the onus on the local governments, because again, we it's a privilege license, and, and not the not the best state, but we did a little bit more work than they did on betting the licenses in the first round. So, we really took a lot of work and time and effort to get that part of the part of the work done, because they were within our jurisdiction, and they had to be regulated by us, and they have to be inspected by us. So, we took a little bit more time to kind of go through the application process.

**Chair Goins** 1:58:32

I appreciate the detail and dicey you know, I know Darcy

**Member Scott** 1:58:39

work to watch it. Yeah. So

**Chair Goins** 1:58:43

boys. I appreciate the work and consideration. I know the city works extremely hard. And I know Darcy takes personal interest as it relates to the cannabis licensing. But what I do want to say is that there is a buffer that's been put in place, and that's why this is a consideration. But to Member Ogden's point, I do think, considering our criteria, that there could be a tear and maybe the tear, it's 75% for most of these points, except for those persons who are family may immediate family members. And then there's it's 50.

**Member Ogden** 1:59:23

Yeah, because that's why would lower because I'm like it covers everybody, you know, yes, but if there's a tier, I can see that

**Chair Goins** 1:59:30

So 75% for all of the other criteria except for family members would pay the 50% of the fee.

**Member Scott** 1:59:43

Okay, but again, the locals as well.

**Chair Goins** 1:59:47

Well, let me be clear, every single person that should be applying for social equity applicant should be

\*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** 1:59:55

the local jurisdiction

**Chair Goins** 1:59:57

We're only talking about CCB It has no relevance to what we have right now. With no, no offense. Ms. Darcy. I understand you need to have a meeting like this over there.. But as it relates to this discount. Yeah. Okay, gotcha. 75

**Member Scott** 2:00:22

I'm okay with that. Okay. You know, I'm not trying to get you in trouble.

**Chair Goins** 2:00:27

You know people have my phone number they can call me too.

**Member Ulman** 2:00:33

Don't get yourself in trouble on the first meeting Member Scott. I think for the application being \$10,000, for the independent lounges with the reduction of 25 is 100%. Fair, the fact that the dispensaries are having to pay \$100,000 to apply to offset that cost, I think will prevent any hindrance as you're suggesting on the state. Also, I don't know if this is an option. But if there is an additional cost, is it possible to leverage any of the costs to leverage that with any of the money that we're getting? From the federal government?

**Chair Goins** 2:01:16

I don't know. But that doesn't have relevance on this right now. However, I absolutely, you know, jurisdictionally there that doesn't have relevance on this right now. But there is something relevant to

**Member Ulman** 2:01:31

Members Scott was worried will that cover the cost? Or will the, you know, State institute have to incur that cost? I don't think they will, based on the dispensaries having to pay \$100,000 I know that the intent was to offset any additional costs. So overall, I agree. 2500.

**Chair Goins** 2:01:51

So, are we the question is 75% for all of the criteria, and then 50%? For those persons? Who would be family members? That's the question.

**Member Scott** 2:02:04

Yeah, if you're going to, if you're going to put, if you're going to put a reduction, I think a tiered system works. I say yes. to that.

**Chair Goins** 2:02:09

I say yes. to sound good. Okay.

**Member Scott** 2:02:21

We asked them if they have a current location that they're interested in pursuing? Or would that because again, it's without a vocation, the license does you no good. You know, I know you don't like brick and mortar?

\*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** 2:02:33

No, not what I was going to say is I'm going to turn off the city brain.

**Member Scott** 2:02:41

For 25 years, yeah, that's all hard to do.

**Chair Goins** 2:02:45

That is something that we will be discussing in the next meeting. I want to trudge through some of the facts, right? Yes, that is, I have that is one of the things that we will have to discuss. So, moving on to item number seven. And this came directly from where public comment last meeting. And application stacking means that Member Ogden could put in for application. To maximize their opportunity to win, I saw I wanted to put this in here as one of the quotes criteria. I wanted to make sure that we were that we dialogue about this when it was brought up. You know, when it was brought up in public comment, I made a note, and I was like, I hadn't considered that that is one of the basis of every other state being sued has been because application stacking, here's an opportunity for us to be forward thinking. I am against this wholeheartedly, especially as it relates to social equity applicants, and these are the these are the only thing that we have jurisdiction over right now in conversation. So, for the social equity application program, I am going to say a hard no on application stacking. And furthermore, how can the application stack if we're considering that these persons wouldn't be sitting on so much money that they could stack applications? Because that's the idea. Right? This isn't me saying that they're poor, but this is me saying that.

