



# Office of Cannabis Management

**KATHY HOCHUL**

Governor

**TREMAINE WRIGHT**

Cannabis Control Board Chair

**JESSICA GARCIA**

Board Member

**HOPE KNIGHT**

Board Member

**ADAM W. PERRY**

Board Member

**JENNIFER GILBERT JENKINS**

Board Member

**CHRIS ALEXANDER**

Executive Director

## Meeting Minutes

<b>Title:</b>	New York State Cannabis Control Board Meeting
<b>Time &amp; Date:</b>	February 16, 2024 at 11:00 AM
<b>Location:</b>	Hudson Valley Community College, Bulmer Telecommunications Center (BTC), Meeting Rooms 1-3, 80 Vandenberg Avenue, Troy, NY 12180, SUNY Morrisville, Charlton Hall, Room 104, 80 Eaton St., Morrisville, NY 13408, 181 Ellicott St., Buffalo, NY 14203, and Virtual via Webcast

## Attendance

<b>Board Chair:</b>	Tremaine Wright
<b>Board Members Present:</b>	Jessica Garcia, Hope Knight
<b>Board Members Present (virtually):</b>	Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins, Adam W. Perry
<b>Board Members Absent:</b>	N/A
<b>Others Present:</b>	Chris Alexander, Linda Baldwin, Damian Fagon, John Kagia

## Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Welcome and Opening Remarks
- III. Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 29, 2023 and January 12, 2024 Board Meetings
- IV. Consideration of Adult-Use Cannabis Licenses
- V. Consideration of Cannabis Research Licenses
- VI. Consideration of Proposed Adult-Use Home Cultivation Regulations
- VII. Consideration of Proposed Adult-Use Cannabis Regulation Amendments
- VIII. Consideration of Medical Cannabis Regulation Amendments
- IX. Consideration of Adult-Use Application Window Opening
- X. Consideration of Conditional Processor Relocation
- XI. Executive Director Report
- XII. Public Comment
- XIII. Adjourn



# Office of Cannabis Management

## Action Items

<b>Resolution No. 2024-53:</b>	Resolution to Issue Certain Adult-Use Cannabis Licenses.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
<b>Resolution No. 2024-54:</b>	Resolution to Issue Certain Cannabis Research Licenses.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
<b>Resolution No. 2024-55:</b>	Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to File Certain Proposed Personal Home Cultivation of Cannabis Regulations.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
<b>Resolution No. 2024-56:</b>	Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to File Certain Amendments to Adult-Use Regulations.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
<b>Resolution No. 2024-57:</b>	Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to Adopt the Revised Medical Cannabis Regulations.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
<b>Resolution No. 2024-58:</b>	Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to Open Application Period for Certain Adult-Use License Types.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
<b>Resolution No. 2024-59:</b>	Resolution to Approve Relocation Request of Certain Adult-Use Conditional Processor Licensees.	Passed, Unanimous Vote

## Notes & Comments

- Chair Wright stated that today they are prepared to approve the first non-conditional adult-use cannabis licenses in New York State, and that this moment has been a long time in the making and they assure you it only represents the beginning. She commented that the Office of Cannabis Management (“OCM” or “the Office”) has been diligently working to prepare as many applications as possible for consideration and that the Cannabis Control Board (“CCB” or “Board”) will continue to approve additional licenses at future board meetings. She further commented that the Conditional Adult-Use Retail Dispensary (“CAURD”) program is back on track and licensees are opening stores. She noted that there are now over 70 cannabis dispensaries opened and operational throughout this State.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Adam Perry, and a second from Board Member Jessica Garcia, the Minutes of the December 29, 2023 Cannabis Control Board Meeting were approved unanimously.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Hope Knight, and a second from Board Member Jessica Garcia, the Minutes of the January 12, 2024 Cannabis Control Board Meeting were approved unanimously.
- Chris Alexander, Executive Director for OCM, provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-53, a Resolution to Issue Certain Adult-Use Cannabis Licenses. These applications are from the application window that opened on October 4, 2023 and closed on December 18, 2023. The applicants include retail dispensaries, microbusinesses, cultivators, processors and distributors. Overall, nearly 7,000 applications were received by the Office. The applications being recommended for approval today is the first cohort of the adult-use cannabis licenses from this window that will be considered for approval.



