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CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Good morning, sir. Can you please, spell, state your name for the record, please?

MR. PRITCHETT: Absolutely. My name is Antoine Pritchett. I am the CEO and managing partner of Renee and Andria Health, LLC.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Spell your name for the court reporter, please.

MR. PRITCHETT: A-N-T-O-I-N-E.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: The last name?
MR. PRITCHETT: All right. Sorry. P-R-I-T-C-H-E-T-T.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: One of the reasons we go through this exercise, we do have a court reporter and there's a transcript just to make sure that everyone's name is correctly spelled. So that's why $I$ go through there, that exercise. All right. Good morning. All right. This is a fact-finding hearing.

Renee and Andria Health Medical
Cannabis Cultivation Center, they receive -- they were -- during the last application open period were the first-place winner for the Cultivation

Center license. They have made -- they're making a request to us this morning because they want us to -- they want to make some changes to their ownership structure and to request a reclassification of their license. And the Board thought it was pertinent that we have a public hearing, that we can put everything on the record, what the specific request that's been made.

You will start off by -- for you to provide us, what it is that you're requesting. And then the Board members might -- I have some questions and the Board members might have some questions. This is just gathering facts. And at the -- we are -- at the end of the hearing, we'll take this matter under advisement and then discuss, and make a recommendation what we believe is in the best interest of, you as the licensee and the process, whether or not we believe that the request that's been made, whether or not we believe it should be issued. But, so this is informal. And so we can start off by you telling us what it is that you are requesting from us.

MR. PRITCHETT: Absolutely. Thank you,

Chairman Anderson. And thank you to the Board for having this hearing. I appreciate you giving us the time to speak with you regarding our concerns.

So our concerns are really twofold to begin. It regards our operating status as a licensee. One of the things enshrined in the Medical Cannabis Amendment Act or the MCAA as we've taken to calling it, is the legacy operator status of those who were licensed prior to the date enshrined in the Act, which I believe was December of last year.

And the particular language of the law specifically states awarded, whereas the language of the letter that we received on September 28th, states approved. And in our conversations with Director Moosally, he was very clear in his warning to us that based on the letter of the law, we are not classified as a legacy operator because of that small distinction between awarded versus approved, and that due to that, there are few provisions to which we are not entitled, at least in technicality, which would be the status of legacy operator, which would grant us the manufacturing license to go along with our
cultivation license, which is, as I'm sure the Board knows, the law under which we applied in DC prior to the MCAA being passed. And it would also preclude us from obtaining an allocated dispensary license to vertically integrate as a legacy operator, as all other operators licensed prior to the MCAA's passage are granted.

So that small distinction is causing a bit of a ripple for us because one of the things that we have communicated both to our investors and as we move forward through this process to the Board, is our intention to manufacture. That's where a lot of our financials have been placed. And it is the, I'd say approximately about 50 percent of our revenue generating capability. So it would be cut in half if we were not allowed to obtain that status, as was the letter of the law when we applied.

Additionally, of course, because the MCAA was passed after our license was approved, we were not able to take advantage of any of the other provisions therein, including discounted licensing fees and the non-competitive nature of the application process, which all legacy
operators, including Renee and Andria Health, were subjected to.

So in all but name, it seems that we have been operating as a legacy operator and unfortunately because of the letter of the law, this would strip us not only of 50 percent of our revenue generating capacity up front, but it would also strip us of our ability to obtain a dispensary license, as is currently allocated for all legacy operators. And in doing so could very well be detrimental not only to us but to our investors, considering that that is very largely what the financial statements that we've provided them and projections that we've given have been based around.

The second issue that we have is with regard to the equity dilution as it relates to our business. So as I'm sure the Board knows, it's very expensive to stand one of these businesses up and the order of operations here makes a little bit difficult for us considering we are the first social equity applicant licensees or at least licensed applicants to be approved, I should say, since that's the letter of the law as it stands.

And because of that, when we spoke with the director, he also mentioned that if we were to raise the money, which requires that we give equity in our company in exchange for those millions of dollars, that it would dilute our ownership down below the 51 percent CBE threshold that's currently established in the DSLBD code which is required to maintain the CBE.

And what the director so aptly pointed out was that if we were to dilute below that threshold prior to receiving an actual license or prior to a ruling from the Board stating that we are allowed to dilute in order to raise the money, which is obviously necessary for us to open our doors and get the business running, that that may invalidate the very basis on which we were approved for the license and that could very well jeopardize our approval status.

So that is something that we found pertinent and it's one reason that we have not actually taken on very much funding up to this point other than what's been necessary to maintain the current level of operation that we currently have. And in that operation, we've discerned that, you know, in raising that money,
it would come down to about a 40 percent ownership stake from 51 for those CBE holders within DC.

We've also had an opportunity to speak with DSLBD, who has acknowledged and is a proponent of a collaborative conversation both with us and with ABCA to ensure that the letter of the code is conducive to the success of those trying to enter the social equity program in DC and to ensure the sustainability of that program and their ability, in this case, to raise money as we are trying to do.