**Member Ogden** 2:04:48

He could apply for several

**Chair Goins** 2:04:54

do we want to make applications stacking a criteria as one of the pass-fails. For applicants.

**Member Scott** 2:05:03

I think it's unfair. I don't think you should be able to have more than one. I agree. Especially we're going to have a lot of legal on the back of you get rolling at the end, you have intend to continue having one ticket in is.

**Member Ogden** 2:05:20

I agree, can I ask this? How's it going to be? Is it going to be like how the dispensaries where we're certain jurisdictions have certain amounts that they can give in that. So, if there's 10, Henderson gets one that gets one is that kind of how it is? And then you have to decide ahead of time where you're going to apply in what jurisdiction and that only jurisdiction that one application? You know, because that that also needs to be considered in the sense of how you apply?

**Chair Goins** 2:05:46

We won't. So, I think that because we're going to be talking about that next meeting, right. But I don't think that there's 10 applications. And I think with these 10 applications, they're going to kind of be arbitrary, because it's 10 applications and the new license the retail licenses throughout the state throughout the state. So, the retail licensees will kind of already designate what's available.

\*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** 2:06:12

Because they'd have to be in their location

**Chair Goins** 2:06:15

Exactly why they have to. They have exactly, so it will be what is left if we're looking at it, holy. I do hear what you're saying. If we say that we can't have advocates and stalking them, and we're saying that there's so many applications available, and somebody doesn't want to be in the city, and someone doesn't want to be in the county than they should be able to apply in the city and in the county. I do hear that. But there's 10 licenses. We'll see why. Yeah. And see only.

**Member Ogden** 2:06:47

Yeah, because that's the only issue is, is why and I get what you're saying because I agree I don't like it. It's really unfair in the grand scheme of things. But what happens is that, you know, you might have 30 people applying in Henderson, and you might still want to turn your application there, you probably will, you know, the odds of getting it very slim to none. So, you're like, let me go apply somewhere else, just in case, I just want a license.

**Member Scott** 2:07:11

The only thing in this we called the golden ticket when you get your dispensary like that was the golden ticket. And then you went to the just jurisdictions and says, look, I got the golden ticket. Now, here's my location, yeah, where I want to go. And then they determined that for now. Yeah, so this essence, 10 people, we have the golden ticket. Yeah, and they go wherever they can find a location, you have to remember too that the number of locations where these will be allowed for so I'm going to have to not in my backyard, then you're going to have to you have to be with 50, you can't be within 1500 feet of a gaming licensed facility can be within 300 feet of the school, church synagogue. So, the places where these are going to be located can be very live.

**Chair Goins** 2:07:48

I agree. Especially after we have already designated where the retail lounges will be. The space will be.

**Member Scott** 2:07:58

There's very few places where I've ever been able to get one

**Member Ogden** 2:08:00

You'll still have an obstacle of like, let's say Henderson will say we don't want it. So now you've got to take those 10 people are fighting for let's say the city goes well, we'll just take two. Yes. And now you're fighting, and you might even have a license with no area, no place to go. Yeah. There's things like that can happen. So, we'll have to make sure I'll be

**Chair Goins** 2:08:20

But that's the reason why I think application stacking is a no is because I think you have an applicant and then after those two napkins have their as Member Scott's saying they have the golden ticket. It's up to them to do the lobbying and the footwork right, say where they're going to fit that that structure. I'm

**Member Ogden** 2:08:38

fine with the other one where you can only apply in those jurisdictions.

\*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** 2:08:45

The state license so you have the golden ticket for state. Yeah.

**Member Ulman** 2:08:49

Just to clarify, you don't have to have an address?

**Member Scott** 2:08:52

You do not? Yes, that's it.

