#### GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

#### MARIJUANA PRIVATE CLUB TASK FORCE

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY APRIL 22, 2016

+ + + + +

The Marijuana Private Club Task Force met in Conference Rooms 406/407, 899 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m., LaQuandra Nesbitt, Chair, presiding.

### PRESENT

LAQUANDRA NESBITT, MD, MPH, Director, Department

of Health, Chair

MICHELE BLACKWELL, Legislative Director, Office of Councilmember Brandon Todd

DANIELLE BURS, Legislative Director, Office of Councilmember Brianne Nadeau

HELDER GIL, Legislative and Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety

FRED MOOSALLY, Director, Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration

BRIANNE NADEAU, Ward 1 Councilmember, Council of

the District of Columbia

KELLY O'MEARA, Director of Strategic Change, Metropolitan Police Department

LORI PARRIS, Deputy Director, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MAUREEN ZANIEL, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

## ALSO PRESENT

PATRICE DICKERSON, Office of Government Relations

PHILLIP HUSBAND, General Counsel

MONIQUE JOHNSON, Executive Assistant to the Director

JACQUELINE WATSON, D.O., Chief of Staff
SHAUNA WHITE, PharmD, RPh, Executive Director,
Board of Pharmacy, Program Manager,
Pharmaceutical Control

MARCUS WILLIAMS, Director of Communications

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome and Opening Remarks, Dr. LaQuandra Nesbitt, Chair4
Introductions 4
Charge of the Marijuana Private Club Task Force and Time Line6
Review of Current District of Columbia Marijuana Laws and Policy9
Impact of Current Laws and Policy on District of Columbia Landscape
- Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration
District of Columbia29
Chart Course Moving Forward
Public Comment
Adjourn

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	10:04 A.M.
3	CHAIR NESBITT: Good morning. How
4	is everyone today?
5	MR. MOOSALLY: Very good.
6	CHAIR NESBITT: So we are going to
7	be prompt and on time. Got to get
8	Councilmember Nadeau out.
9	COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: Yes. Thank
10	you. I appreciate that. It's Passover
11	tonight, so I thank you for adjusting the time.
12	It makes a huge difference.
13	CHAIR NESBITT: No problem. My
14	apologies for scheduling this on this day.
15	COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: It's all
16	right. We're all learning.
17	CHAIR NESBITT: We have some of my
18	team who are out for the entire day and we
19	thank you for accommodating this morning.
20	We are going to go ahead and get
21	started. I'm not sure if Councilmember Todd
22	will be joining us. And so let's go ahead and

do a round of introductions for the actual task force members so everyone is familiar with who is present in the room. I am Dr. LaQuandra Nesbitt, Director of the Department of Health and have been asked to chair this task force and will do so diligently for the next 120 days to have us be very productive and deliberative in our process. And so I'll start to my right.

MR. MOOSALLY: Sure. Thank you so much for holding this. Му name is Fred Moosally. I am the Director of the Alcoholic Regulation Administration which is Beverage responsible for overseeing and regulating agencies that sell, serve, and allow the consumption of alcoholic beverages. Thank you.

MS. PARRIS: Good morning, everyone. My Lori Parris. I'm the name is Director for the Department of Consumer Regulatory Affairs. And as you know, the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs is the licensing and regulatory agency for the District of Columbia.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: I am Brianne
2	Nadeau, Ward 1 Councilmember. I have with me
3	Danielle Burs, my Legislative Director.
4	MS. ZANIEL: Good morning, Maureen
5	Daniel on behalf of the Office of the Attorney
6	General.
7	MS. BLACKWELL: Good morning. My
8	name is Michele Blackwell and I'm Legislative
9	Director to Councilmember Brandon Todd.
10	MR. GIL: Good morning. Helder Gil
11	from the Office of Deputy Mayor for Public
12	Safety.
13	MS. O'MEARA: Good morning. I'm
14	Kelly O'Meara. I am the Director of Strategic
15	Change for the Metropolitan Police Department
16	and I oversee legislative affairs and
17	implementation of legislation.
18	CHAIR NESBITT: All right, and so
19	this task force which is called the Marijuana
20	Private Club Task Force, has been charged to
21	convene for 120 days to deliberate and make
22	recommendations as to whether or not private

clubs should be permitted in the District Columbia and have the ability to or authority to make recommendations if recommended in the private clubs were to be District of Columbia, what the regulatory infrastructure for those clubs would look like.

The membership for this task force includes the Department of Health, Metropolitan Police Department, the Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, two members of the Council of the District of Columbia, the Office of the Attorney General of the District of Columbia with staff support the Deputy Mayor of Public Safety and Justice.