And so being the first one through the door, our goal is not only to get that approval to raise the money that's necessary to open our doors, but also to establish a pathway for those who are set to come after us, as I'm sure you all are aware, that the licensing process has already started for those social equity applicants. So really creating a pathway for them so that they don't languish in this sort of regulatory gray area where they know they're allowed to raise the in our case, for Cultivation Center, it's about \$5 million total with give or take a million, depending on the type of equipment we select and
the current pricing of it, to get the doors open. So it's very capital intensive and it's very essential to our business that we're able to raise this money because as you know, as a CBE certified entity, we don't have the personal wealth or resources to be able to finance it ourselves. And due to the constraints in the banking industry and the non-passage of the Safe Banking Act, we do not have access to institutional monies. And so the only way for us to effectively raise this money, especially at the current valuation for our company, is to do so through private equity, which requires that we divest.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So the ask from us is that you want us to allow you to reduce 51 percent to 40 percent. And secondly, I'm not sure which one is first, but do you want us to do -- you're asking is it possible to dilute your ownership.

And secondly, to also put you in the category as a legacy operator. And so as a legacy operator, then you can do the vertical integration to get a retail license and also have the ability to have a manufacturer's license,
correct?
MR. PRITCHETT: That's correct, Chairman Anderson.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Now, and you are aware when you went through the application -the open application period, you are the first-place winner.

And I see another person on the line. Yes. Who is supposed to be at the hearing today?

MR. PRITCHETT: So this is -- so it's myself, the -- our business partners, the Khans are the ones who just joined. So that's Rabbi Jeffrey Kahn and his wife, Stephanie Kahn, who are on the call. So they are the owners of Takoma Wellness Center, but also our business partners in Renee and Andria, LLC.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. So can you please identify yourself for the record, please? You're on mute.

MR. KHAN: Sorry about that. I'm Rabbi Jeffrey Kahn.

MS. KHAN: And I'm Stephanie Kahn.
MR. KHAN: We're from Takoma Wellness Center.
that you're business partners. What percentage of the business do they currently own under the current structure?

MR. PRITCHETT: They own a total of 24.5 percent between the two of them.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. So as I stated before your company under -- because we did a -- it was a scoring process, and so your company were number one. You got 212. 212.25 points because you receive 50 points at the CBE.

Now, DSLB was the one who determined that it's a 51 percent ownership, so I'm not quite sure what we can do because if we worked -well, if you decide -- I'm asking, let's say if you decide to to dilute the ownership, it falls below the 50 percent threshold. And so if it falls below the 50 percent threshold, you then, Will automatically lose 50 points that you received that you would not be the -- you would not come in number one.

So how do you address that? Explain that to me. How would that work? Because how would that work? Because DSLB is the one that determines that the ownership to get the 50 points. So explained that then.

MR. PRITCHETT: Yes, I'm happy to elaborate here. So as in cannabis, as in every other business, when you're raising money, it requires that you issue shares, which dilutes all existing owners, not just the CBE shareholders.

And in working or in speaking with DSLB, they have recommended that we have an open conversation. And what we would be looking for here from the Board would be a ruling stating that we would not forfeit our status as the winner as we work with DSLB to establish new rules for the Maryland -- I'm sorry, Medical Cannabis Program.

And what they've come to realize, and I've spoken with program manager Kate Moran, she has come to realize that the medical cannabis CBE program needs to be separated from the general CBE status code in DSLB because of the very different industry circumstances that involve being a CBE as it compares to a medical cannabis CBE .

So one of the things that we have suggested to them and we will continue to have a conversation on and we would love to have ABCA support in this, would be to adjust and also help

DSLB to craft the regulations necessary to ensure that the MCCBE program is robust.

And in that regulation, we would, for example, include a clause where the post capitalization, which would be after an MCCBE had raised the necessary funds to operate the business, could dilute down to a certain percentage threshold and still maintain their CBE status as is required by any business that needs to raise money and doesn't have the means in -on the current capitalization table or on the current ownership table to do so without bringing in outside capital.

So that's the approach that we think would be -- that would resolve the current situation, which would be to be able to raise the money that we need to start our operation and to have an assurance from ABCA that that would not invalidate our approval status as we simultaneously work with the DSLB to craft the new regulations for a completely separate MCCBE program, which would then enshrine exactly how much each MCCBE would be allowed to dilute their ownership when they are raising the necessary capital to open their doors.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: But I'm just -and I'm thinking aloud because I've -- that's not what I thought was -- the ask was when I got here today. But I don't -- I don't see -- we, this agency doesn't play any part in the qualifications for CBE. So as far as we are concerned, you have been certified as a CBE and so therefore, you got the 50 points and until -and unless, DSLB informs us that you are no longer a CBE, you're qualified.

But so I'm not quite sure -- so I'm not sure if this Board can make any type of determination regarding the dilution. I mean, I thought I was under -- I was under the understanding that at least you're coming to the Board, you're diluting your -- okay. You're going to dilute the -- you're -- the ownership state -- statue to 40 percent. And that you're saying, okay, fine, this is where we are. Do we still maintain a license now under the new law? Well, let me back up and see if you can give me some more information before I go there. Tell me -- so let me start at the beginning. So tell me your business -- provide me your business plans and what type of licenses
do you intend to seek in the next three years, so I'll have a more elongated thought pattern of what you're asking.