**Member Ulman** 2:08:56

And I have one thing for us to consider Chair Goins. Do you? What are your thoughts on social equity applicant being able to apply for both social equity and independent lounge

**Chair Goins** 2:09:08

That to me is application stacking. That's putting your name and two because social equity will be pass fail, right? Independent will just be a pot? Yeah

**Member Ogden** 2:09:23

Because it's all an application no matter how you slice equity pieces, just one

**Member Ulman** 2:09:26

Yes. Okay. So social media only apply for social equity. And then add one other thing just on the fees, let's say somebody applied for social equity and they paid the 2500 and the after being vetted. They were found out you know, not to qualify, giving those folks an option to pay the difference of the 10,000 paying the 7500 so they're now moved over to the other pot. We I want to be careful for that.

**Chair Goins** 2:09:55

No, no, no I want no part of that.

**Member Ulman** 2:10:02

So, if I can finish my comment. So, one thing we want to be careful is if somebody applies for social equity application, and they just miss it, they don't qualify for whatever reason, their crime, what I don't know, whatever reason, it doesn't matter. We don't want to just say, you're out, you can still apply, but you have to go to this category. And I think that's solid that we allow them to do that.

**Chair Goins** 2:10:28

So, Member Ulman, what I will say is one of the things that we are trying to be specific about is identifying who that social equity applicant is, as a pass fail so that they already know where they are right? I don't, what I don't want to do is get into a scenario where we are commingling the funds in an in an idea. Because then that puts the CCB in a very weird space, and it puts the program itself in a weird space if they fail.

\*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** 2:11:00

And we're just saying that you failed now, you can't apply for independent. I mean, that's not really fair to that applicant.

**Chair Goins** 2:11:08

But I'm not saying you can't apply for independent what I am saying is the independent program is its own program.

**Member Ulman** 2:11:16

Sure, sure. It is. But again, if someone isn't a social equity applicant, and they thought they were they thought they checked all those boxes, yes. And then through vetting the process decided, unfortunately, you're not, but you are welcome to apply for the independent license. And you know, you can do that that cost is \$10,000. That's going to happen, we have to be prepared for that and be able to mitigate it so

**Member Scott** 2:11:41

But the thing is, the deadline applies exactly the same. Are you going to say October one for all the social equity applicants, but then November December one for all the other applicants?

**Member Ulman** 2:11:57

If you if that's not the solution, you know, what do we do with those folks who thought they did everything right, you know, went through the process, took the class, maybe even got an attorney, and then they just they find out through the vetting process actually don't qualify. So again, we want to set people up for success. And if you didn't get a license on the first round, we want you to have the opportunity. And this is how we're going to do it. So, I don't have the answer to that just something I think we should discuss.

**Member Ogden** 2:12:28

And this is let me ask you this just to go because I don't even know if that's our issue right now to even determine that's something that CCB if they're scoring as a whole, they would say, Okay, you didn't get these five points for social equity or pass fail, but then let me score the rest of your application on

**Member Ulman** 2:12:46

Sorry, we're not on that step yet. Just the Pass-Fail

**Chair Goins** 2:12:49

No. So yeah,

**Member Scott** 2:12:52

that'd be you'd have to do, you'd have to allow the stacking, you mean, that means you'd have to apply social equity advocate. The timeframes are exactly the same.

**Member Ulman** 2:13:06

It's not what I'm saying. So using qualifying, you paid the \$2,500? Are we allowing those folks to then move their application to the independent lounges? And I think it should, absolutely, you should be able to, again, the point is, to let people into this space that we're 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 Scott 2:13:24**

well, but that that's a social equity applicant.

**Chair Goins 2:13:27**

So, Member Ulman, what I will say is, this is also the reason why we are discounting the application fee, because we do realize it's a risk. And we do realize that some stress to those applicants, but that's why the fee is being discounted so much is to say, hey, we know that this is a risk, we know that you're taking it. And so, here's a little for that, I think as to what Member Scott says, I think it puts it makes the waters a little muddy. And what we want to do is and I agree there's going to be space where people thought they qualified and maybe there needs to be a program where we can pre check people to see if they're qualified, maybe you know, that's something one of the progressive movements out there could do is say, hey, you know what, we'll pre check your qualifications before you go into the application process. I think that's a great program that someone could do, it ain't going to be me because I got some other programs, putting it out there. But I think that's a great program that someone could put in place. But when we're when you do business doing it's a risk. And the unfortunate part is this is a component of the risk. And that is the reason why there is a deduction, or excuse me a reduction and fees for that risk.

