

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Jon Heredia](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Public comment re: 200144
Date: Thursday, May 25, 2023 2:38:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your message.

By copy of this message to the board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org email address, your comments will be forwarded to the full membership of the Board of Supervisors, and I am adding your comments to the file for this ordinance.

BOS File No. 200144.

John Carroll

Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)554-4445



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

-----Original Message-----

From: Jon Heredia <jon.heredia@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2023 8:41 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public comment re: 200144

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My comment is in support of ceasing acceptance of new cannabis retail applications.

Current retail businesses in SF, many of whom are owned and operated by social equity applicants are struggling to stay open for a multitude of reasons. Security, taxes, lack of banking. But what is unique to large cities like San Francisco is the over-saturation of retail locations. There are already too many open retail stores per ratio to individual per square block. Retail stores are competing for the shrinking number people who live and work here, let alone the people who use cannabis.

Unless the city can attract more tourists or folks from surrounding counties to come and spend in San Francisco, it looks extremely bleak for current retail stores without some sort of retail advantage. For these reasons, I support the ceasing of accepting new cannabis retail applications.

- Jon Heredia

May 25, 2023

Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee
Members: Catherine Stefani, Joel Engardio, Matt Dorsey
Public Comment Item #4, File # 200144 (Clerk, please read during public comment if that's allowed)

Dear Committee Members,

We write to urge you to not recommend/approve the legislation to stop new cannabis retail applications for the following reasons:

- **This policy harms the social equity movement, by stopping it. Reefer madness continues, with it's negative minority group implications and new dog whistle called "saturation".**
- The Cannabis Committee includes stakeholders from equity applicants, business owners, labor representatives, subject matter experts, among others, provides recommendations to the Board on cannabis policy. **Their recommendation, attached to this file, explains either a two year moratorium, or until retail parity is met.**
- The original file asks for the Small Business Commission's input.
- Supervisor Safai said that **Cannabis Retailers Alliance lobbied him for this legislation. That lobbying group includes mostly white males preserving their own economic interests.**
- **If there's saturation, then why does members of the Retailers Alliance continue to open retail shops in the City? If saturation exists, then why aren't new retailers actually closing? This is a smokescreen for a lobbying group to seek a government bailout and intervention. Shouldn't market forces dictate successful businesses? If a restaurant struggles, will the Board intervene and say there's too many restarants and no new ones should open?**
- **Allowing vulnerable populations and minority groups to open businesses is a good thing! Opening vacant commercial spaces is a good thing! Jobs are a good thing! This policy stops that and disproportionately harms opportunities for minority groups.**
- **It would be better policy to write a report to analyze if saturation actually exists. Everything else is talk without back up.**

Please use your common sense to advance good policy and to stop bad ones. Don't get sucked into this smokescreen, negative politics, and attempt to railroad processes for unbecoming reasons.

Please protect/strengthen social equity and economic opportunity for vulnerable populations and City residents. Resist goliath, protect david. It's more important now than ever.

Thank you,
Coalition of concerned San Franciscans

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2023 MAY 23 PM 3:58
BY 