This task force will convene at a minimum once a month and issue a full report within 120 days of its initial convening which is today.

We have published our agenda for today's meeting in the Register and we will hold to the agenda for today. The task force

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

will, as part of our agenda for today, chart out our course moving forward in terms of the work that the task force will accomplish and so pretty much we will put forth our plan for the next three months in terms of what we would like to cover, our goals and objectives that we would like to accomplish.

In terms of this first meeting, thought that it would be a really great use of the team's time in terms of being the first time convening together in terms of this body for the purposes of discussing marijuana and marijuana policy as relevant to marijuana use patterns in the District of Columbia, the overall marijuana policy impact of in the District of Columbia, and how that relates private clubs, sort of giving an overview current District of Columbia marijuana laws and policy and the impact of those current laws and policy respective agencies on the and organizations been selected who have to participate in this private club's task force.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And so that will pretty much serve as our agenda for today and help us move forward in terms of charting the course. And so we will just at this point move quickly into that agenda.

Any other questions about the task force, task force structure or that part of the process?

All right, SO essentially, Initiative 71 created а very interesting environment for us in the District of Columbia. There is an Initiative 71 Marijuana Working Group that Mayor Bowser convened in February of 2015 when Initiative 71 was to be enacted as law in the District of Columbia. The Chief of Police Cathy Lanier and I co-chair that working is some cross pollination group and so there between members of this task force and that working group. And so we have the opportunity on a monthly basis to talk about the impact of marijuana policy on that the District of Columbia.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We issued a status report, a one year status report of that initiative on the District of Columbia which has been circulated to the members of this working group and I believe is included in your meeting materials today. If you have not had the opportunity to review that, we would ask that you do so.

One of the challenges that we have in terms of reviewing the impact of Initiative 71 is that our data collection processes terms of use patterns tend to fall a year or behind in terms of the availability. And that's from -- when we talk about use patterns, that's from self-reported data, usually collected from health surveys which is different from criminal justice data or arrest data which can be gathered and collected more closely in real time.

And so what you'll see reflected in the report, the one-year report is our best efforts in terms of having real time data as it relates to the one-year impact of Initiative 71

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

as opposed to ongoing use patterns there. The Department is working on an overall marijuana report that looks at long-term use patterns for marijuana in the District of Columbia.

We have, as a result of Initiative 71, moved to very quickly inform people of the of Initiative 71 which intention was home growth and home use and the possession of two ounces or less of marijuana for individuals 21 years of age or older. And that barter of any kind was still illegal in the District. And so we find ourselves on many occasions having to clarify for those who have an entrepreneurial spirit that donations is considered illegal under Initiative 71. And so for those who believe that having not what they consider to the sale, but donation for the receipt of marijuana is not the intention of Initiative 71 and it's still not permissible in the District And so we've done quite a bit in of Columbia. education clarify of to that for terms individuals.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

part And SO of our purpose of meeting on a monthly basis is to be able interact agencies and understand as communicate with each other the requests clarifications that come in from the public, things that circulate in the mass media around confusion around issues or our current marijuana policy or any interactions that may have had with the public, the legislative other jurisdictions involving the body, or marijuana policy or the science of marijuana, nationally or internationally, in some cases, so that the District may remain up to speed in that regard.

And so it is an evolving landscape. We have lots of eyes and ears as a result of the diversity of that working group into the various thoughts and perspectives on marijuana laws and policy which are highly varied here in the District. And so I believe we have the ability to have a very robust dialogue and discussion with the composition of this task

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

force as it relates to the need for private clubs, and if private clubs were to exist, what that regulatory framework would look like.

And so with that, I think we can move into the impact of current laws and policy on the respective organizations that are here because I'm kind of tried speaking. I don't want to start with the Department of Health. I'm going to take a break and drink some tea because of my allergies and start with ABRA, if you don't mind.

MR. MOOSALLY: Sure. ABRA's role has been much more limited than the Department of Health, a little bit more indirect, pretty much been in two areas. First, we've had more of an educational role where it consisted of educating alcohol licensees. The current District law does not allow them to rent make their facility available including private functions for patrons to consume marijuana.

Specifically, we've had alcohol establishments ask if they rent out their

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

facility to an event that's not open to the public does that allow marijuana consumption? And the answer is currently no. And then we've inquiries had licensees who have from individuals who want to do marijuana dinners they'd have food that's cooked with marijuana or has marijuana in it that would be consumed on the premises. And currently, you marijuana edibles at licensed cannot consume establishments. So we've had a lot of educational role there.