## Office of Cannabis Management

- Board Member Jessica Garcia asked Chris Alexander if he could speak on the enforcement review of all the licensed applicants that they are voting on today.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that every applicant for licensure has to submit fingerprints for background checks while previous drug convictions do not disqualify an applicant. He further commented that they do have a requirement to guard against licensing individuals who have been convicted of fraud or employment related offenses.
- Linda Baldwin, General Counsel for OCM, commented that in the event that they do become aware of information that they didn't have at the time of the review, they can always go back and take another look to make sure that the licensee meets the qualifications for the license.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins asked if they have now removed that cap on the number of licenses, and that they are now doing rolling applications.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that there is not a cap on the number of licenses, there was an approximate number provided previously, and before the application window opened of the non-provisional licenses that will be awarded, just for that particular group was the number that the Office was advancing to the Board to consider.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins commented that she wanted to make sure that there is no number, that you can have a target, and that is fine, but there is no top number and that they need to make sure that the public knows that there is no top number, and that they will continue to review.
- Chair Wright asked what types of products are proposed to be processed by the people who are presented to them today.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that they have seen beverages, tinctures, vapes and other concentrates.
- Board Member Jessica Garcia commented that she wanted to commend the agency staff for all the work and getting to where they are today, and she knows that they can always go faster but there is a lot of work involved.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins, and a second from Board Member Hope Knight, Resolution No. 2024-53, a Resolution to Issue Certain Adult-Use Cannabis Licenses, was approved unanimously.

- Chris Alexander, Executive Director for OCM, provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-54, a Resolution to Issue Certain Cannabis Research Licenses. Pursuant to Section 38 of the Cannabis Law, the Board has the authority to approve and license individuals interested in conducting research with cannabis and cannabis related products. Cannabis research licensees may produce, process, purchase and/or possess cannabis for research purposes. This opens the door to conduct more intentional scientific studies that will expand the understanding of the cannabis plant. The following individuals have applied to OCM to be cannabis research licensees:
  - OCM-RSCHAPP-23-0002 (Nedrow, NY)
  - OCM-RSCHAPP-23-0004 (Buffalo, NY)
- The Office has reviewed the applications for project quality, study design, value, and impact and believes the applicants have the appropriate expertise and infrastructure to successfully



## Office of Cannabis Management

perform the proposed research. If approved today, these two applicants will become New York State's (NYS) first Cannabis Research Licensees.

- Chair Wright asked what type of research is being proposed under these two licenses.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that they are different activities, both focused on cultivation.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins, and a second from Board Member Jessica Garcia, Resolution No. 2024-54, a Resolution to Issue Certain Cannabis Research Licenses, was approved unanimously.

- John Kagia, the Director of Policy for OCM, provided an overview on the proposed Adult-Use Home Cultivation Regulations. In the Marijuana Regulation and Taxation Act (MRTA), the Board is required to establish regulations permitting adult-use home cultivation within 18 months of the first adult-use sale of cannabis in the State.
  - These proposed regulations would amend the existing Personal Home Cultivation of Medical Cannabis Regulations currently in effect to allow adults 21 and older in NYS the ability to cultivate a small number of cannabis plants at home. The law allows each adult to cultivate up to six plants, provided no more than 12 plants are permitted per household.
  - These amendments would authorize the personal cultivation of adult-use cannabis at or in a private residence and would also authorize the sales of immature medical and adult-use cannabis plants by licensed adult-use dispensaries, microbusinesses, registered organizations (ROs), RONDs and RODs.
  - Pursuant to the State Administrative Procedure Act, these proposed amendments are subject to a 60-day public comment period.
- Board Member Jessica Garcia asked what the education components were going to look like.
- John Kagia commented that it is going to include several components, one is helping the public understand the rules, a maximum of three immature and three mature plants per person, and a maximum of six immature and six mature plants per household. He further commented that it will help folks understand where they can source the inputs for their cultivation and how that is going to be covered, and it is going to help folks both at the community level and household level to understand the rules around odor management.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that he would also add and emphasize the municipal education. He further commented that they did provide quite a bit of resources for patients interested in medical cultivation home cultivation when they authorized that activity, but they have continued to work with municipalities, work with their state partners, to ensure that both tenants have certain restrictions around their personal cultivation and folks in certain communities have as much information about what is allowed and what is not allowed.
- Chair Wright asked if there are any significant departures or differences between the medical and what they are being presented with today.
- John Kagia commented that the biggest difference is who gets to do it and that they tried to make this as aligned as possible partly because they did not want it to create two different regulatory frameworks and the medical rules really were a great template for them to follow, it is now just extended most of those authorizations to any adult over the age of 21.



