



Pam Caronongan <pcaronongan@cityofsuttercreek.org>

More comments on the dispensary issue.

1 message

Brian Comnes [REDACTED]

Mon, May 25, 2026 at 7:27 PM

To: Claire Gunselman <cgunselman@cityofsuttercreek.org>
Cc: "jsierk@cityofsuttercreek.org" <jsierk@cityofsuttercreek.org>, "jswift@cityofsuttercreek.org" <jswift@cityofsuttercreek.org>, Dan Riordan <driordan@cityofsuttercreek.org>, "sfeist@cityofsuttercreek.org" <sfeist@cityofsuttercreek.org>, "pcaronongan@cityofsuttercreek.org" <pcaronongan@cityofsuttercreek.org>

Mayor Gunselman
with cc to the City Council and Recorder:

Why is the City of Sutter Creek negotiating with Embarc about what percentage of their gross revenues they would have to pay to operate in Sutter Creek?

Local cannabis taxes are **imposed** by city or county governments through ordinances, not negotiated individually with dispensaries. Municipalities establish tax rates, structures (e.g., gross receipts, excise, or per-square-foot canopy fees), and exemptions via local legislation. For example, Los Angeles imposes a 10% gross receipts tax on recreational sales through **Proposition M**, while Los Angeles County independently sets its own rates for unincorporated areas. Individual dispensaries do not normally negotiate tax agreements. Martinez, with an EMBARC shop gets 9%. We should settle for no less if we get that far.

On a separate note it was disappointing to see City Manager DuBois's public comments this week to the Ledger Dispatch on this issue. He is quoted saying, "We have been checking references with seven other cities [presumably where Embarc has dispensaries] and they have not reported having the types of issues discussed at the Board of Supervisors" He continued "The cities also report that they have not seen increases in crime or in usage by youth..." Mr. DuBoi, whom presumably should be neutral as the City studies the issue, did not bother mention or point to the multiple studies based on much larger sample sizes than the seven cities he interviewed. This studies have been submitted to Sutter Creek Council from local opponents showing quite the opposite conclusion. That omission suggests that public commentary is being ignored. As a reminder here is a link to a web page with 26 documented large studies showing THC's ill effects - <https://iasic1.org/doctors-warn-cannabis-can-cause-serious-health-hazards/>. Many of those studies were previously submitted to Council so this is a reminder to review them again. He goes on to push the pro-dispensary propaganda line that it is "much better" to have it regulated than kids and anyone else getting things on the black market. That is a specious assertion. The black market will not go away because of a dispensary here. The dispensary will simply add \$5mm more THC product a year to the County. It also shows the City as condoning marijuana use in order to meet its budget demands. Keeping dispensaries illegal here is by far and a away the "much better" outcome.

btw - A simple internet query shows that when City Manager DuBois was on Palo Alto's City Council he supported the 2017 dispensary ban in Palo Alto, which is still in effect. Why does he see a dispensary as fit for our rural, mostly conservative, community, but not welcome in wealthy Palo Alto?

Please enter this email to the public record on this subject.
=====>> **Brian Comnes Sutter Creek, CA** <<=====