The second role that ABRA, the Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration, had is have ABRA investigators has we licensed alcohol venues including night clubs experienced have issues with patrons marijuana inside of their establishments. And so when ABRA investigators have gone to night clubs, they've encountered patrons smoking marijuana inside their venue. So we've played a role and just to clarify, ABRA investigators currently work seven days a week until 4 a.m.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So every day of the week, they're out until 4 in the morning.

So we advise establishments. night District's including clubs, of the prohibition against smoking marijuana inside their licensed establishments and work with the establishment to remind patrons that thev're not allowed to smoke inside of their venues. That's pretty much where ABRA's two roles are Thank you. right now.

CHAIR NESBITT: Kelly.

MS. O'MEARA: Good morning. I'm here from MPD and of course, MPD has two primary roles in this. Our first, we really education, consider making sure people understand what the changes in the laws were so they knew what the limits were and what their well. There is lot of rights а are as misinformation out in the public, so MPD, with all of our government colleagues, works really hard to get correct information out.

One of the things we did to really

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

make sure that it got to the street was gave all of our officers just little hand-held cards to give to residents and people they encounter on the street about what the change in the law was and what it meant for them individually.

Even with that education effort, of course, there was still violations of the law. We've seen arrests drop dramatically. It's included in the report. I also have handouts of the charts which I can pass around.

Patrice, do you think you can help pass these out to the table? Thank you.

What we've seen is sort of dramatic drops points. One was with at two decriminalization which was in July of 2014 and then again with the legalization Initiative 71 in February of 2015. We still have arrests for just a few for consumption. We have a few arrests for public consumption and that is actually one of the areas where we still get complaints from. We're certainly no strangers educating the public that something

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

their neighbor is doing is okay and there's no action that we can take and we're comfortable in that role. But there are people who are not prohibition listening to the of public consuming it consumption and are on And so we take some action there, but it's been very low, about seven arrests month which is very, very low.

Distribution, arrests for distribution and possession with intent to has distribute also dropped. And that is partly because some of the factors that were used in identifying that before the law changed longer allowed to be factors are now no establishing probable cause such as the odor of marijuana is not probable cause to assume there's a crime being committed. So the police can't take action then. So there's been decrease in those arrests as well. But otherwise, this has not had a tremendous impact on the Department.

CHAIR NESBITT: Lori?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. PARRIS: With DCRA being licensing arm of the District of Columbia, work closely with the Department of Health and the Metropolitan Police Department and sometimes ABRA when there's complaints with respect to a business either having donations for the use of marijuana or if there is an event and how can we ensure that business activity is in the compliance with the law.

So our role has really been assisting MPD and specifically assisting the Department of Health with regulatory any type of investigations, vending regulation, investigations regarding the business activity. So our role has not been on the forefront. think our role has been primarily assisting to making sure that if there needs to be enforcement with respect to business activity, we can assist the District agencies, our sister agencies.

CHAIR NESBITT: So as it relates to the Department of Health, we have had the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

responsibility of administering the Medical Marijuana Program which to date or prior to Initiative 71 which permitted the ability for individuals to grow plants at home, immature and mature plants if you are over the age of 21 which was the primary way for individuals to possess or gain access to marijuana in the District of Columbia.

To date, we have just over 3600 patients registered in the program, primarily — the majority of registrants are males. We have 2,333 males in the program; 1,276 women in the program and 29 care givers are registered.

In 2014, the District changed from requiring individuals to have a certain set of medical conditions to be able to just simply have your physician state that you should have access to the program. When that law was enacted, we did see a surge in participation in the program.

We have seven cultivation centers currently in the District of Columbia and five

dispensaries where individuals can purchase marijuana.

To add to some of the statements made by Mr. Moosally and Ms. Parris, the access to edible products in the District is restricted to those that are produced by cultivation centers. So in order to make an edible product, you have to be a cultivation center that also is licensed as a food retail establishment. So you have to create a commercial kitchen and then you have to prepare the edibles in the cultivation center that has the commercial kitchen. And those edible products have to be prepared there.

these businesses that try create themselves now that Initiative 71 exists, they're going to create edible products, under District law and the food code, that would be adulterated food products which would essentially be illegal to sell in a licensed food retail establishment. So those would be violations of their business license as well as District food code and could result in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fines. So the notion of having marijuana cooking parties for which tickets are sold and things of that nature are not permissible in the District of Columbia, even if you were to bring your own marijuana.

So those are the types of things that we are constantly educating business owners about and the public about, as well as marijuana patients. Currently, there is only one cultivation center in the District of Columbia that makes edible products.