## Office of Cannabis Management

- Chair Wright asked to confirm that today they are asking for the ability to file these, they are not actually taking effect.
  - John Kagia commented that this is going to go through the public comment process.
  - Chair Wright asked how long they will have to make comments.
  - John Kagia responded 60 days.
  - Upon a motion from Board Member Hope Knight, and a second from Board Member Jessica Garcia, Resolution No. 2024-55, a Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to File Certain Proposed Personal Home Cultivation of Cannabis Regulations, was approved unanimously.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-56, a Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to File Certain Amendments to Adult-Use Regulations. These proposed regulations would amend the existing Adult-Use Regulations currently in effect. The proposed amendments include certain technical changes to the social and economic equity provisions to conform with the Cannabis Law, minor clarifying changes to the municipal provisions on measuring requirements by clarifying exclusive use buildings for houses of worship and schools and would remove references to pesticides. Pursuant to the State Administrative Procedure Act, these proposed amendments are subject to a 60-day public comment period. The Office anticipates needing to continue to edit and amend the adult-use regulations as the adult-use market rolls out and new information becomes available.
  - Board Member Jessica Garcia asked if this will be sufficiently adding clarity to municipalities on their role in approving or denying locations to applicants.
  - Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that they are just making sure that it is consistent with their own restrictions as they apply and evaluate locations and that municipalities were already using exclusive use as their determining standard.
  - Chair Wright asked if this mimics what they see in the SLA.
  - Executive Director Chris Alexander responded yes.
  - Upon a motion from Board Member Jessica Garcia, and a second from Board Member Hope Knight, Resolution No. 2024-56, a Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to File Certain Amendments to Adult-Use Regulations, was approved unanimously.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-57, a Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to Adopt the Revised Medical Cannabis Regulations. The proposed medical cannabis regulation amendments were originally approved by the CCB to be filed for public comment at the July 19, 2023 Board meeting. The proposed amendments make changes to harmonize certain ownership provisions and packaging and labeling provisions between the adult-use regulations and the medical regulations, among other changes. The proposed amendments completed a public comment process where the Office is recommending that no changes be made to the proposed medical cannabis regulations.



## Office of Cannabis Management

- Upon a motion from Board Member Jessica Garcia, and a second from Board Member Hope Knight, Resolution No. 2024-57, a Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to Adopt the Revised Medical Cannabis Regulations, was approved unanimously.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-58, a Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to Open Application Period for Certain Adult-Use License Types. Adult-Use Conditional Cultivator (“AUCC”) and Adult-Use Conditional Processor (“AUCP”) licensees that are in good standing with the Office and did not apply to transition to a non-conditional license in the previous Adult-Use application cycle will have the opportunity to do so within a limited window determined by the Office. AUCC and AUCP conditional licenses expire in June 2024. This window is the last opportunity to apply to transition. Additionally, businesses interested in the Type 3 Processor license (brand license) and those who have a Processor license and want to apply for a Distributor license will have the opportunity to apply. The Office will be providing additional information on the opening of these license types soon including an exact date when the applications will open.
- Chair Wright asked if this application window is specifically for those who are already licensed under conditional adult-use generally, with the exception of those persons who may want to do a small processing license, which is a Type 3, and Type 3 is not actually just limited to branding, is it.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that it is branding and packaging. He further commented that the smaller processing license does not include extraction or infusion techniques, those are required Type 2 or Type 1 licenses.
- Chair Wright asked if a small processor fits under Type 2.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander responded no; it is the techniques being used that distinguish the three.
- Chair Wright asked where the designated small processor fits into the processing licenses that they have identified.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that it is really divorcing from the size piece and focusing on the activity. He further commented that there are folks who are larger who are engaged in heavy extraction and other techniques of creating products, but really it is distinguishing between the types of certifications needed for the activity.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins asked if she wanted to make icing for a cake, she would get the Type 3 license, and she would work with a Type 2 license to get the extract to put into her icing, so she is not plant touching but she can still process and make products.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander responded yes, and you can provide your recipe for your icing to that processor, and they can just make it for you.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins commented that that is different and that she does not want the Type 2 person to make it for her, she wants to make it with her proprietary ingredients and wants to just get the extract from them to be able to make her product.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that you will need the Type 2 if you are going to be the one making the product yourself.
- Chair Wright asked to be clear, at this time they do not have a space for the identified small processor.