MR. PRITCHETT: Absolutely. So our intention since the inception of Renee and Andria health has been to be a cultivation and manufacturer of cannabis. And so that requires obviously under the new law, both the cultivation and manufacturing license. Whereas when we applied, it only required a cultivation license. And that's one of the reasons we're seeking the legacy operator status is to accurately reflect that.

And then additionally, our plan was always to vertically integrate, and that was one thing that was enshrined in the MCAA, which we were very supportive of, regardless of whether or not we had been included in it, because it does serve a very large purpose to allow for us as operators to find new cost efficiencies to develop and push the market forward, and in doing so would allow us to have a sustainable business model.

So I can tell you with the new licensing period, the open application period
that just happened most recently on May 1st for all legacy operators, that's open for the next year, we would intend to apply for and receive that dispensary license to vertically integrate in the city. So we would have a cultivation, manufacturing and dispensary license as Renee and Andria Health.

So that is our plan. That's our goal.
And we have always had those intentions and that's something, at least to the extent of the cultivation and manufacturing functions was elaborated upon in our application when we submitted to ABRA at the time in 2022.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Now, who are the two majority owners? Because it's my understanding at least one of them. So who are the two majority owners and what -- who are the two current majority owners?

MR. PRITCHETT: So the two majority owners currently are our Chief Compliance Officer, Frank Boris II, and Bradley Jones, our Chief Financial Officer.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And under this plan, will they remain as majority owners?

MR. PRITCHETT: Yes, Chairman, they
will. Actually, can I? I'd like to amend that. They will remain plurality owners because in order to have a majority, you'd have to have 51 or more percent on the ownership table, but they would have a plurality and that they would own a larger proportion of the company than anybody else on the ownership table at that 40 percent.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So what is it currently owned?

MR. PRITCHETT: 51 percent.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm sorry. So how much does Frank -- I mean, what percentage? I mean, I'm not sure if it -- if this is not public information, you don't have to, but I'm trying to figure out if this is public information on the application itself.

MR. PRITCHETT: It's public. Yes.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.
That's why $I$ 'm trying to be careful that $I$ 'm not, actually --

MR. PRITCHETT: No, I appreciate that.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Only provide me with public information. Okay?

MR. PRITCHETT: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So tell me,
currently, what percentage does, um. Frank.
MR. PRITCHETT: So Frank and Brad both split the 51 percent majority in half. So each of them own 25.5 percent individually. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So under the new system, if -- under the new, your issuing shares in this deal, what would their or what would they -- what do they own?

MR. PRITCHETT: So their plurality, as we predict right now, we are in the process of raising 5 million. That's the number we've given our investors. It may rise to six depending on some of the costs that we incurred during our build out because we have to get, you know, more concrete numbers from the MEP engineers and some of the individuals who will be building out our facility.

But our anticipation is it will be no more than 40 percent because that is at the issuance of about 25 percent of our company at a $\$ 22.5$ million valuation, which would take them from 51 percent collectively down to 40 percent, potentially down to about 36,37 percent if we raise an additional, for example, $\$ 1$ million.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Now under our
current system and how the license was awarded, now, you -- are you aware that if you're no longer qualified for the 50 point preference, do you agree or disagree that your application for Cultivation Center previously scored a 212.25 points, you would only have -- now receive 162.25 points.

MR. PRITCHETT: I do concur, Chairman Anderson, and that is what the director pointed out to us, and that's one of the reasons we requested this hearing. And I think you're very apt in pointing out that ABCA doesn't issue the CBE or say whether it's valid or invalid.

I think what DSLB recommended was that because ABCA is the regulatory body that oversees cannabis, that when crafting an MCCBE program that is specific to the needs of the industry and those participating in it, that you would have insight as to what would be conducive to ensuring that the MCCBE process remains rigorous and that it is sustainable and conducive to the licensing of individuals such as myself who post award right after the approval, then are only capable of raising the money necessary, which would trigger, right, the dilution and then effect that
ownership state.
So there are other various, I think, areas of that that they would want to have a conversation about. But as far as making sure that the CBE is not invalidated, that is absolutely a DSLB matter. I think their whole goal was just to make sure that they were on the same page with ABCA and that we're kind of stepping hand in hand.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Now under, even under -- because of the recently passed medical cannabis Clarification Supplementary Emergency Amendment Act of '23, all applicants for Cultivation Center would receive -- will receive over 150 points, which you have received. You are now eligible for consideration for Cultivation Center application pending the filing of the correct application or appropriate change of location. You have before May 1st, 2024.

So you're saying that what impact -okay. So if you were to lose the 50 points and then, what impact would that have on your business model? Because you still qualify for a license if you lost the 50 points.

MR. PRITCHETT: So the 50 points that
we would lose would invalidate, for example, the CBE that we currently hold, which would make us ineligible for all of the social equity applicant grants, funding and allocations or benefits enshrined in the MCAA. For example, the 75 percent reduction in licensing fees for the first three years, we would no longer be eligible for that because our CBE would no longer be valid.

In addition to that, it would require that we apply separately for those additional licenses as opposed to being vertically integrated as it relates to our legacy status, because that 50 points would no longer exist.

So there's a few different, 1 think, ramifications of not being able to dilute, one of which and I guess the most proximal would be we may not be able to even raise the money to get the doors open because as an investor, when you give a company $\$ 5$ million, your goal is to make money on that investment and that becomes a lot more difficult to do when the operations are more limited than we were initially led to believe, of course, under the letter of the law under which we applied and what we communicated to our investors up to this point.