**Member Ogden 2:14:50**

You can't hold hands. You can't hold everybody's hand and what they should be doing as a business owner. If they can't feel it out. They didn't know that's the risk they, I mean, look, they might miss a board member on the application to you don't let them go back and fill that out. No, it just doesn't it just next time, you got to apply it and follow, if you did it wrong, you're out. That's like everything in life like you got to get, get you get you a consultant, make sure you know, whatever it is that people need to do to get their application, right.

**Member Scott 2:15:21**

That's why the criteria has to be as clear and concise as possible. Because if there's two interpretation, they are going to like they're going to they're going to like, remember all them said they're going to think they qualify, and they don't. Yeah, that's why the criteria has to be crystal clear. Yes. And there is no kind of gray area.

**Chair Goins 2:15:42**

And I think we have I think the suggestions we will make to the CAC to vote on are clear. criteria I think that they're easy to identify. I don't think the, you know, I'm looking forward to seeing what this looks like. Member Ulman, I You brought up a great question, a great suggestion. And I can appreciate the empathy given. And, and although I am completely empathetic, I also am a business owner. And there's, you know, there's a fee to do a business. And, you know, to Darcy watching this, you know, they've raised my fees recently to doing business. You know, it's part of doing business, as we're moving into item number eight, on the agenda. future meetings, we do have a future meeting already. On the books, I believe October 4, so I we will be back here next week. Because I'm trying to make sure that you know, we get done what we need to get done. We've made great headway day. I appreciate everyone's time

**Member Scott 2:17:05**

What's your deadline for actually putting in the suggestions to the CCB.

**Chair Goins 2:17:11**

This CAC is supposed to be meeting and then in a few weeks, as

\*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** 2:17:17

you said, our focus next time should be incentives.

**Chair Goins** 2:17:21

Yes we want to talk about incentives.

**Member Scott** 2:17:26

And can we can we get a copy of the application, and we try to find a copy of the application so we can see if there's any criteria? We want to list for the lounges

**Chair Goins** 2:17:36

Absolutely. And we also want to so the next meeting will be talking about the diversity component of the application as it relates to women and veterans. And

**Member Scott** 2:17:48

are we going to do disabled as well?

**Chair Goins** 2:17:50

Yes. Yes, we'll be talking about how they have that looks for second tear. And then also, incentives for investors and or future applicants. And I had one more thing. I have notes everywhere. So, give me a second who. Oh, and I want to make sure that we can identify those disproportionate areas. So, I'm going to get try to get a study done so that we can have that ready to dialogue, you know, what we're really looking at so that we're clear on that.

**Member Scott** 2:18:37

And so that's only going to be one factor in the overall scoring of the applicant,

**Chair Goins** 2:18:45

that would be a pass-fail. So yeah, so what we said is five years in these areas, so that's what I'm going to identify as those areas.

**Member Scott** 2:18:55

And how many failures can you have before your applications gone?

**Chair Goins** 2:18:58

Only one of these qualify if you hit one of these.

**Member Scott** 2:19:01

So if you've have one pass you qualify yes.

**Chair Goins** 2:19:08

that's what I was considering.

**Member Ogden** 2:19:10

\*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>

Right. The only one I was questioning is a family member after they have to live because I thought someone said they maybe live in those areas, their family member lived in those areas. So that might be a layer there. But other than that, there was not that I saw. Yeah.

**Chair Goins** 2:19:24

And when we say it was an immediate family members that lived in that disproportionate area for the five years for that same amount of time

**Member Ogden** 2:19:30

or had a conviction

**Member Ulman** 2:19:36

Okay, so we're going to give somebody preference that has a family member that lives in a disproportionate area, but not if they were affected by cannabis policy.

**Chair Goins** 2:19:51

No, we're saying the same thing. We're going to one of the criteria is 10 years out of A felony conviction cannabis policy conviction, any misdemeanor anytime cannabis conviction, that also person who's lived in a five year disproportionate area, a person who is 51%. So, they have to be this is a Carter on top, they have to be a 51% social equity applicant. And then also a person who is an immediate family member of a person who was disenfranchised by the war on drugs based on them having a misdemeanor or a felon, but live five years in a disproportionate area.

