

Communication from Public

Name: Charles Lockett
Date Submitted: 06/23/2020 08:52 AM
Council File No: 20-0446
Comments for Public Posting: Hello, my name is, Charles Lockett I live in district, 10 and I am a social equity applicant. I am in support of the lawsuit filed by Social Equity Owners & Workers Association against the DCR and the city of L.A. The application process was unfair and disadvantaged hundreds of applicants. In the TRO ex parte hearing between SEOWA and the City of Los Angeles on June 19th, 2020 Honorable Judge Mary H Strobel found the matter to be so urgent that she schedule an expedited preliminary injunction hearing to make a ruling on this matter on July 9th, 2020. Please review all of the facts at hand and refrain from ruling on the agenda items in front of you today. We urge you to be on the right side of justice and allow due process to take its course.

Communication from Public

Name: Raza Lawrence and Allison Margolin, Margolin & Lawrence

Date Submitted: 06/23/2020 08:29 PM

Council File No: 20-0446

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Los Angeles City Council: We are submitting this comment as a supplement to the letter that we submitted on June 22, 2020, outlining our recommendations for how the City Council should amend its commercial cannabis ordinance. We wanted to raise two additional points that have become relevant since we sent our last letter. First, the Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee has recommended that you allow only Social Equity Applicants who have a prior cannabis arrest or conviction, and only those who meet new eligibility criteria for the Social Equity Program using amended definitions of “Low Income” and “Disproportionately Impacted Area,” to apply for cannabis retail licenses in Phase 3, Round 2. Many Social Equity Applicants have relied upon the City’s current qualification standards for the program, and have expended great amounts of time and resources planning their businesses pursuant to the current standards. This group includes many applicants who applied for retail licenses in Phase 3, Round 1, and have been holding onto expensive properties since September 2019 in expectation that they would ultimately receive licenses from the City. Changing the standards for these people in the middle of the application process, after they have invested so much in reliance on the current rules, would be grossly unfair and potentially subject the City to liability from applicants who were initially told they were qualified, and then ruled ineligible under the altered rules. We have no objection to the City broadening the qualifying criteria to make additional people eligible to apply for licenses in future rounds, but there is no reason to also punish existing applicants by removing them from the program after they were already accepted. Second, one of the members of this City Council was arrested on June 23, 2020, for allegedly engaging in corrupt practices involving bribes for approval of development projects. In light of this arrest, we remain deeply concerned that the manner in which the Undue Concentration process is structured will invite corruption. We urge the City to adopt a liberal approval process that is fully open to the public, and does not reject any applications from qualified applicants who want to responsibly open a new business that will provide employment and tax revenues to the City, and help to shrink the massive illicit cannabis market that has proliferated in Los Angeles.