

## LARA WEISIGER

---

**From:** M Tong <maung6@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 15, 2019 4:32 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie; City Clerk  
**Subject:** Please STOP from increase Cannabis dispensary from 2 to 4 !

Dear Mayor & Council members,

We are long term citizens of Alameda & are very concerned of the number of cannabis dispensaries in our city.

Alameda is a small city that we are proud of our unique culture and would like to maintain our peaceful livelihood here.

We worry about the safety, noise & heavy traffic the proposed additional dispensaries may add to our city.

We want our family esp. children & elderly to be free to go around town without worrying about many strangers who may bring violence, crimes or civil disturbance to our safety.

Our small city has no need for more than 2 dispensaries.

Please vote No to increase more dispensaries.

Thanks!

Margaret Tong

## LARA WEISIGER

---

**From:** Joanna Lau CPA <lau\_joanna@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 15, 2019 1:52 PM  
**To:** Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft; John Knox White; Tony Daysog; Malia Vella; Jim Oddie; City Clerk  
**Subject:** Don't add more marijuana storefronts in Alameda City

Dear council members,

Please don't add two additional marijuana storefronts in our small city. Two storefronts is more than enough in this moment. They can serve a lot of people. Plus, people can always order marijuana online.

Alameda city does not hire a independent group of people who monitor, regulate, review marijuana licensing & business compliance, and work on social studying for marijuana impact in the city. In long run, nobody know what the social costs will be. Adding two additional marijuana storefronts is taking higher risk for City of Alameda.

In case, two storefronts become not enough later on. The city can think about adding more stores in the future. However, it should not be in 2019! Please vote no tonight.

Thanks.

Best,  
Joanna Lau

# PORTMAN ENTERPRISES

2934 LINCOLN AVE

ALAMEDA, CA 94501

[WWW.PORTMANENT.COM](http://WWW.PORTMANENT.COM)

**To:** Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft  
Vice Mayor John Knox White  
Councilmember Malia Vella  
Councilmember Tony Daysog  
Councilmember Jim Oddie  
Acting City Manager David Rudat  
Acting City Attorney Michael Roush  
City Attorney John Le  
City Clerk Laura Weisiger  
Economic Development Manager Lois Butler  
Community Development Director Debbie Potter

**From:** Mark Hersman                      Carrie Tillman                      Nick Portolese

**Date:** January 14, 2019

**Topic:** Cannabis Business Ordinances

Dear City Leaders,

As you are all aware, one of the final acts of the previous council was the finalization of the cannabis business ordinances. It's our understanding that the Open Government Commission (OGC) has an objection to the notification process leading to the passage of the ordinances as discussed at the October 16, 2018 City Council meeting and finalized at the November 7, 2018 City Council meeting. Specifically the complaint focuses on the change from the authorization of "2 storefront dispensaries, and 2 delivery only dispensaries" to the final decision allowing "4 storefront dispensaries, with a minimum of 2 offering delivery services". Regarding this specific issue, we were attendees to this debate, have reviewed the video recently, and we noted the following:

- The key issue debated was not the visual footprint on the city of having four storefront dispensaries, the primary concern was access to cannabis via delivery for patients who are compromised in their mobility
- Once Council received guidance that they could require a minimum of two dispensaries to provide delivery services throughout Alameda city limits, the physical nature of these dispensaries (storefront vs. warehouse) became irrelevant to the discussion

- Further, it was noted that a delivery only warehouse dispensary would need to conform to the same regulations as a storefront dispensary
- The City Attorney gave guidance to the Council that this change from warehouse/delivery only to storefront was not material enough to require a new first reading for public comment.

As witness to the council meeting in question, it's our opinion that the previous council acted in good faith and, by requesting advice from the City Attorney, was well aware and respectful of their obligations under the Sunshine Ordinance. Clearly the OGC disagrees with the City Attorney guidance, putting you, the new City Council in a difficult position. While we understand that opening up this one issue for public comment is being done to satisfy the request of the OGC, we respectfully request that your actions be limited to this one item regarding the public notice requirement concerning the nature of the approved dispensaries, and not re-litigate the balance of the cannabis ordinances.

Over the course of the last two years, the city has gone to the following lengths to gather public input:

- SCI Consulting was hired to help craft the initial ordinances and presented their findings to Council on September 5, 2017
- Questions regarding cannabis businesses locating in Alameda were included in the [quality of life survey](#) (65% of respondents favored adult use dispensaries on the island)
- A well-attended public forum was held at the Mastick Center on August 20, 2017
- On Saturday October 21, 2017, a special six hour City Council meeting was held exclusively on the topic of cannabis allowing for robust public comment
- Individual council members met with community groups, cannabis industry professionals, local prospective business owners, and community activists in order to gather multiple perspectives on the topic
- The School Board request for expanded buffer zones around schools was adopted

The city has done a thorough and professional job in evaluating the pros and cons of establishing cannabis businesses in our city, and created a comprehensive application process that will ensure that only the highest quality operators who are committed to being good stewards of our community values will be granted licenses.

As prospective dispensary operators, and long time residents of Alameda, we ask that you respect the work of the previous council and not prolong the ordinance process any further than absolutely necessary. Let's move forward with bringing cannabis business into Alameda in a responsible way.

Thank you,

Mark Hersman

Carrie Tillman

Nick Portolese

January 12, 2019

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft  
Vice Mayor John Knox White  
Councilmember Malia Vella  
Councilmember Tony Daysog  
Councilmember Jim Oddie

Re: Item 6B on City Council agenda set for 1/15/19 concerning proposed changes to Alameda's Cannabis Ordinance

Dear Mayor Ashcraft and fellow Councilmembers:

I am writing to you in my personal capacity concerning the above-referenced matter that you will consider at your next city council meeting on January 15, 2019. My husband and I have closely followed the trajectory of cannabis regulations coming to Alameda since the first community meeting was held at the Mastick Center on August 20, 2017. We attended early council meetings on this issue where a majority of you asked for public input into proposed regulations. As a result, on September 17, 2017, the Alameda Board of Education submitted a resolution to Council urging it to adopt regulations supporting a 1,000-foot buffer zone from schools in Alameda. In addition, the Alameda PTA Council submitted a similar resolution also asking that the 1,000-foot buffer be implemented.

This collective voice from the Board of Education and from PTA organizations across the island reflect a common goal: to reduce exposure of cannabis businesses to areas where our children go to school and congregate. This policy statement is consistent with the intent of Proposition 64, which promised to keep marijuana businesses a certain distance from schools and "other areas where children congregate." On Tuesday, this Council will consider whether to reduce the buffer zone protections for youth, tutoring, and child care centers from 1,000 feet to 600 feet. Please consider keeping the 1,000 foot buffer intact regarding these sensitive use facilities in town. While we understand the unique nature of Alameda and the apparently limited options for cannabis businesses to open under the current regulatory scheme, placing these businesses closer to areas where children congregate should be a last resort to increase location opportunities for cannabis businesses.

Second, please keep the number of allowable dispensaries to exist in Alameda at this time to two. Doubling the number of permits to be issued to dispensaries from two to four is premature. City staff have yet to work with any existing dispensaries under the new ordinance. Once new businesses open under the proposed regulations, the ordinance may need to be amended to improve outcomes for both the businesses and the city's oversight responsibilities. Once we have the benefit of time to work with a dispensary and a regulatory scheme that works for everyone, then the city can consider increasing the number of permits. Thank you for being thoughtful in your approach to these issues so that all interests are reflected in this ordinance.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Williams and Bassey Obot