**Member Ulman** 2:20:36

Gotcha. And anywhere in the United States, they lived in a disproportionate area as long as they've lived in Nevada for five years.

**Chair Goins** 2:20:46

No, they have to have they have to be living and Nevada for the same criteria for the five years applies to that immediate family member. Because we're going to, we're being consistent.

**Member Ulman** 2:21:00

Okay, but they have to live in Nevada in a disproportionate area. So, they couldn't have lived in another state. And a disproportion area. Now they're a grown adult, now they live in the suburbs, then they wouldn't qualify as what you're saying.

**Chair Goins** 2:21:15

That's what I'm saying.

**Member Scott** 2:21:19

I guess, yeah. Well, I guess we were going to have to check all these criteria to make sure that they're actually telling the trust. So, I don't know how much investigative power We have to see if someone was in Chicago and lived in a disproportionate, yeah. Needs to be something easy for the CCB

\*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 2:21:35**

Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. And then plus, we're already saying you because one of our questions was, if you're a family member, how do we funnel that to make sure that we don't have everybody? This is what we've decided to stay consistent. All right. Before we open it up to public comments, does any of the members have any final comments? All right, then we're going to move to nine, agenda nine and public comment, we're going to keep your please I'm going to ask that you keep your comments at two minutes. And I do want to say this, because I am not being rude when I say last 30 seconds. Final comments, I just want to offer you an opportunity to kind of sum up what you're trying to say, with your last 30 seconds. But we do have a timer here. So, if everybody's wondering, how am I keeping time, I have a timer here. So that's how I'm keeping time. But I'd like for you to state your name. limit your comments to two minutes, please come to the public comment podium. And this is your time for public comment.

**Chris Robintish 2:23:03**

Afternoon, commissioners, thank you for your time. Thanks for putting this together. I got into this industry out of necessity for medicine, and 2008. And there was nothing clean here in Nevada back then. And there's no safe access. And so, as I work with more and more patients, it became necessary that, you know, I expanded and grew. And I was super excited for the licenses to keep the dispensary and 2014 and 2015. And I was working with groups where I was going to be their cannabis expert and become an owner. Prior to that, unfortunately, I was raided by a federally funded task force here in Nevada. And those conversations ended abruptly and why the state tried to figure out what I was what they're going to do with me for three years. And then they finally charged me with a simple misdemeanor possession charge that that opportunity was taken from me. I made something of myself in this industry. I've created hundreds of jobs in this state. But one thing I haven't been able to do is participating in a license. And so, what I'm asking for is that you put the priority on those who were whose justice was taken away here in the state of Nevada who sacrificed their freedoms and liberties to lay the foundation for the medical marijuana market. So many now benefit from

**Chair Goins 2:24:32**

Can you state your name

**Chris Rebentisch 2:24:33**

Chris Rebentisch

**Chair Goins**

Thank you. Thank you. Thanks for Thank you very much for your comment

**Timothy Addo 2:24:52**

Hello, hi. My name is Timothy Addo. Oh for the record. I'm speaking on behalf Chemovario. To Start off. And just to keep the comments briefly, I wanted to start by stating that the reason we're here is social equity. And given the right message analysis, and tools, people will work toward social equity doesn't reasonably here were yours because of NRS453A. At some point, we had a system that does appropriate this appropriately marginalized serving individuals from this industry. Some of us, like gentleman just have stated, like, we could prove that you're in the early stages of this industry. I was the first personal caller to have applied, we help cannabis patients gain techniques of growing, providing medicine for patients. We helped them in their early draft with the 2013 of bills. Some people were in here when that happened. So, we know exactly what it took for us to get to where we are right now. This is not a laughing

\*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>

matter. This is serious because we know what it took to get here. Unfortunately, for some people, being a lobbyist, you would have to disclose what your interests really are in this position that you're playing right now. And I'm going to speak on this. We are the only state that is moving forward with a consumption lounge business model for social equity. That's a shame. Why? Because we have a system that does not provide any profitable model. It's not proven. So why are we doing this? Why aren't we doing exactly what other states are doing? Path to ownership? Because we help establish those facilities? What are we doing here? What is the need for you? What is in it for you?

**Chair Goins** 2:27:15

Last 30 seconds, sir.

