

March 24, 2026

Honorable Members of the Lake County Board of Supervisors:

I respectfully request that Agenda Item 26-0207, authorizing the Probation Department to apply for Proposition 64 Cohort 4 funding, be removed from the consent calendar and continued to a future meeting, rather than heard the same day, so that a complete and detailed staff report and all supporting materials can be properly agendaized and included in the agenda packet with adequate time for Board and public review.

As currently presented, the item provides only a high-level summary indicating that Probation and the Community Development Department (CDD) are collaborating on an application, with an anticipated allocation of more than 70% of funds toward public safety and enforcement and the remainder toward youth programming.

However, the agenda materials do not include a defined statement of need, project description, scope of activities, budget detail, or explanation of how the proposed program specifically addresses cannabis-related public health and safety impacts, which are central to the statutory purpose of the grant.

This lack of detail raises concern that the public and the Board do not have sufficient information to meaningfully evaluate or comment on the proposed action. Providing only a general authorization without substantive program information may create potential Brown Act concerns, as the public is not adequately informed of the nature and implications of the decision before the Board.

While the staff report references a narrow application window, it is important to note that the existence of a state-imposed deadline—particularly one that has been known for some time—does not override the responsibility of departments to provide sufficient information to the Board and the public in advance of consideration.

The need to meet a deadline should not come at the expense of transparency or informed decision-making. Additionally, the memorandum indicates that the lead agency has shifted from CDD in Cohort 3 to Probation for Cohort 4 due to grant requirements.

While this may be appropriate from an eligibility standpoint, it introduces important questions that are not addressed in the staff report. Specifically, it is unclear how the proposed activities align with Probation's core responsibilities, and how implementation authority and accountability will be structured between Probation and CDD if both departments are substantially involved.

Where the lead agency does not appear to be the primary program implementer, there is a risk of misalignment with grant requirements related to organizational capacity and program delivery, which could affect both compliance and competitiveness.

I would also respectfully note that, historically, youth programming has received a relatively smaller share of cannabis-related funding under the County's allocation practices. Given that youth prevention and intervention is a core purpose area of the Proposition 64 grant program, it would be preferable for any awarded funds to be directed toward clearly defined and evidence-based youth programs that are specifically identified in advance and aligned with the intent of the grant.

From a legal and procedural standpoint, approving an application of this magnitude without a defined program description, funding allocations, or implementation structure raises concern that the Board may be making a discretionary decision without adequate disclosure of the underlying project.

Courts have consistently emphasized that agenda descriptions must provide sufficient detail to inform the public of the substance of the action being taken. Where key elements of a program are undefined at the time of approval, there is a risk that the action could be viewed as a pre-commitment to a project without proper transparency, potentially implicating both Brown Act notice requirements and broader principles of informed decision-making.

Finally, I would respectfully note a broader procedural concern. This item appears to follow a pattern of last-minute actions brought forward without sufficient supporting information, limiting the Board's ability to exercise informed oversight and the public's ability to participate meaningfully in the decision-making process.

In this instance, the State has encouraged applicants to submit proposals well in advance of the deadline; however, this item is being presented to the Board less than one week prior to the application deadline and without the basic program details necessary for review.

Given the significance of a potential \$4.5 million grant application, it would be prudent to ensure that the proposal is fully developed, properly agendaized, and transparently presented prior to authorization.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that this item be removed from the consent calendar and returned with a more detailed staff report that includes:

- A clear statement of the specific cannabis-related public health and safety needs being addressed;
- A defined program description and scope of activities;
- A breakdown of the proposed allocation of funds;
- Clarification of roles and responsibilities between Probation and CDD; and

- An explanation of how the proposal aligns with the intent and requirements of the Proposition 64 grant program.

In addition, all supporting materials should be properly included in the agenda packet with sufficient time in advance of the hearing to allow the public and the Board to review and provide meaningful comment consistent with the requirements of the Brown Act.

Thank you for your consideration and for your continued service to Lake County.

Respectfully submitted,

--

Sky Laiwa

Executive Vice President & Director of Operations

Pillsbury Family Farms Inc.