Open Session Meeting Minutes

Thursday, July 23, 2026
10:02 am – 10:48 am

Cannabis Control Appeals Panel
400 R Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

Members present:

- Dr. Diandra Bremond, Chairperson (in Sacramento County – In Person)
- Cathryn Rivera, J.D. (in Sacramento County – In Person)
- Jim Wood (in Sacramento County – In Person)
- Toni Atkins (in Sacramento County – In Person)

Staff present:

- Anne Hawley, Executive Director, Cannabis Control Appeals Panel
- Christopher Phillips, Chief Counsel, Cannabis Control Appeals Panel
- Sarah M. Smith, Senior Staff Attorney, Cannabis Control Appeals Panel
- Brian Hwang, Senior Staff Attorney, Cannabis Control Appeals Panel
- Melita Deci, Administrative & Business Services Coordinator, Cannabis Control Appeals Panel
- Ruben Garza, Office Technician, Cannabis Control Appeals Panel

Summary:

1. **Call to Order and Establishment of Quorum.**

Chairperson Diandra Bremond called the teleconference meeting to order at 10:02 am. Melita Deci took the roll call vote. Panel Members Diandra Bremond, Cathryn Rivera, Jim Wood, and Toni Atkins were present. A quorum was established.

2. **Welcome – Panel Member Toni Atkins.**

Chairperson Bremond took a moment to introduce the newest Panel Member—Toni Atkins. Atkins was recently appointed to the Panel by Senate President pro tempore Monique Limon of the Senate Rules Committee.

After Bremond's introductory remarks, Atkins made a brief statement. Atkins thanked Chairperson Bremond for the welcome, then thanked the Panel and Panel staff with helping her with the onboarding process. Atkins closed by stating she is looking forward to getting started.

3. **Approval of the Minutes.**

Chairperson Bremond asked the Panel if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the June 25, 2026, meeting. There were no additions or corrections. No public comments.

Motion (Wood): Approve the minutes of the June 25, 2026, meeting as submitted. Seconded (Rivera). Melita Deci took a roll call vote on the motion. Motion passed 3-0 with Atkins abstaining.

4. **Executive Management Report.**

Chairperson Bremond introduced Executive Director Anne Hawley to present her report.

First, Hawley discussed CCAP's Budget Change Proposal (BCP). The Governor recently signed a three-year limited term funding for the Panel. There were no major changes to the Panel's staffing or budget levels. The Panel will be funded through Fiscal Year (FY) 2028-29 and will have to submit another BCP around August 2028.

Second, Hawley updated the Panel on CCAP's budget as of June 30, 2026. CCAP's budget consists of two major categories: Personal Services (PS) and Operating Expenditures & Equipment (OE&E). For PS, the Panel has a budget of $2,579,000 with a total expenditure of $2,309,196. For OE&E, the Panel has a budget of $794,000 with a total expenditure of $616,860. Altogether, the Panel's entire budget adds up to $3,373,000 with a total expenditure of $2,926,056—leaving a surplus of $446,944.

Third, Hawley provided a summary and update of the strategic planning process. On May 21, 2026, the Panel had a brainstorming session. On June 25, the Panel reviewed its strategic plan goal areas, made a few adjustments, and voted to approve the 2026-29 strategic plan. On July 20, Panel staff met with the Department of Consumer Affairs' SOLID Unit to work on action plans for each of the strategic plan objectives. These ideas will be presented to the Panel at its September meeting for further feedback and review.

Lastly, Hawley handed the floor to Chief Counsel Chris Phillips for two legal updates. First, Phillips informed the Panel that the Lucky 13 appeal is now closed. After issuing the preliminary decision, neither party requested a hearing prior to the deadline. Staff will now convert the preliminary decision into a final decision and notify the parties. Second, the agenda for the August meeting is unlikely to have any appeals. Therefore, staff will probably present a formal legal training for the Panel's benefit.

Hawley finished her presentation. No comments from the Panel. No comments from the public.

5. **Legislative Update – AB-1826.**

Chairperson Bremond introduced Senior Staff Attorney Brian Hwang to present this agenda item on Assembly Bill 1826. Before handing the floor, Bremond noted that this agenda item is an informational item only. Hwang began his presentation by noting that no action from the Panel is required. The Panel may simply take this presentation under advisement.

