

1. The title of the agenda item highlights several topics to be discussed as part of the entire ordinance review which include:
 - a) CC will discuss adding cannabis retail businesses (dispensaries) to identified zones (neighborhood and commercial districts)
 - b) that CC will consider the addition of "two delivery-only cannabis retail businesses...", also considered dispensaries.
2. The original regulatory ordinance caps the number of retail dispensaries at two. Staff's recommendation was to maintain the cap of two dispensaries that would be open to the public. The agenda item b) above indicates that CC would be discussing the increasing of this number to a total of 4.
3. The state does not make distinctions between delivery-only and full blown dispensaries. They consider all cannabis retail as dispensaries with the same permitting requirements. They leave it to the local jurisdiction to limit use as they see fit.
3. In the meeting, CC reviewed the aspect of "delivery-only" and opted to modify the ordinance language to add these two additional dispensaries, but to not make them "delivery-only", choosing to instead make them open to the public but require that they have a delivery service. This brings these two additional businesses into alignment with state regulations on dispensaries.
6. CC indicated that these two additional dispensaries must include a delivery option. The original intent was to cap at two retail and add two delivery only (4 total). In discussion, the total number of cannabis businesses is still 4, but all four are now considered retail, two with a delivery mandate.
7. With the two new dispensaries, as were scheduled to be discussed per the agenda, we will have a total of four permits available.

My thoughts:

- It is impossible to list all possible topics that will come up as part of the conversation during a meeting. It is clear that there was an intent to "add cannabis retail options to specific zones" and to also "add two delivery only retail locations". With the addition of the two new "delivery-only" retail locations, the city would have a total of four retail permits.
- The discussion portion of the staff report, in response to the complaint, states that the agenda included mention of "increasing the number of cannabis retail businesses" but it omits the words "delivery-only".
- I am unclear that the public was made aware that the state does not make a distinction between retail, brick and mortar dispensaries and "delivery only" dispensaries, that the permitting regulations for both are the same and the state allows for local jurisdictions to make

their own land use decisions. But is it staff's job to make sure that the public is aware of every state regulation? I don't think so.

- The circumstances were confusing, and a general person, such as myself, might not know that something defined as a "delivery only" business would carry no distinction in the permitting process from a regular retail businesses (brick and mortar, open to the public).
- The public was notified that the city was considering the addition of two more retail permits, but as the item reflected "delivery-only" might that have played a factor in their decision to attend? If a member of the public had concerns about additional permits being allowed and upping the number of retail opportunities from 2 to 4, were they sufficiently notified?
- Is it the CC's right to amend this language within the October 16th meeting? It appears from historical actions, that this is a right of the CC, to accept staff's recommendations or to make amendments to those recommendations, and voting to accept or decline accordingly.
- In reading the state regulations, there is no such thing as a "delivery-only" permit. This distinction is made within the local jurisdiction, and it seems that our CC chose not to include this language in the ordinance amendment.
- To clarify, the CC opted to not make the two new retail permits "delivery-only" and instead modified the local land use description for the additional two dispensaries to mandate the inclusion of delivery services, but opted against making them delivery only, as was their right.
- The entire situation was very confusing to someone who was not privy to all the various conversations that have taken place.