And like I mentioned, it would essentially cut in half our ability to generate revenue. And when you consider cultivation and manufacturing as separate functions, they both contribute about 40 to 45 percent of the value chain in this industry. So having that be removed takes us from 85 percent of the value down to 40 percent.

And then subsequently, of course, we would not be allowed to obtain the dispensary license, which would be the remaining 15 percent. So we'd be operating at about 40 percent of our overall revenue generating capacity, which we initially anticipated.

## CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: As I said

before, I'm not quite sure what is it that this agency can do because we're not the ones who set the definition for what a CBE is. So I am not quite sure what position we can take on that issue. Because we don't have the expertise to determine DSLB. They're the ones who have the expertise to determine who qualifies as a CBE. And on -- until -- unless. You have informed us that you are no longer a CBE, you have -- you qualify for -- you still would be
awarded the license because you had the 212. Now, there is interpretation or depending how we look at the law it was enough to qualify as a legacy operator.

And explain to me how -- how do you -explain to me how do you think that you qualify as a legacy operator? Because my understanding that these are businesses that were -- that would have been -- or businesses that were in existence for a period of time. You're not in business. You don't have a license. Well, there's an interpretation whether or not you have a license or you qualify for a license because -- so how is how then do you believe that you could qualify as a legacy operator?

MR. PRITCHETT: I'd love to elaborate here. So we were licensed prior to the passage of the MCAA. So that's, I think, number one. The law was -- when we were approved for our license and when we applied, and I can tell you, Chairman, we've spent close to half a million dollars to this point.

No, we are not currently out in operation, but we have very much put our money where our mouth is, and a lot of it has come from
our own pockets to be able to get to this point. And all of it was under the, $I$ think, very fair presumption that we would be operating as a cannabis cultivator and manufacturer, which was the letter of the law when we were approved and when we applied.

As I'm sure the Board knows, our application process started in 2021. So it was -- it very much predates the passage of the MCAA. We had no hand in crafting the MCAA and for the lack of, I think, wording in the MCAA, we would have been classified as a legacy operator.

As I mentioned, the only difference between us being a legacy operator and not as the difference between the word approved and awarded and everything that we -- that encompasses our experience as a licensee has been reflective of the application process prior to the passage of the MCAA, which includes the necessary capital that we have expended up to this point, the necessary risks that we have taken, the period in which we were licensed and the letter of the law under which we we were approved for our license.

MR. PRITCHETT: I think that the only thing precluding us now currently is a
technicality because as I mentioned, we didn't receive any of the benefits from the MCAA. Right? We didn't get the reduction in application fees, we had to compete versus having a noncompetitive application process. And in that application process, we had no intentions or even awareness of the MCAA existence until it was passed in December, which was after our license was awarded.

So for all intents and purposes, when we were licensed, we were licensed with the intent to function outside of what is currently now the MCAA, knowing that it had not been passed, nor had we had any awareness of it. And so for want of, you know, understanding or knowledge of that act, for example, if it had been passed in 2023 or in 2024, we would be up in operating prior to the passage of the MCAA. It's just a matter of timing.

And because of, like I mentioned, our process starting two years prior to the MCAA becoming law, we did in fact operate up till now as a legacy operator. We've not had the privilege or the benefit of operating under the law of the MCAA, which would have been far less
strenuous, I can promise you, for getting us to this point as it relates to accomplishing, you know, a competitive licensing process.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I mean, when I think about it, the legacy operator, I'm more so thinking about these are folks in the unlicensed market and we are trying to get those folks to be licensed. And so I'm still trying to --

MR. PRITCHETT: Yeah. I think you're absolutely right. I'm sorry. I just want to make sure I can clarify, because I see exactly what you're saying. I just want to distinguish the legacy operator from I-71 legacy operator. So when we say legacy, we mean licensed prior to the MCAA as a medical cannabis operator, not as an I-71 operator.

So, for example, Alternative Solutions or Takoma Wellness Center, right, are classified as legacy operators, wherein if Takoma Wellness Center wants to apply for a cultivation and manufacturing license under the MCAA, they are allowed to do so because they were licensed prior to its passage.

And so we, in wanting to be classified as legacy operators, again, that difference
between awarded and approved would want that same ability to acquire both the manufacturing and a dispensary license because the letter under the law -- the letter of the law under which we were approved was prior to the NCAA, as was all of the constraints and hurdles that we faced to get that license or that approval.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Thanks. Any other Board member have any questions that they want to ask? All right. If you if you do, please let me know as we move forward.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, Mr.
Grandis.
MEMBER GRANDIS: May -- I don't want to interrupt your thoughts. If you want to go ahead with your --.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: No, go ahead, sir.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Good morning and we appreciate. You are coming in front of us to explain your tax situation and how you all would like to resolve the hurdles that you see going forward.
you got the highest score for, you did that as a CBE?

MR. PRITCHETT: That's correct, Board member Brandis.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Why did you do that?
MR. PRITCHETT: Because that was the -what we deemed necessary to win, number one, to have had that 50-point allocation. Number two, because we are social equity applicants. And that has been obviously verified by DSLBD and that is conducive to and indicative of who we are as an organization. And it's one of the reasons that we actually were very fervent about applying during this first social equity licensing process.