Following an administrative hearing, the Department of Cannabis Control may issue a final condemnation order requiring the destruction of a licensee's adulterated or misbranded cannabis and cannabis product. Currently, nothing in the Department's statutes or rules lays out a path to appeal these orders. Additionally, the Panel's own statutes do not include condemnation orders among the list of cases that may be appealed to the Panel.

AB 1826 would fill this void in the appeals process by expanding the Panel's jurisdiction. Specifically, the bill proposes inserting a new provision into the Department's existing statutes which would expressly authorize licensees to appeal condemnation orders to the Panel. Hwang completed his presentation then opened the floor for any questions.

Panel Member Rivera asked about the fiscal impact of the bill. Hawley stated there is no expectation that AB 1826 would lead to a significant increase in Panel workload. Based on public data, Panel staff estimates that the bill would result in one additional appeal per year. Hawley said that such an increase in Panel workload would be absorbable.

Panel Member Wood spoke about the potential length of the appeals process, and how some of these cannabis products have a certain shelf life. He expressed that if there is another appeal from a condemnation order and the Panel has jurisdiction to hear such an appeal, he hopes that the Panel would be expeditious and timely in adjudicating the matter. No other comments from the Panel. No comments from the public.

6. **Preliminary Decision Process.**

Chairperson Bremond introduced Chief Counsel Phillips to present this agenda item. He will discuss the specific procedures surrounding Panel rule 6007, subsection (a), which governs the Panel's preliminary decision process. This is an action item requiring action on two questions. After discussion and public comment, the Panel will vote on which procedures to implement.

Phillips noted that the language of rule 6007 gives the Panel significant discretion in terms of deciding on the specific manner of handling the preliminary decision process. This action item requires the Panel to decide on two questions: (1) which preliminary decision process does the Panel prefer? and (2) should the preliminary decision be issued to the parties in the appeal?

The first question concerns how the Panel reaches a preliminary decision in an appeal once the recommendation memo and the administrative record have been disseminated to each Panel member. The Panel may choose between two scenarios. In Scenario #1 (Individual Feedback), each Panel member provides individual feedback on the preliminary decision directly to the

Chief Counsel. In Scenario #2 (Group Deliberation), Panel members meet in closed session at the next Panel meeting to deliberate on the preliminary decision as a group.

After summarizing each scenario, along with their benefits and costs, Phillips opened the floor for questions and comments. Panel Member Atkins asked how much longer an appeal would be under Scenario #2 versus Scenario #1. Phillips answered that the difference would be a matter of weeks. No other comments from the Panel. No comments from the public.

Motion (Wood): Adopt Scenario #2 (Group Deliberation) as the Panel's approach to the preliminary decision process under rule 6007 moving forward. Seconded (Rivera). Melita Deci took a roll call vote on the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

The second question concerns what to do once a preliminary decision has been reached. The Panel may choose between two scenarios. In Scenario #1 (Disclosure), the full preliminary decision is shared with the parties. In Scenario #2 (No Disclosure), the parties are simply informed that the Panel has reached a preliminary decision.

After summarizing each scenario, along with their benefits and costs, Phillips opened the floor for questions and comments. Wood expressed support for disclosing due to transparency reasons. Rivera agreed since it will better inform the parties as to what decision they should make. Bremond expressed agreement with both Wood and Rivera. No other comments from the Panel. No comments from the public.

Motion (Atkins): Adopt Scenario #1 (Disclosure) as the Panel's approach moving forward and allow both parties to see the analysis and conclusions in advance. Seconded (Wood). Melita Deci took a roll call vote on the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

7. **Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda.**

Chairperson Bremond warned any comment should not involve pending or future appeals, complaints, applications, or any disciplinary actions that may come before the Panel.

No comments from the public.

8. **Future Agenda Items.**

No comments from the Panel. No comments from the public.

9. **Adjournment.**

Motion (Wood). Adjourn the meeting. Seconded (Rivera). Meeting adjourned at 10:48 am.