Secondly, also have we some differences in our program from other jurisdictions, however, Scientific we have а Committee that advises the way that on program is structured. There was recently article in Health Affairs where the District of Columbia's medical marijuana program is actually considered to be a medical marijuana program that is medical in nature, whereas some of the medical marijuana other states that have a considered really medical program are not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

programs. They are just considered programs that give people access to marijuana and have been diluted in such ways that they are just simply access to marijuana programs. And so we pride ourselves on having а program that requires fide patient-physician bona relationship, relationships where cannot be established with physicians just on the basis of getting access to marijuana, and where we have a couple of other things that are in place that really the patient-physician shores up relationship.

There are some other things that we have in place that requires you to be a District resident that prevents us from being a place that people descend upon for the purpose of getting access to marijuana products without being District residents. That also helps us keep our standing as being а true medical constant marijuana program. So provide we updates to our program. The data that I shared with all is accurate as of April 21st.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

For people who provide a complete application to us, we turn around their request for a medical marijuana card within five days. A complete application also requires that you provide proof of District residency. So people who are asking for their cards to be sent to a P.O. box is not complete application. is often That the source of delay. So those tends to be part of some of the things that come up frequently as complaints or concerns about the program.

The other thing that we wanted make sure we discussed today and is highlighted in the one-year report is the notion of crime around dispensaries and cultivation centers. Wе do not have in our strong oversight of cultivation centers and dispensaries which the responsibility of the Department of Health, we have staff who are in these facilities and we have oversight over them as an enforcement over those facilities in the same way that we have oversight over pharmacies. And then crimes that would be reported at these facilities would be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

under the purview of MPD is that there is not a crime associated with these facilities. crime, Ι believe, reported was one dispensary and it was a stolen cell phone. Ιt had nothing to do with the marijuana product. And so we want to make sure that residents are understand that having clear and cultivation center in your neighborhood does not increase crime or violence in the neighborhood and neither does a dispensary. So those are the things we wanted to share in terms of the impact marijuana policy it relates of as to the Department of Health.

I think we also would like to hear from the Attorney General's Office on this particular issue.

MS. ZANIEL: Thank you. Our role is primarily legal advice on the changing landscape of the law. We would stand as prosecutors as appropriate as MPD has indicated there is still some public consumption and where appropriate we would begin to prosecute that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Were there to be marijuana clubs, we may be the enforcers on the regulatory end.

And lastly, it's the forfeiture report category and again, we have as your indicated from the working group, the Kush God situation and MPD, of course, makes the decision in the first instance as to whether vehicles certain malls will be held for used in forfeiture and if so, then District of Columbia Office of the Attorney General would handle those case.

COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: So as you know, the Council established the task force and has also introduced legislation that would for the whole regulatory scheme should the budget rider ever be lifted.

I held a public meeting on Tuesday. Danielle is circulating right now a memo which includes written comments that we got before and after and also minutes from the public meeting in which we detailed comments from each person who appeared before us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Councilmember Todd and I co-convened this meeting, the thinking being this would be a good way to bring public input to the What I thought was interesting in the force. meeting -- well, there were a couple of things. You probably saw that the Council actually voted of private clubs on permanent ban that morning, Tuesday morning, which was obviously a very heated conversation for those of us on the task force who feel we would like to do this work before there's a permanent ban.

You know, my hope is that we will get to do this work. We will fully dive into this work and we will wait for a time when there is not a permanent ban which we can revisit once the rider is gone and that would be my goal here.

The sentiment at the meeting that I held Tuesday night, there was a lot of frustration about that vote. So you'll notice when you read through people's comments. That sort of shone through. Nevertheless, there was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

some important and helpful information there that I think will quide us.

What I thought was very interesting was that there was nobody who showed up to that meeting opposing clubs. And I was surprised by We tried to very widely circulate the notice. The media covered it. I assumed, as with frankly with ABRA hearings, that folks would show up and say we don't want something like this in our neighborhood. We don't want to I don't know that that is conclusive, it. wanted to note it that but I as you through, you'll see there isn't any of that comment.

I will continue to bring input from the public that comes to the Council. tell you from this point we've heard all kinds interesting things such discussion of as а around what else should be served in a space like this. Should there be food to offset the impact of marijuana use? Should alcohol be served? Is that allowed? Those sorts of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Another concern that I bring is the public health side. As a member of the Health Committee, I know our chair won't mind that conversation, but you know, is there a way to lead on this that is -- that opens the door for more use of edibles or vaping or things that -- moving away from the smoke which we know people don't like in neighborhoods.

And finally, just ensuring that whatever framework we come up with, there is an opportunity for community input, similar to how a liquor establishment is licensed where it. comes before the ANC and community can weigh in. had initially started with piece We а legislation that actually would have just put the framework out there and that was part of that. also would have prohibited clubs Ιt within a certain number of feet from schools and other educational institutions that children attend and it would have restricted one to each ward which I thought was interesting. And it

probably wouldn't have been my recommendation, but that was what was in the original bill before the task force was established.