As I'm sure you know, the new social equity licensing process is very going to be very robust. But us being the first ones in the door, we wanted to be able to blaze that trail. So for a number of reasons, we applied with that CBE.

MR. KHAN: And before making this application, you already -- your entity, you already had a license, correct?

MR. PRITCHETT: No. So Renee and Andria did not have a license prior to this
licensing process. Jeffrey and Stephanie are owners of Takoma Wellness Center, which is a completely separate entity from Renee and Andria Health. The only commonality there is common ownership, and we have a strategic partnership that has allowed us to -- that was in, you know, allowed us to apply successfully. We had a very synergistic relationship, so that was the reason for that.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Right. So you had a partnership with an entity that was already in operation. Okay. So in developing your business plan, didn't you all forecast on how much money you would need to be able if the license was actually granted?

MR. PRITCHETT: That's correct.
MEMBER GRANDIS: What happened that made it that you need to come before us today, that it seems like you're not going to be able to get that money. So can you sort of explain what happened?

MR. PRITCHETT: Absolutely. So the money that we forecasted to be able to raise. There are a few different ways to raise money and it really depends on who the investors are. So
one of the reasons that we're currently raising money and haven't raised it already is because of the dilution clause and the CBE.

But an additional reason is due to the changes in the cannabis marketplace and in the economy as a whole. Obviously with the Fed raising rate hikes, it makes it a lot harder to raise money or to borrow money in this economy. The cannabis industry has also seen a significant downturn due to no fault of our own, but at a national level and in several different markets and there's been a ton of price compression and investor hesitation and apprehension around funding new businesses.

So we in our own volition, because of the asking price of some of the institutional cannabis investors, has decided to step outside of that institutional money to preserve as much of the CBE as we could and raising the money at the best possible valuation so that we could retain not only the CBE or as much of it as possible, but also to ensure that we retain our core values, our corporate structure and our -the control over our business.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Okay. And I do
understand the change in the marketplace. If you all relinquish the CBE, you are -- will relinquish the 50 points, correct?

MR. PRITCHETT: That's correct.
MEMBER GRANDIS: But if I understand what we're hearing is that even if you relinquished that, you still would be in line to receive the next step of applying for the license?

MR. PRITCHETT: So that's correct. We would receive the next step to apply for a cultivation license, but it would be strictly cultivation, whereas when we applied, it was cultivation and manufacturing that was indicated in our application, which was approved. It's been indicated in all of the materials we provided to our investors, of course, and as you mentioned, Board member Grandis, that is very predictive of the amount of money, not only that we need to raise, but we will be able to make thereby affecting our investors returns and their willingness to be a part of our business.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Did you see the importance of the district offering a mechanism to get into this marketplace by having a social
equity provision?
MR. PRITCHETT: Absolutely. I'm one of the biggest proponents. And I'm honored to be one of the first. It is a huge honor to be the first in DC. And quite frankly, very many of these programs across the country fail at their aim of creating an actual social equity application and licensing process that awards those licenses to the correct individuals and entities. And DC has done a phenomenal job of getting that right.

And I want to make sure that as we move forward, Renee and Andria and myself as an individual do everything that we can in our power to increase the sustainability of that program and to make sure that those licenses continue to go to legitimate social equity applicants.

MR. KHAN: So to do that, if I understand correctly, that's under the Small Business Administration and therefore there's a whole set of opportunities that have been carved out so that the district can be proud of having a strong social equity program going forward. Aren't you here today asking us to minimize that?

MR. PRITCHETT: So I would say no. In
terms of minimization, $I$ want to make sure I'm understanding your question correctly. So in my ask of being able to dilute and loosening in that sense, a regulation to allow a lower threshold of CBE ownership, that would, you think, negatively impact the social equity or the robustness of that program because it would invalidate that 51 percent majority?

MEMBER GRANDIS: Well, if $I$ can use the term minority. It would no longer be a majority. And isn't that sort of the foundation of what we're trying to preserve is that our residents are returning citizens. People who have been economically outside of the ability to get loans. If we don't -- that's something that we should be very proud of.

So I agree with the chairman. If you wish a change in that formula to be considered a CBE, we're not the place. But on the other hand, it just is remarkable that you've achieved what you've achieved so far and that you should continue being proud of that 51 percent and not want to become a 40 percent, because, as you know, while you have a good relationship with everyone else who has the basically 60 percent
collectively, it may not be the same people because they can share -- sell their shares, as you know, in business. And all of a sudden one day you go to a Board meeting and they buy you out forcefully.

So I think that what you're doing in coming -- in trying to work with something that will help you all get forward, could end up at the same time making, what we were, I think we all are striving for is, majority ownership so that district residents and their families, generationally can prosper here in the district.

MR. PRITCHETT: I think --
MEMBER GRANDIS: Excuse me. Go ahead.
MR. PRITCHETT: No, no, no. I just want to say thank you. I appreciate that. I am -- I want to continue championing this program. And I do think it's worth clarifying that, I think what we're aiming for is actually the opposite of weakening the restrictions, but actually strengthening them.

