Open Session Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 20, 2026
10:01 am – 10:56 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 San Diego County – Remote)

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 10:01 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. **Approval of the Minutes.**

Chairperson Bremond asked the Panel if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the July 23, 2026, meeting. There were no additions or corrections. No comments from the public.

Motion (Wood): Approve the minutes of the July 23, 2026, meeting as submitted. Seconded (Rivera). Melita Deci took a roll call vote on the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

3. **Executive Management Report.**

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

First, Hawley discussed outreach and education plans. CCAP plans to begin sending newsletter updates to stakeholders on a quarterly basis. This newsletter will help promote educational content on CCAP's website such as instructional videos and FAQs. Hawley also shared that CCAP plans on launching a YouTube channel in the near future.

Second, Hawley shared the action plan that staff came up with to implement the Panel's Strategic Plan. Hawley reviewed the action plan for each of the four Goal Areas of the Strategic Plan with the Panel. The Panel provided the following feedback:

- For Goal Area 1, Objective 1.3, Panel Member Rivera and Bremond suggested revising "enhance" to either "maintain" or "ensure."
- For Goal Area 1, Objective 1.4, Bremond made a non-substantive edit to Action Item #1.
- Panel Member Wood asked whether the Panel's YouTube channel will be a live broadcast or just an archive. Hawley confirmed it will only be the latter.

Third, Hawley provided a brief update on the Panel's budget. The Panel's overall budget for Fiscal Year 2026-27 is $3,500,000. Since it is currently early in the new fiscal year, there are not many expenditures to share or report.

Lastly, Hawley provided some administrative updates. She is working with the Department of Cannabis Control (DCC) to set up cannabis tours previously requested by the Panel. She has also reached out to Rohit Chopra, new Secretary of the Business and Consumer Services Agency, to attend a future meeting to introduce himself as well as meet the Panel and Panel staff.

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

4. **Legal Update.**

Chairperson Bremond introduced Chief Counsel Chris Phillips to provide the Panel with a legal update. This is an informational item only.

First, Phillips provided a legislative update on Assembly Bill 1826. Legal staff previously reported on this bill to the Panel at the July 23, 2026, meeting. This bill would have expanded Panel jurisdiction to receive and hear appeals from condemnation proceedings. Recently, however, this bill went into suspense file with the Senate Appropriations Committee. This bill is, therefore, effectively dead for this legislative session.

Rivera asked whether there was ever an official cost associated with this bill. Hawley said there was no formal fiscal analysis on the bill. Hawley added that, based on the number of stipulated settlements involving condemnation orders, the Panel would have likely seen only one or two additional cases per year and thus this bill would not have impacted CCAP's bottom line.

Second, Phillips updated the Panel on a recent case. A few months ago, the Panel heard an appeal in the Euphoric Life case—which the Panel ultimately dismissed due to a lack of jurisdiction over condemnation orders. Phillips informed the Panel that Euphoric Life has since appealed the case to California's Sixth District Court of Appeal. Phillips shared that staff will update the Panel on these proceedings as they continue.

Phillips finished his presentation. No other comments from the Panel.

There was one public comment. However, this comment posed a risk of exposing the Panel to information regarding a potential future appeal. Therefore, Phillips directed this individual to contact him directly with questions.

5. Presentation – Writs: Procedures for Appeal from Administrative Decisions.

Chairperson Bremond introduced Senior Staff Attorney Sarah Smith to give a presentation on Writs and the procedures for appeal from California government agency decisions. This training is an informational item only.

Smith began her presentation. She provided a definition of writs, identified the types of writs, and explained their various purposes or functions.

Smith's training focused on two types of writs: administrative writ of mandate and statutory writ of review. She explained the scope of review for each writ as well as the relief provided by each writ. Smith explained how the two writs differ from one another. Smith finished her presentation and opened the floor for any questions.

Rivera asked what happens if a licensee were to file an appeal with the Superior Court instead of the Panel. Smith speculated that the DCC would likely file an opposition about the licensee failing to exhaust their administrative remedies by not appealing to the Panel before seeking judicial review. Chief Counsel Phillips added that every final decision issued by the DCC or the Panel provides information regarding next steps to appeal the decision. Rivera expressed that parties and their attorneys are not always aware of the exact jurisdiction or the appeals process, which is why public outreach and education is important.

Bremond asked if CCAP's website provided material or content regarding the appeals process with the Panel. Phillips and Hawley confirmed that the website provides such content like FAQs, infographs, and checklists. Among other topics, these materials cover the Panel's appeals process—including the steps required prior to filing an appeal with the Panel.

Rivera raised another question regarding Panel jurisdiction. She asked what category of cases cannot be appealed to the Panel, such as condemnation orders. Smith pointed to Business and Professions Code section 26043, which defines the scope of Panel jurisdiction. Section 26043 provides an exclusive list of cases over which the Panel has jurisdiction. Therefore, anything not on this list is excluded from the Panel's jurisdiction.

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

6. **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.

7. **Future Agenda Items.**

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

8. **Adjournment.**

Motion (Rivera). Adjourn the meeting. Seconded (Wood). Meeting adjourned at 10:56 am.