So I expect that the Council will keep having this conversation as various political developments emerge, whether that's with the DEA's examination of the schedule of where marijuana falls on the schedule or whether that congressional election or any other thing that might impact this work. And so I will bring that to the task force as appropriate. I look forward to serving with you all.

CHAIR NESBITT: Thank you. Any other comments? I do want to thank Council for hosting that public session to seek the input from the public and your commitment to continue to have that process for providing that input into the task force and we will be absolutely sure to input that into the record and review it, those comments and input moving forward.

So I think we've done our sort of

review. In terms of the review of data on
marijuana use in the District of Columbia, as
mentioned, the Department is still working to
compile that data and present it at a subsequent
meeting. Our primary way of collecting that
data and information is to use the Behavioral
Risk Factors Surveillance System and the
Behavioral Risk Surveillance System which are
both self-reported systems where we use for
Behavioral Risk Factors Surveillance System, we
use a telephonic survey that we move to both a
land line and cell phone, surveying methodology,
so we have a representative sample of the
District's population because not all of us
still have land lines. And make sure that we
capture a good sample, as I mentioned, of who
live in the District and is in the District.
But just some examples that I can give you of
the survey is that, for example, people who
report regular marijuana use report higher rates
of binge drinking than those who don't. So
those are the types of things that we want

people to be mindful of as we're thinking about
private clubs and to the point that was
mentioned earlier what should be allowed in a
private club that is intended for marijuana
consumption, what other things should be allowed
to be consumed in that space. We should be
mindful that it is still an intoxicating
substance, regardless of where it falls on the
federal schedule. There are other things that
are on the schedule that also are mind altering
and intoxicating substances that should not be
mixed with other intoxicating substances. And
so we want to make sure that people have that
data in mind as we're reviewing the process.
The Youth Risk Behavioral Surveillance System is
administered in middle and high schools in the
District of Columbia. It is not administered in
all high schools. It is administered in a
sampling of those public, charter, and DCPS
schools intended again to be a representative
sample of those schools. And so we will only be
able to report aggregate level data . It doesn't

give us detailed data in terms of by ward for all kids, but it will give us some information by age group. So we will know, for example, the age of first consumption in the District is around 11 or so years old. And so that's just something to be mindful of and it's decreasing. And so those are the types of things that we want the group to be able to review and to look at moving forward.

The Department of Behavioral health is not a member of the task force, but we did work with them to launch a marijuana awareness campaign that is also referenced in the Initiative 71 working group one year report. And we have some samples of what that campaign looks like. And the purpose of that is that we wanted to bring awareness around marijuana as a drug in the same way that we bring awareness about alcohol as a drug. Alcohol is permitted for use in this country at a certain depending on the jurisdiction that you live in, and in the same way that alcohol is permitted

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for use at a certain age, we wanted to bring that same level of awareness to our youth for marijuana. And so we have what we consider to be a responsible campaign.

We think it's extremely important for families to be able to have conversations with their children around if parents, example, consume alcohol in the home, how do you have a conversation with your 16-year-old about I consume, but you are not age appropriate to consume, being able to have the same tools to be able to facilitate those conversations around marijuana use. And the same when we did our focus groups around peer influences marijuana. And so that campaign was designed and led by the Department of Behavioral Health for those same particular purposes. So we want you all to be familiar with that. And there's a web site. There's calling cards. We had Metro ads and a host of other things that went along with that campaign as well. I didn't want to leave that part out around marijuana education.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So I now want to just make sure have the opportunity to have a robust dialogue around what it is we want to accomplish in the remaining 20 minutes that we have together our first meeting and setting our agenda for the next three months or so in terms of teeing up what we want our goals and objectives as a task force being aligned with enabling legislation and the administrative order. But how do we see ourselves completing the work of this task force and the sort of outlining agenda for our next meeting and subsequent meetings in terms needing to be productive as individual members, but also ensuring that we are productive in our deliberative meetings and convening when we're together. Thoughts? Yes.

Well, MR. MOOSALLY: SO the task asked to make recommendations force in was several areas. I think it would be helpful at least to me going forward is putting forth a schedule of when we're going to talk about these issues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think one of the issues that came up which is probably one of the first things to talk about which I see is number, item 3 -- I'm looking at the Mayor's order here in terms of what the Mayor asked us to look at and I think it's also in the legislation from the Council, is whether food or beverages, alcoholic or nonalcoholic, may be sold the So at venues. these clearly, we have issues we need to discuss.

