

Public Comment October 26th SECTF Meeting

Received 10/24/2022, 4:52pm via email

Hi Crystal,

Thank you for sending over this draft of the final report. Whew!! i can see the work that was put into this.

I want to revisit a request/injustice piece that I believe is being overlooked. I would like to understand why the licenses that are not able to open due to bans and moratoria are being included in the number of licenses that will be available. I believe that any licenses that are offered should have a viable opportunity to thrive. These licenses will be doomed from the first day. I believe we should keep in mind;

1. That the state can't mandate that cities/counties be mandated to allow stores to open. The AG has already found that issue to be a nonstarter.
2. That only 14 recaptured/recycled (semi) viable licenses are not enough to offer true relief to this situation of inequity.
3. That the allowable number of licensees was legislated into law (I think) and can be changed and the law amended
4. Where and how many licenses can open was only a policy issued by the WSLCB. And the WSLCB should be able to change where those licenses can open.
5. The recaptured licenses should be allowed to open in areas that will allow them to do so. We will not be properly addressing equity store issues by placing stores in areas that won't allow them to do business. This legislation should allow new equity stores the ability to operate successfully.
6. Those licenses already owned by minority folks are categorized as initial, previously existing social equity licenses and be afforded the same rights as the incoming licenses.
7. These licenses may increase the number of operating equity licenses and afford the existing owners the same access to the new programs, protections, and support of the new license owners.
8. That existing minority license holders not be required to go through additional screening to move the new licenses or be considered equity owners. Not only is that redundant, but it would also be wholly unfair to new licensees by having to compete with existing licensees within such a small pool of newly available licenses. In addition to adding to their long and exhausting existing trauma, by applying the new process to current licensees that requirement would be overly burdensome, unwarranted and harmful to that population.

I hope you can reflect fully on these thoughts and facts. I hope some of these thoughts and revelations can be included in the draft.

Warmest Regards,

Angel Swanson

253.273.1260