And I say that because I think two points. Number one, when we are divesting our equity. The 51 percent is only what's right in DC. I myself own 24.5 percent because I'm not a

DC resident, so I would be a part of that, you know, that initial 100 percent and we'd be issuing only 25 percent to other investors outside of who's already a part of Renee and Andria Health to include the Khan family.

So the other remainder outside of those who are current shareholders would only be 25 percent that we would be taking on. And additionally, those shares that we're issuing, there's a difference between those and the shares that we own, and those are Class $B$ versus Class A, And what that basically means is they have no voting rights. They have no managerial rights, they have no rights to sit on the membership Board. They are simply silent partners who have provided a certain amount of capital to allow us to raise to open our doors.

And in this allowance for dilution
that we will work, and I take your point and the chairman's point, we will absolutely work with the DSLB to craft the right regulations for this because what's necessary in all business is that you raise the money.

And we would love, absolutely love, not to have to give any equity away. That would
be my ideal dream. I want, if I could have 100 percent DC ownership, I absolutely would. But the one thing that's an uncomfortable reality, especially in capitalism, is that you've got to give them something if you want their money, and that's either you secure it through a loan or you fund it yourself, or you give them ownership. And I can tell you that every single social equity applicant to follow in our footsteps will have to do the same exact thing we are doing without exception. The very letter of the CBE law precludes us from having the necessary money to stand our operation up. And while it will be to different extents for different applicants, whereas, you know, one building may be more expensive than another, one operation may be more high end than another. In all cases there will not be a applicant who has the personal resources to fund it and they will have to dilute their shares just as we are. And we want to make sure that when that time comes, when those licensees are here, we can't -- maybe, we can't keep 51 percent, maybe because of capitalism, because we have to raise money, we can't. That's an ideal scenario.

However, we can make sure that they maintain a plurality, make sure they maintain 100 percent control of the entity by only issuing non-voting, non-managerial rights to those shares and to making sure that they have the framework that's necessary so that they can prove to be an attractive investment to those individuals that they need in order to get their business up and running.

Because as I can tell you, $I$ don't have the money for it. Most dispensaries cost between 1 million and a million and a half dollars. So everybody is going to have to do this without exception. And the goal is not to make it, you know, prohibitive so that they have to maintain 51 percent because that would really stifle the industry. But to give them the framework necessary to maintain the ideals of the social equity program of DC ownership and DC control over this industry, while still allowing the regulatory leeway and leash necessary to operate and function as a business in our district.

MEMBER GRANDIS: I want to congratulate you and the people you've been working with to
get to where you are today of getting that 212 points. That's a remarkable achievement, and I understand that. I think we all understand there are nuances that we will be learning about as we move forward on getting this important social equity embedded strongly in D.C. But we're not the people. We're not the Board that can help you today in changing that. But I think perhaps you may have models that have not been thought about and you should go ahead and try to promote that in front of the right agency that actually has the legal authority to make that decision. I want to congratulate you on what you've accomplished so far.

MR. PRITCHETT: Thank you, Board member Grandis. I appreciate that. I will be sure to do that. And to your point about making sure that we -- this social equity program is embedded in D.C., I think the first thing is to make sure that the first social equity applicants have a sustainable chance at success here and have the ability to raise the money the way that they need to, not from a dilution standpoint, but from a operation standpoint of that legacy operator status of having the intended ability to
manufacture and to dispense, as was the law when we applied.

And the other recommendation, I guess, in terms of frameworks that $I$ think could be very helpful for this social equity program and making sure that it remains heavily embedded into the district is something very unique and innovative. And it hasn't actually happened in any other market that I'm aware of.

But I think that establishing a social equity advisory commission or Board outside of ABCA that's comprised of industry experts, subject matter experts, for example, have a relationship with the chief economist in the cannabis industry who'd be happy to lend his expertise, basically just to give the Board whatever information it needs to make the decisions in regulating the industry so that it's conducive to that success.

And I have a case that I've written up I'm happy to send over, but $I$ do think it would be an incredible opportunity not only for ABCA but for the market as a whole to make sure that D.C. gets it right where most other people have gotten it wrong.

MEMBER GRANDIS: I'm sure our agency would be interested in any research that you've done to help improve our program as we move forward. And once again, I want to congratulate you on the strong work you've done.

MR. PRITCHETT: Thank you. I appreciate it. I look forward to it.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Short. You're on mute, Mr. Short.

MEMBER SHORT: Good morning, Mr. Pritchett.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Good morning, Mr. Short.

MEMBER SHORT: I would just like for you -- and you sound so ready for business and you sound so ready to make this really work.

The only question I have is, what vision do you have for long term distinct sustainability of persons like yourself in this industry in the District of Columbia. Just give us your version of a vision you have for long term. Where will we be 10, 20 years from now if what your business model does. Where will we be 10, 20 years from now, how will your company help
sustain or the sustainability of this program, which you've benefited from?

MR. PRITCHETT: That question is so exciting. I very rarely get asked about that grand vision, and I do have it. And I think it's necessary as an operator in this space. So I can tell you my goal for D.C. is for it to be the flagship not only for this country but for the world as to what cannabis ownership, diversity, equity and inclusion and sustainable proactive social equity programming can create in this industry.