And I think it would be helpful ahead of time to know at each meeting what topics we're going to cover so we're prepared and able to come with questions, ideas, thoughts to talk with the working group so we can get through Because at the end of the day, we need a The report is going to have to include recommendations, whatever those are and so we're obviously going to have to have substantive discussions on areas. So I think it would be helpful to talk about at least as it relates to the next meeting, what areas in item B of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Mayor's order, we're going to talk about it at the next meeting. That way we're prepared. And to the extent we can get consensus from the group, have recommendations we can make going forward and the basis for those recommendations. That's just one thought I have.

attention to Section B as Fred had mentioned, are there items that we should prioritize to discuss first, in terms of in the -- if we were to talk about an infrastructure for the private clubs. Let's not answer the question of should they exist first, right? We'll take that vote at maybe meeting two or three.

But if we were to have them exist, which agencies would need to be part of that regulatory infrastructure? think that's a Ι discussion we could have sooner than later based on professional experience with our own regulating businesses and then having what I think would be a very robust discussion defining membership in private clubs. I think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 would really benefit from getting some quidance from DCRA on clubs and club membership 2 3 and the current licensure process for businesses or organizations and entities that fall under 4 that criteria. 5 Until understand that current 6 we 7 framework and infrastructure, it's going to be difficult, I think, for us to move forward and 8 9 make any other decisions or discussions until we understand what the options of defining a club 10 and membership look like. 11 And then we have a 12 sort of options to select from or menu of 13 criteria to select from or may discover that 14 there needs to be created something new that 15 doesn't currently exist. think that's I 16 critical part of the discussion that may need to 17 happen sooner than later. And then getting into 18 19 Can I just chime in? MS. PARRIS: 20 CHAIR NESBITT: Yes. 21 I think that's a great MS. PARRIS:

starting point and I think one of the things

struggling with that we are always is regulatory authority. So I think it's something that once we figure out what this thing really, I think the next step needs to be who really can do that and how can we coordinated response.

One of the things that having worked in the District for so long, sister agencies are always working together and I think ensuring that each role is clearly defined and that authority is clearly written in regulation or something so it's clear who has what authority. I find when things aren't clear, different agencies can only go up to just a certain point. So I think we need to look at it holistically as what agencies will touch this and how.

MR. MOOSALLY: And to piggyback on what Lori said, I think if you look at number 9 under B, "licensing including the requirements for licensure such as proof of compliance with all applicable District laws, the application procedure and fee structure."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So just as it relates to different agencies that are here, some of the questions I would have would be okay, let's just take DCRA, so do you need a basic business license from DCRA? What kind of basic business license would you need from DCRA?

And DOH, what would you need from DOH? What type of health inspection would you need? What type of other licenses would you need from DOH? So I think it would be helpful to hear from each agency, okay, what would you need from each agency so that we kind of get a feel of what's required.

think to give a good example could give you, we went from having no alcohol manufacturers in the District five years ago to now we have 11 or 12. And so what happened we had the situation where you had -- we issued licenses for manufacturers, but it really wasn't that simple because DCRA didn't really have any alcohol specific licenses for manufacturers because we didn't have any for so long. So DCRA

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

had to figure out how they could regulate that within their structure. And then DOH had to do the same, right, in terms of inspections and everything else in terms of what you were going to require.

So even though it was just an alcohol manufacturing license, it took a little longer to figure out because DCRA had a role. DOH had a role. Other agencies had a role. And we had to figure out how the pieces fit together.

COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: I just want to jump in because I think we're going in a direction and I'm not sure I'm comfortable with this. I want to stop us before we go too far down that road.

So I hear what you guys are saying and I think what the Council had on over here. We are going to get to all of it in this task force, but I think that we need to decide the what before we figure out the who. And I hear - what I hear is that agencies are used to being told the what and then having to figure out the

how and the who. But I think we can actually do
all of that here. And we have to decide I
mean I'm just looking at part B. I think we
have to decide number 12 first which is the
spirit of this is how all District residents can
utilize the benefits of the legalization of
possession. How can we use clubs to help
implement that? And then some of the what is
probably 3, 6, and 7. And once we've determined
that, then we're going to know which agencies
and how. And so that's what I don't want to
get too far in the weeds on who and how until
we've all decided what.
CHAIR NESBITT: So what I have
written as the first three questions is what
does it mean to be a private club.
COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: Okay.
CHAIR NESBITT: How is membership
defined? And then what agencies have a role in
licensure enforcement of this entity?
COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: Great.
CHAIR NESBITT: So this entity will

be borne out of 1 and 2, and recognizing, I 1 think everybody has recognized that this entity 2 3 may not yet be an entity under our current infrastructure or current rules and regulatory 4 5 infrastructure. MR. MOOSALLY: Can you go over those 6 7 three questions one more time? CHAIR NESBITT: What does it mean to 8 How is membership defined? 9 be a private club? 10 And agencies in what have а role licensure/enforcement of this entity? 11 12 COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: Great. Thank 13 you. 14 MS. BLACKWELL: Dr. Nesbitt, to even a step before those, one of the things that 15 16 came out of the town hall which I thought was 17 very helpful was this notion of ensuring that there is sort of public input and one suggestion 18 19 -- I'll be honest with you, it's very important 20 for Councilmember Todd, particularly for people 21 at all -- who have varying views on this.

