Latest Developments **Cannabis Regulation** City Attorneys' Spring Conference May 3, 2018

Presenters

Tim Cromartie

Senior Advisor, HdL Companies

Jeff Dunn, Esq.

Attorney, Best, Best & Krieger



- Challenges to local government authority
 - Myth: Proposition 64 prohibited local governments from banning cannabis deliveries (media and even state govt)
 - Reality: Deliveries are just another business activity falling squarely within cities' constitutional land use and police powers, which were expressly protected by Prop. 64



- Development on Deliveries: SB 1302 (Lara) seeks to statutorily prohibit local governments from banning deliveries
 - Direct threat to local control
 - Violates Prop. 64: Commercial activities not allowed where locally prohibited
 - Independently violates Article XI, Section 7 of California Constitution



Article XI, Section 7 of the California Constitution

- "A county or city may make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary, and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws."
- Cities may want to consider formal opposition to SB 1302
- A measure of this type could be the opening wedge to further attacks on local control



Development on State Tax Policy:

AB 3157 (Lackey) – Cannabis Taxation

- Suspends state cultivation tax until June 1, 2021
- Reduces state excise tax from 15% to 11% for the same period
- Intended to give industry breathing room as it phases into the regulated market



AB 3157 (Lackey) – Cannabis Taxation (continued)

- Bill in itself poses no threat to locals
- Triggers concerns that, if it takes effect, locals will increase local tax rates in response, frustrating the bill's purpose
- This in turn may lead to discussions about legislation <u>regulating</u> <u>local tax rates</u>
- Could lead to dangerous legal precedent
- Locals need to be aware of danger, keep taxes at reasonable rates to discourage state action

Developments on Banking Front

SB 930 (Hertzberg) - Financial Institutions: Cannabis

- Would authorize creation of limited charter banks and credit unions, and the use of special purpose checks for payment of state and local taxes, rent, and goods and services
- Intriguing but legal hurdles not completely ironed out cautionary testimony from former Federal Reserve regulator to Treasurer's Banking Task Force



Legal Challenges to Local Regulations:

- Local regulations re: personal cultivation
- After Prop. 64, in response to its provision that "local governments cannot ban, but can reasonably regulate" indoor cultivation for personal use, a number of cities enacted ordinances requiring permits and in some cases inspections.
- **December 2016 and months following:** Drug Policy Alliance sent letter to several cities challenging locally adopted ordinances.



Drug Policy Alliance laid out four broad challenges:

- 1) Preventing categories of people from engaging in personal cultivation violates AUMA;
- Local permits or fees to engage in personal cultivation violates AUMA;
- 3) Requiring a permit to engage in personal cultivation violates the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution;
- 4) Requiring a warrantless inspection of a private home violates the Fourth Amendment to the United State Constitution.



Tax Fairness, Transparency and Accountability Act

- Threatens to cripple local government by requiring 2/3 vote on ALL tax measures and fees
- Sponsored by Business Roundtable, signatures are being gathered now for November ballot
- Serious threat to state and local ability to govern
- Will finish the work of 1978's Proposition 13 in restricting government access to tax revenues

Tax Fairness, Transparency and Accountability Act

- Retroactive to January 1, 2018
- Local taxes enacted since that date by majority vote will be invalid by operation of law
- Local tax proposals must run a double gauntlet to be enacted:
 - 2/3 vote of city council to place on local ballot
 - 2) 2/3 vote of local electorate



Litigation: <u>Harris v. City of Fontana</u>

- Filed June 2017
- Mounted a challenge to the City's:
 - Permit requirement
 - Inspection requirement
 - Fee requirement
 - Background check requirement
- Underlying issue: What is "reasonable regulation" within the meaning of Proposition 64?

Harris v. City of Fontana (continued)

Rationale for Regulations:

Permit Requirement

- Due to inherent risks of unregulated cultivation, it is reasonable to require a permit prior to allowing it to occur indoors
- Allows City to impose reasonable conditions to mitigate risk:
 - Prohibit storage of explosive chemicals
 - Secure cannabis from unauthorized persons (minors)



Harris v. City of Fontana (continued)

Rationale for Regulations

Inspection Requirement

 The only authorized inspection under city regulations is one conducted with applicant's consent – similar to other inspections prior to issuance of permits

Fee Requirement

• The fee is tied to the amount of staff time and resources required to review and process a permit application.



- Harris v. City of Fontana (continued)
- Rational for Regulations

Background Check Requirement

 Allows authorized personnel in the Police Department to examine an applicant's criminal background and provide a recommendation to the Planning Department to approve or deny a permit based on criminal history with regard to drug possession or sales.

Case is pending, City will rely in part on **Riverside** and **Maral** cases, both of which upheld local authority to regulate cannabis activity per local police power.

QUESTIONS?