**Timothy Addo** 2:27:18

I'm here to acknowledge that. Thanks for your time.

**Chair Goins** 2:27:25

Thank you, thank you for your comment.

**Katree Saunders** 2:27:37

My name is Katree Saunders for the record. And I just like to establish I don't have a residency I've been displaced for the past two and a half years for Nevada state legislatures bad policy for Federal Labor legislations bad policy. So, when you guys are putting requirements on residency, I don't even have a home to provide where I've been for the past two years, my kid's father is displaced, he moved my kids to another state because he didn't want to have to deal with the federal government and things that were going on with Nevada state legislature. So, with him being my ex, he's not eligible, because he doesn't live in the state, my son had to go to the Air Force, he just moved back, he wouldn't be eligible. The tenure requirements for people having been affected by the war, I wouldn't be involved. Because I'm only seven years out of my felony from being at prison. So first and foremost, you guys are discussing social justice and social issues, there needs to be a special session to address that law. First and foremost, if you guys are really planning on making an impact on the harms that have been done at a state level and at a federal level. There also needs to be a real pathway to leadership, I can attest when we I worked in industry, when I worked at The Source, they were building out lounges so that they could have social consumption. Social Equity language was only added as an afterthought to make it look like you guys are actually trying to do something for those most harm. If you guys are actively trying to do something for those who are most harmed by the war on drugs or the ownership, discussion of occupations, dispensaries, labs, ancillary businesses, etc. There's no discussion that this was set up primarily for existing operations who are already in ownership, and who have already spent the money to be built out for social equity lounges. So, I'm asking for a special session to be called for first and foremost, to address the 10-year clause because this can't go on if they really cared about social justice and making a blueprint for the rest of the nation to follow that needs to be addressed first and foremost, before anything goes on. My name is Katree. Thank you.

**Rachel Lee** 2:29:41

Good afternoon. Thank you. Hi, I'm Rachel Lee. I've been here since 1985. And I was raised up in Herbert Gerson Park. At age 19, I was with a friend and some FBI agents or police officers came in and put a charge on me. And it was a drug trafficking charge. And I never sold drugs in my life. It's not a secret here, that is the battle of African American people were put charges on. Even if like they go to prison, that charge affected my name. So when I went to the look for jobs, they saw that even though I did not commit their crime claim, I want to keep that in consideration when you say that the person has to have been in prison, because even though I did end up working for

\*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 state of Nevada for Department of Child Protective Services, it took a long time for me to get there, because any, any employer that saw that fake charge on my name, turned me away. So, it took a long time for me to get established. Second of all, someone was mentioning about the 75%, or two or 50%, if we're looking at social equity, and you're looking at people who may not have the money, and we're talking about this program for people who may not have the money, that should not be something to be argumentative about, especially if there's the option to say, well, maybe they don't qualify for the 75%. But let's give them points 50%, over 25 years, but to pinpoint a number to make 25% or 50% is ridiculous. Also, a suggestion, if there is an applicant, and they are able to get into they're able to get into the program, and they have to sell off. Why not sell out to the CCP, by the CCP, not Berger, why not help the people who are able to get on the program to say, hey, we're going to give you this application, or, Hey, if you're making a profit, you need to put some profit back into the program that kept you established, how about, hey, you're getting a certain amount of money, you got to put in 2% for the next person to come behind you ever been put into their car, because you've got a hand up. So now put your batteries for somebody else. That's an option, I mean, if something that you might want to look into. And also, the process, like the queen said, there, Las Vegas is now that it's getting a little bit more diverse for people that have been here for a long time knows the history of Las Vegas, that we weren't even allowed to go to the strip.. Sorry about that.

**Chair Goins** 2:32:15

We're past time. Thank you. Please have your last comments.

**Rachel Lee** 2:32:19

Just say I'll be back again, to make more comments. And I thank you for establishing this opportunity first. Thank you.