someone

had

was

that

suggestion

22

having

either like an email for the task force because otherwise if people are individually emailing all of us, their views and suggestions, how does that sort of reach the entire group?

And so I don't know if there's a way to sort of allow for the public to sort provide that input because some folk can't get to the Wilson Building. Folks will call or email and so is there a way to sort of collect? Because I think that sort of helps with what it mean and how do we define -- because does this sort of first experience is my with something like this. So there are experts, I'm assuming, in the room that have far more experience on this. if we could do And so something like that.

CHAIR NESBITT: So I'll take that under consideration, but my current position is that the private task force as currently outlined is for us to deliberate as a task force or group.

If Council would like to have a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

including and taking input from process public and then sharing that from the seats that Council holds on this task force, objection to certainly have no that or no problem or challenge to that at all.

the Department here at marijuana address that receives tons of emails frequently, input and information and scientific and anecdotal and the like. So we already have a pathway for public input into this particular agency. That does not obviously take people out of the conversations for private clubs, but I can assure you that information related to places for consumption, both public and non, comes into that email stream.

But my current position is that if Council would like to have an on-going public process as Councilmember Nadeau has mentioned before, I defer to Council to continue that process.

MS. BLACKWELL: And I appreciate that because I did actually get an email after the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

town hall from someone who was in opposition, but they either didn't feel comfortable coming to the town hall or they couldn't make it and so it's like we have these varying sort of piecemeal ways that people communicate with us. We can talk about that.

CHAIR NESBITT: And I'm glad you raised that as a point because I think all of us have been sort of identified as people who are engaged in this process in some way or role that we have and I have a few people who I think email me nightly about their varied positions on these issues.

And so one of the positions that I have taken professionally is to consolidate that information. Some of it I send to my staff and some of it I have -- I push through to our Scientific Committee which is an objective group of reviewers to digest and then they advise me back in terms of directions that we should take, it relates medical much of it to as our marijuana program, but it's not information I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

can unlearn. I'll put it that way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Okay, I want us to keep in the vein of overall goals and objectives for the committee. So I think we have three really good starter questions that are probably going to be very robust discussion in terms of -- especially that one what does it mean to be a private club and how is membership defined? And then what agencies have a role in licensure enforcement of the entity?

And then if we're looking at the specific numbered items in terms of 12, any other major global questions that come to mind for people?

MS. O'MEARA: I think one of the auestions that Ι have and not arising specifically from this language, but do we have any information about anything similar that's happened in the other states? I think that may be important to look at to sort of help shape the context here.

CHAIR NESBITT: So as an intro for

our next meeting, we need the background information still for current use -- current marijuana use in the District and then private clubs in other states.

Okay, so are people comfortable with this as the next agenda, just these three questions as the agenda for the next meeting and that background information?

MR. MOOSALLY: Yes, I think that's I think part of that discussion and maybe as the fourth item as Kelly mentioned would be best -- I don't know if you want to call it best practices, because I know it's fairly new, but looking at what other jurisdictions are doing. I think I recall reading that I think Alaska for one is looking at this issue. And there might jurisdictions two other that be or looking at the issue. So I think to the extent we can look at how other states have looked at issue, I mean it's helpful to see what this issues they've identified.

CHAIR NESBITT: Okay. All right. So

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to recap, our agenda for our next meeting would
include background, an opening with background
information on current marijuana use in the
District of Columbia for youth and adults; an
overview of practices in other jurisdictions and
as detailed as we can get as it relates to
private clubs or what's similarly been proposed
in the District. And then diving into the work
of the group as it relates to having a
discussion around what does it mean to be a
private club with DCRA providing us guidance
around how clubs, private clubs are currently
defined in the District and what the current
licensing constructs around those clubs are.
How is membership in those clubs defined and
what the different criteria are there for us to
sort of a catalyze a discussion around how we
would begin to propose membership in clubs in
that regard.

