

Open Session Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, April 28, 2026
10:02 am – 11:00 am

Cannabis Control Appeals Panel
400 R Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

Members present:

- Dr. Diandra Bremond, Chairperson (in Sacramento County – In Person)
- Jim Wood (in Sacramento County – In Person)
- Josh Newman (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 and 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, Jim Wood, and Josh Newman 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 March 10, 2026, meeting. There were no additions or corrections. No comments from the public.

Motion (Newman): Approve the minutes of the March 10, 2026, meeting as submitted. Seconded (Wood). Melita Deci took a roll call vote on the motion. Motion passed 3-0.

3. Executive Management Report.

Executive Director Hawley began her report by discussing CCAP's budgetary numbers for Fiscal Year 2025-26 (3rd Quarter). These numbers reflect expenditures from July 2025 to February 2026. Hawley stated that CCAP's budget looks to be in good shape rest of the year. Out of its total budget (\$3,318,000), CCAP projects to spend \$2,847,106 by year end – leaving a positive balance of \$415,894.

Next, Hawley's report covered the Panel's Strategic Planning process. The Department of Consumer Affairs' SOLID Unit will provide a copy of CCAP's Environmental Scan along with a "Goals and Objective" workbook to the Panel prior to the next meeting. The information provided will include environmental scans covering both internal and external stakeholders.

Hawley then opened the floor for questions.

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

4. Administrative Delegations.

Chairperson Bremond introduced Chief Counsel Chris Phillips to present regarding several proposed delegations of the Panel's authority.

Phillips stated that staff has a list of necessary delegations to better streamline Panel meetings. The proposed delegations fall into two categories: delegations to the Executive Director and delegations to the Panel Chair.

Phillips first introduced and presented the five proposed delegations to the Executive Director:

- 26-01: Delegation of Review of Appellant Requests for Extension of Deadline to File Administrative Record
- 26-02: Delegation of Review of Motions for Extension of Briefing Deadline
- 26-03: Delegation of Review of Motions to Waive Briefing Page Length Restrictions
- 26-04: Delegation of Review of Stipulated Requests to Submit a Partial Administrative Record
- 26-05: Delegation of Review of Requests or Motions for Hearing Continuance or Location Change

These delegations are largely ministerial actions. They do not require Panel deliberations regarding questions of fact or law. It would not be a good use of resources to calendar and notice Panel meetings under Bagley-Keene for the purpose of these minor, technical requests.

During the presentation, Phillips identified a necessary revision to Delegation No. 26-02, which has two parts. The last line of the second part reads, in relevant part, "...provided the Executive Director determines that the appellant has demonstrated good cause." Phillips struck "appellant" and replaced it with "moving party" since it is possible that the Department of Cannabis Control (DCC) may also request a deadline extension to submit a brief.

Phillips then opened the floor for any questions from the Panel. No comments from the Panel.

Motion (Newman): Approve all five proposed delegations of authority (including Phillips' amendment to Delegation No. 26-02) to the Panel's Executive Director. Seconded (Wood). Melita Deci then took a roll call vote to approve the proposed delegations of authority to the Panel's Executive Director. The Panel voted 3-0 to approve the proposed delegations.

Phillips then introduced and presented the two proposed delegations to the Panel Chair:

- 26-06: Delegation of Review of Motions to Vacate Automatic Stay
- 26-07: Delegation of Authority to Dismiss Appeal Upon Appellant's Own Motion, or on Other Limited Procedural Grounds

Delegation No. 26-06: Reviewing a motion to vacate stay must be an expedited procedure since they are dealing with potential or actual public harm. Once an appeal is filed with the Panel, CCAP's regulations grant an automatic stay of the underlying DCC decision (along with any imposed discipline) during the pendency of the appeal.

CCAP's regulations also allow the DCC to file a motion to vacate stay if the stay would present an immediate danger to the public. If there is a genuine risk to the public, it is critical that the Panel be able to vacate a stay as quickly as possible. This proposed delegation would expedite the process by permitting the Chair to decide on these motions thereby allowing stays to be vacated as soon as the Chair can review relevant materials.

Panel member Newman asked Phillips for an example where upholding a stay could present an immediate danger to the health, safety, or welfare of the public. Phillips explained that an example would be a licensed dispensary that has been caught selling cannabis products to minors. If they have filed an appeal with the Panel, the dispensary would be permitted to continue selling its products unless or until the stay is vacated.

Delegation No. 26-07: This delegation deals with the authority to dismiss an appeal. CCAP's regulations permit dismissal in certain limited, non-substantive circumstances. For example, when the appellant moves for dismissal themselves or if appellant fails to correct procedural requirements. This delegation would permit the Chair to act in these circumstances where dismissal does not require the Panel to exercise its judgment and only requires reviewing filed documents to ensure dismissal is appropriate under CCAP regulations.

Phillips opened the floor for questions.

A member of the public asked about the automatic stay. They asked what is the standard for determining what circumstances justify vacating a stay? Phillips explained that the standard required in motions to vacate stay is demonstrating that a stay remaining in place would present an immediate danger to the health, safety, or welfare of the public.

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

Motion (Wood): Approve both proposed delegations of authority to the Panel Chair. Seconded (Newman). Melita Deci then took a roll call vote to approve the proposed delegations of authority to the Panel Chair. The Panel voted 3-0 to approve the proposed delegations.

Phillips completed his presentation and handed the floor back to Bremond.

5. Panel Handbook Updates.

Chairperson Bremond introduced Chief Counsel Phillips to make his presentation regarding proposed updates to the Panel's handbook.

Phillips stated that the Panel currently lacks a formal process for creating a subcommittee. This agenda item proposes updating the Panel Handbook to establish a process for creating subcommittees. Staff surveyed numerous state boards and bodies, and identified best practices.

Phillips summarized the different subcommittees. A delegated subcommittee is granted authority to act on behalf of the Panel. In contrast, an advisory subcommittee has no authority to act on the Panel's behalf but instead advises how the Panel should exercise its authority.

The key difference is that delegated subcommittees still must abide by all applicable Bagley-Keene requirements. There is no convenience or benefit to the Panel using them. They might as well convene a publicly noticed meeting with the full Panel.

Phillips pointed the Panel to the two proposed updates to the Handbook. The first update is the inclusion of a subcommittee policy which outlines the process for creating a Panel subcommittee. The second update is to update the Panel Chair's list of responsibilities to reflect their additional duties under the proposed subcommittee policy.

Phillips then opened the floor for any questions from the Panel.

Panel member Wood asked about the process for adopting this proposed subcommittee policy. Phillips explained that the policy will be formally adopted once the Panel votes to approve the proposed updates to the Handbook.

Motion (Wood): Approve the two proposed updates to the Panel Handbook. Seconded (Newman). Melita Deci then took a roll call vote to approve the proposed updates to the Handbook. The Panel voted 3-0 to approve the proposed updates.

Phillips completed his presentation and handed the floor back to Bremond. No comments from the public. No other comments from the Panel.

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.

Chairperson Bremond proposed a topic for consideration at a future Panel meeting. Bremond requested that the Panel discuss the issue of setting a time limit on public comments.

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

8. Closed Session.

Open session was suspended at 10:46 am for the Panel to continue its deliberations in the matter of Santa Ana Main Distro, LLC (CCAP Case No. 2025-08-DCC-0003) in closed session, under the authority of Government Code section 11126(c)(6).

Open session resumed at 11:00 am.

9. Adjournment.

Motion (Wood). Adjourn the meeting. Seconded (Newman). Meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.