And that means a robust set of rules and regulations that allow for smaller operators like myself to thoroughly thrive and flourish in this industry. And that requires a sense of partnership between those who regulate the businesses and those who run the businesses.

And I can tell you in every other industry, the professionals or the subject matter experts have a seat at the table and they influence policy not because they have an agenda, but because it's necessary. I don't expect anybody in a regulatory framework to be an expert on my industry. It's my job to be the industry
expert, to be a business professional. And that goes the same for everybody who looks like me, who wants to become a part of this.

And that's why it's so, so important that we are involved in the process of regulation, because in order for us to understand the consequences and the implications of all the regulations that are enacted, we have to know what the people who are living through and dealing with the implications of those regulations are actually seeing in the marketplace.

So what I see in the next 10 years, if we can get this thing done right and if we can get the right people with the right framework and the right opportunity into this industry, we're going to create one of the most diverse cannabis industries in the world because of where the district is situated, because of its political reputation, obviously, and its prestige as the nation's capital, we have an unprecedented opportunity to show the rest of the country who is, as I mentioned, frequently failed at getting the licenses into the right people's hands to promote that diversity, equity and inclusion to
show them what it can look like if you do it right.

And I want to be that trailblazer. I want to be that person that plants that flag in the ground. And I am willing to do any and everything in working with ABCA and any other agency in the district, including DSLB, to make sure that the framework that we commit to is conducive to everybody who comes behind me.

Because I can tell you as a young black man and trying to raise 5, 6, $\$ 7$ million, the hurdles that exist just in the marketplace are high enough. So, you know, we want to make sure that the hurdles that exist in the regulatory framework are necessary but still effective without being overly burdensome. And that really is the core of making sure that the industry is sustainable.

Because I can tell you in most states and in most territories, regulatory bodies don't talk to industry experts. It's a very anti-business mentality with the policy that's developed. And that's why you see, and I can tell you when I spoke with The Economist, only 25 percent of all cannabis businesses in this
country are right now profitable.
That is not a number that exists in any other industry. And there's a reason for that. And that has to do with the way it's regulated. It has to do with the way that the licenses are allocated, and it has to do with the lack of dialogue between, as I mentioned, those who run the businesses and those who regulate the businesses because we're on the same side.

I think the Board would agree you want to see this industry flourish just as much as I do. You want to see just as many social equity applicants in this industry doing and creating value and generational wealth for the district and for their descendants the same way I do. And I think we're partners in that mission, and I think we owe it to each other and to everybody who's going to come after us to make sure that we put that framework in place to make sure they have the best possible chance at success. So that's what $I$ see in the next 10 years.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Thank you, Mr.
Pritchett. That's all I have. Mr. Chair, thank you very much for your answer, sir.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.

Thank you.
MEMBER HANSEN: I just have one add on. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Go ahead. Go ahead, Ms. Hansen.

MEMBER HANSEN: That's down the road.
And I know that this conversation is ongoing, but what are your plans for the immediate term and what do you -- you've raised this money so far. So what are your next steps right now?

MR. PRITCHETT: Love it. So yesterday we had a meeting with our general contractor partner who also serves as our project manager. And so they've given us everything we need to essentially move forward for pre-construction. So we, in the near future, see ourselves, once we work with the DSLB to make sure that CBE is guaranteed and not invalidated so we don't lose those points.

And hopefully once the Board, you know, allows u to have that legacy operator status, we've already priced out a lot of the manufacturing equipment that we'll need for our facility. So we want to get the ball rolling. We're really eager. We're really excited to not only show the district, but to show the world
what it is we can do as you know, one of the very few social equity applicants who have been licensed effectively in this country.

So our goal and our next steps are really, we are anticipating once we work with DSLB, that the money, the $\$ 5$ million that we're anticipating, which has already been verbally committed, will be in within the next 30 days or so. And then at that point, it's just a matter of paying to have boots on the ground for our MEP engineers and getting the facility retrofitted. And that is very exciting.

Like I said, we met with our
contractor yesterday and they gave us a very robust launch plan to get that done. So we're super excited to be a part of not only this industry but a part of the district and to be able to give back not only to those who look like us, but to the community at large.

MEMBER HANSEN: Thank you. Thank you for your time.

MR. PRITCHETT: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I mean, the only
correction I want to make on the record is that the problem that we're facing now with your
application, we're never going to face that issue again because we no longer have scoring. But if we -- but not for the scoring, there might be other issues regarding qualifying as a social equity.

But the issue that we have here is the score and the 50 point that you got from DSLB. That's what puts you at the top of the scale and they gave you 50 points. And I don't recall what number two -- the number two score was. But with the new law, you would still qualify for a license.

But as I said, as you pointed out, you want to be considered as a legacy operator. And so therefore, there are certain benefits that are attributable to if you qualify the legacy application. I'm not sure if the Board would necessarily agree with your description, but that's a matter of further interpretation. But that's the problem that we have.

Now, do you have any idea when, because it appears that no matter what -- it doesn't -- whatever decision at the Board would make today, that's not really going to change. Okay. So the Board agreed that they would
support your application. Okay. But what does that mean? Because we're not the ones who determine that you're CBE with the 50 points. That's a that's a different agency.