And then for us to, as a result of what that entity we would begin to propose, beginning to identify which agency as a result

1	of that would have a role in the licensing and
2	enforcement process of that, recognizing that we
3	may have to add more to the list once we start
4	getting into the conversation around security
5	plans, hours of operation, what other things
6	need to be or should be permitted in these
7	private clubs as it relates to food, beverages,
8	etcetera.
9	MS. PARRIS: I think once we not
10	to get too far ahead, but I think that's where
11	that coordinated response and where the
12	regulatory authority will lie because when you
13	have competing regulatory authority from
14	different areas in the DCMR, it's a question of
15	where you go and how do you get there.
16	CHAIR NESBITT: Right.
17	MS. PARRIS: So I think we need to
18	think about how that coordinated response is
19	going to look at where that authority is going
20	to lie.
21	CHAIR NESBITT: Right.
22	MS. PARRIS: So when you're a

1	restaurant the authority lies with DCRA, right?
2	It starts with DCRA in my mind. We just went
3	through this process of creating a restaurant
4	guide. It touches everywhere. We've made it
5	very seamless for people, but we say it lies
6	with DCRA.
7	CHAIR NESBITT: And the restaurants
8	are trained to believe that and they know they
9	have to go to these other places and we sort of
10	have made this process where we all pass you
11	along from DCRA. So Lori raises a very valid
12	point of if you're going to have all these touch
13	points with DCRA and ABRA and DOH and Fire and
14	MPD and all of these other touch points, then
15	where is the real authority and where is the
16	starting line and where is the finish line?
17	MS. PARRIS: With Fred. It's always
18	with Fred.
19	CHAIR NESBITT: All right. Any other
20	comments from the task force?
21	COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: I just wanted
22	to let you know, I'm going to email around the

committee report, the Judiciary Committee report 1 on the Marijuana Decrim Clarification Amendment 2 3 Act. CHAIR NESBITT: Fantastic. 4 It has more 5 COUNCILMEMBER NADEAU: public input on this particular issue and some 6 7 people showed up to our public meeting and said well, you have my testimony from that. So I 8 9 thought you might also like. So I'll send it 10 I have -- I need your card and I need around. 11 vour card. And then should be easy enough. 12 CHAIR NESBITT: Okay, fantastic. All 13 right. Any public comment? 14 MS. BELL: Sure. Hi, everybody. those of you who don't already me, my name 15 16 Kate with the Marijuana Policy Project.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the largest marijuana policy organization in the

United States. We work in all 50 states.

federal level as well as in the future

live.

which I think you guys already have.

myself.

state where I

Ι

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'm a Ward 4 resident

submitted some written testimony

And

51st

CHAIR NESBITT: I circulated that.

MS. BELL: As well as a draft of sort of a regulatory framework, that was specifically drafted to be an amendment to the temporary ban, I think, in the rider. So certainly it is not as expansive as what it would have been were I covering this for this task force specifically.

I would be more than happy to provide any input. Certainly, we have worked in Alaska and Colorado which are jurisdictions considering this issue now.

I would also -- the one thing I did want to note is that because of the permanent ban as has already been mentioned, that may tie the hands of the Council moving forward until there's some further changes in the law. perhaps since this body is empowered to consider additional relevant things, perhaps consider beyond private club model. For example, currently in D.C. cigar bars and hookah bars have a specific exemption to the smoking ban and so everyone going in there knows that they're

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	going to be exposed to tobacco, as you rather
2	may go or work there, but those to my
3	understanding are not private clubs. I know
4	there's one in Columbia Heights that has hookahs
5	that I've been in. And so that might be another
6	model that this task force could possibly
7	consider as you move forward. So I just wanted
8	to suggest that. And I'm happy to provide any
9	information on other states that might be useful
10	to you all. Thank you.
11	CHAIR NESBITT: Thank you. Any other
12	public comment?
13	MS. BOECKER: I'll just introduce
14	myself quickly. Kaitlyn Boecker with Drug
15	Policy Alliance. We are also a national
16	advocacy organization. We work on drug policy
17	more broadly, but focus on marijuana reform as
18	well. And we are happy to help in any way that
19	we can.
20	You mentioned background on other
21	jurisdictions, we are more than happy to help

provide any of that info to link you up with

1	people who actually run these private clubs. We
2	are in contact with them. We know the people
3	who wrote the report about these clubs in
4	Catalonia, Spain. So we are more than happy to
5	provide the connection. I know there's not
6	necessarily an existing relationship with other
7	jurisdictions, so we're always happy to help and
8	we look forward to being here and watching you
9	guys work.
10	CHAIR NESBITT: Thank you. All
11	right, if there's no further business, we will
12	stand adjourned. Thank you, everyone.
13	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
14	went off the record at 11:00 a.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	