**Sal Ali** 2:32:39

I just wanted to say a couple of things. From the discussion that was going on earlier, I think there was a lot of questions about social equity. And you know, how you guys verify that all the information in this and that I've worked on a lot of social equity programs in different states, and I know none of them really work. But one thing that a lot of the states do, and they pre-qualified people for social equity quite a bit, submit an application. So, you can submit for the pre-qualification submit all the required documentation to provide whether it's, you're requiring them to show like, you know, utility bills to prove their residents or their bank statements or at least the whatever else that can be uploaded via internet and they can get that pre-qualified so that what the lady earlier what they spent the \$2,500. And then they find out they're not qualified for. So basically, this can kind of bypass that whole scenario. So that people can be pre-qualified at the time and know that they're, they qualify for the social equity program. Things like that. Another thing I wanted to say is requiring people to have financials, social equity people are to me, that's, you know, that's discrimination. They should be able to get that provisional license, and then go raise the money they need. You're only given up 10 licenses, those licenses are going to be super valuable. I know you guys say that, you know, and we knew a lot of people are saying that the consumption model is we don't know how it's profitable, it's not profitable. Well, you got people millions and millions of dollars want to open up consumption lounges here is not going to be hard for you to go to raise money. As soon as they get that lunch, like you said, they're going to have the golden ticket. So, they're going to go around, it's a lot easier for someone who's a social equity candidate to now say that I have the license now I can now I have something to stand on. So, I can raise funds. So, I'm not getting a predatory loan from somebody anymore, because now I have, but if you can find me ahead of time, they'll try to get the financials and the financing. I could be subject to whatever those guys terms are fine

\*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>

**A'asha Goins** 2:34:40

Final comments.

**Sal Ali** 2:34:43

So that was basically it from the conversation from what we're talking about are there

**Chair Goins** 2:34:48

thank you for your comment.

**Ryan Bondus** 2:35:02

Hello, everybody, my name is Ryan Bondus. For the record, I first want to thank the commission all of its members in the Chari for hosting such a gracious meeting here and allowing us to have this opportunity to come and speak with these matters. I do feel it's been a long time coming, I will make this short as non-emotional as possible for all committee members hear an older gentleman born of an immigrant mother, not speaking English, raised in the United States, learning the way of life along with his mother, including the language, fighting his way and coming from the States back to a foreign country to do much schooling and returning in high school even more removed from normal lifestyles. This individual chose to get into cannabis out of necessity for medicine, out of necessity for funds out of necessity for life in an environment that was not meant for this particular individual. Moving through cannabis in his life, you become a criminal, no matter what it's a decision you have to make. It's a vow of absolute shadow living. And that's something that you have to do is individual made that decision throughout his life to live in the shadows. Throughout all of this time, developing learning, structuring much of what we use today, the example I like to give is the eighth, the eighth is still designed based on the \$50 from the underground, this, you know, we didn't come up with a new price. So, some of these things were captured by that group of individuals, this particular individual took it a step further into access during the gray areas of our Nevada Law, remember, grow your own, not everybody can grow the wrong. So, this individual took the time to try and develop a system to work within these individuals to get them access in every way that he possibly could getting with groups. And finally, way to work within these gray laws in order to create that access. Final comments within that times individual was raided and spent four and a half years fighting a case within that four and a half years Nevada had switched their laws into what we're using today. But within that four and a half years, two years of being smeared all over media, not being able to get a regular job, much less apply here. That individual was never given the chance. But individuals now an executive working at a high level for MSO still never going to be promised to see at that table. I am that individual. And I just want to thank you guys for giving us not only public comment, but for taking the time to discuss how that program is going to be designed for people like myself who for a very short period of time were made from being a criminal to valuable. Thank you for that audience. Thank you. Thank you,

**Chair Goins** 2:37:38

Thank you for your comment. There's no more public comment..

**Member Ogden** 2:37:57

I'm going to give you just 30 seconds

**Katree Saunders** 2:37:59

No, I just want to add like I was affected by the war on drugs at early age, my real father got incarcerated when I was 12. At the Post Office. I believe he worked there. So, I had to deal with this from a child onto adulthood. So, I'm just

\*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>

wanting that real justice gets served in the state of Nevada, that we have real laws and a real blueprint that the rest of the nation can follow. My name is Katree. Thank you.

**Chair Goins** 2:38:27

I appreciate everybody's time. You know, it is my absolute pleasure to serve my community. You know, I don't have to do this work. I get to do this work. It's tedious work. It's tiring work. But where else would I do? What else would I do? I'd still do that. So, thank you for your time. The meeting is adjourned. See you on October 3.

\*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>