So whether or not if we say that, okay fine we support. But if DSLB comes and say that you're no longer a CBE, then you're going to lose that 50 points. So I'm not quite sure. I mean, in reviewing the letter that you sent to us, I had a different interpretation at a different date.

I thought more so that you came to us to say, this is what we're going to do and we're asking the Board to interpret the law in a certain way so we could still qualify, but I'm not sure.

I mean we'll talk this further with the other Board members. We'll speak to director, speak to our legal office, but I'm not quite sure what, if anything, that the Board can do regarding the 50 points and how and whether or not dilution from 51 to 40 percent, if we can rule that you're still a CBE and so therefore you're still qualified for that 50 points.

And so once since if you qualify for
that 50 points of being the highest rated application, then we can go into that second analysis whether or not we agree with your interpretation of that you are a legacy operator so therefore, you should be able to virtually integrate and also apply for a manufacturer's license.

But you are aware that you can apply for a -- if you're not a social equity -- social equity applicants can apply currently for a manufacturer's license. And if you are not a social equity, you can also apply for, as of August 29th, you can apply for a manufacturer's license.

So you are aware of that irrespective of all of this. So whether that you have a license or not you can apply for -- and even if you're not a social equity, you can apply for a manufacturer's license on August -- as of August 29th, 2023. Okay. Any other comments you want to make before $I$ bring this hearing to a close?

MR. PRITCHETT: Yep. So I'll just say
that I am aware that we can apply for that license under, you know, regardless of whether or not we're considered a CBE. I don't foresee us
having an issue with being classified not as a medical cannabis CBE. As I mentioned, DSLB has already expressed their openness in working with us to make sure that the correct regulations are crafted so that a CBE isn't -- CBE isn't needlessly invalidated because of regular business practices.

And so I don't think that that will be an issue as as qualifying for the points that we've received. However, the -- I guess the main consideration that we would ask here or that we are most concerned with and that can help us with is that legacy operator status, because as I mentioned, that's how we apply. That was our intent. It's been indicated in everything that we've submitted up to this point.

And I think to exclude the only social equity applicants to be licensed to this point from that, and to allow all of the multistate operators who, because they got their license maybe a year or two before we did that, they get to vertically integrate simply because they in proximity or in time chronologically, they were able to get their license earlier, $I$ just think that would be a bit of a travesty, right, to know
that we have an opportunity to really do something great and to make this mean something especially for those social equity applicants who are coming after.

So I appreciate the Board's time 100 percent. I'm grateful for your questions and for your receptivity in our conversation and our hearing today. And I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to make my case in front of you.

And I do hope that as we move forward, as you mentioned when we first met, that you all will have my back as a social equity licensee and as we move forward to make sure that we can make not only the program, but D.C. the best medical cannabis market, that's been seen not only in this industry, in this country, but in the world as a whole.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: No, it's -- you have left us a lot to think about. As I said before, I came into based on the letters that you wrote to the agency. I came into the hearing thinking one way. But then I left based on the act now.

MR. PRITCHETT: Right.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: The act is now
different from what I thought it was based on your written correspondence.

The last Thing I'd like to say, Chairman Anderson, $I$ just want to make sure that I express to you all that $I$ want to make myself available. So if you ever have questions, if you need to contact me, you have my information. I'm open to any and all conversation that's necessary to further flesh this out, because as you mentioned, I put a lot on you today.

It is a lot. And it's something that we live with every day. It's how we operate and it's a part of our industry and the nature of our business. So I don't expect, you know, you to pick it up and run with it the same way that we would. And that's why I want to make sure that we maintain an open dialogue as much as is necessary or you feel that you need to to to hear from us. I'm happy to provide any and all necessary supplementary complementary information.

And as I mentioned, the idea for a social equity advisory commission or advisory Board I think is a huge opportunity for us. So if you ever have any need for additional
clarification or clarity, please, please, please reach out to me.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you. All right. Thank you very much for your presentation today. As I said before, the Board will take it under consideration. It is not clear to the Board what it is that you are requesting.

And but as I said before, it's a two-step process. We do not control the definition of what a CBE is. And if you're considered CBE, I'm open to your creative interpretation of the law, what you believe that you should qualify as a legacy operator. That is something that we would discuss. We look at the law as it existed at the time, the law that we currently have to see if that's the interpretation, if our interpretation of the law equals your interpretation of the law. And I believe that the Board and the agency will do whatever we can do to support this industry.

But the first question, though, is regarding the CBE. And if the DSLB determines that if you're -- if you dilute the share, you're no longer qualify, then that ties our hands
because that drops you to 162 and then you would have to. I'm not saying you'd be eligible. I mean, prior to the change in the law, I would say, sorry, good luck and pick up. You wouldn't qualify for a license.

But under the new emergency
legislation, you do qualify for a license under -- even if you were to have lost the 50--50 point preference. Unfortunately, as you said, you wouldn't get some of the -- more of the social equity benefits of being -- of receiving, being approved initially. But we'll take this matter under advisement and we will advise you as soon as possible what our decision is. Thank you for being here. The Khans, good morning. Have a great day.

MEMBER HANSEN: Thank you.
MR. PRITCHETT: Thank you, chairman
Anderson. Thank you, ABCA Board.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.
Thank you.
All right. $I$ have one - all right.
So we conclude our calendar for the morning.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:47 a.m.)
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