## Office of Cannabis Management

- John Kagia commented that the Type 1 processor has full scope authorizations, you can buy the biomass from a cultivator, do the processing, create the extracts. The Type 2 processor can buy the extracted oils from a Type 1 processor and then do the infusions themselves. The Type 3 processor, the white label license, is suited for folks that have formulations that they want to make.
- Chair Wright asked what the price on the Type 2 processing is and where does their small processor fit into this.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that Type 2 and Type 3 says \$4,000 for the license fee, not the application fee.
- Chair Wright asked what the price for the distribution license is.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that it is \$500.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Hope Knight, and a second from Board Member Jessica Garcia, Resolution No. 2024-58, a Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to Open Application Period for Certain Adult-Use License Types, was approved unanimously.

- Chair Wright provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-59, a Resolution to Approve Relocation Request of Certain Adult-Use Conditional Processor Licensees. In accordance with Section 120.18(d)(1)(iii) of the Adult-Use Regulations and Cannabis Law Section 68-c(5), the Board must consider whether to approve an amendment or change to the cannabis business address or a change in the location of a licensee's licensed activities. Veterans Holdings, Inc, OCM-AUCP-22-000012, has submitted to the Office a request to move processing locations and has supplied the Office with all required information to relocate processing activities including the completion of a Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) audit of the new location. The Office is recommending the approval this relocation.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Hope Knight, and a second from Board Member Jessica Garcia, Resolution No. 2024-59, a Resolution to Approve Relocation Request of Certain Adult-Use Conditional Processor Licensees, was approved unanimously.

- Executive Director Chris Alexander, Damian Fagon, Chief Equity Officer for OCM, and John Kagia, Director of Policy for OCM, provided the following Executive Director report.
  - Licensing Updates
    - The Office received over 6,800 adult-use applications. Applications are sorted into groups based on equity status, provisional status, and license type. The review order is determined through a random process to ensure fairness.
    - The application review process includes several steps: general eligibility, location review, True Party of Interest review, Social and Economic Equity review, background checks, and fingerprinting. The NY Business Exchange (NYBE) dashboard provides real-time application updates.
    - The CCB approves and awards all adult-use applications. Once the application is approved and the licensing fee has been paid, the Office will issue a license certificate, which includes the official license number. The license number is the authorization to begin legal cannabis activities. Today, the Board approved 109 final licenses.



## Office of Cannabis Management

- Social and Economic Equity (SEE) Applicants
  - o Applicants who wish to receive SEE status also completed an application for SEE certification. The Office received over 4,000 applications for SEE status and has begun to review approximately 670 SEE applications with over 200 applicants SEE certified to date.
  - o Applicants who successfully qualify as SEE receive reduced application fees and licensing fees. Extra priority applicants are given extra priority.
  - o Applicants wishing to receive assistance on their corrections process can contact the Office for one-on-one support through the Technical Assistance Providers (TAPS).
  - o Over two-thirds of all adult-use licenses issued today by the Board was awarded to SEE owned businesses.
  - o Today, 60% of the first microbusiness licenses awarded in NYS went to SEE owned businesses.
  - o A full 85% of adult-use retail dispensary licenses issued today were awarded to SEE owned businesses.
- New York Craft Cannabis
  - o Senate Bill S8084A (Conditional Cultivator Bill): Such mentorship program shall be directed to train individuals interested in becoming licensed cultivators and shall leverage remote and in-person mentees with experience in agriculture business management, sustainable cannabis cultivation, and best practices.
  - o Today, 15 graduates of Cannabis Compliance Training and Mentorship (CCTM) were granted the first adult-use microbusiness licenses in NYS.
  - o Legacy to Legal is being realized.
- Market Updates
  - o There are 70 retail dispensaries now open across NYS.
  - o \$183 million in legal cannabis has been sold to date.
  - o Cannabis Grower Showcases (CGS) generated \$9.2 million in sales.
  - o Nearly four million units of cannabis products were sold in 2023. Edibles led unit sales, with nearly one million units sold, closely followed by flower and pre-rolls.
  - o There are nearly 600 unique strains available.
- Chair Wright asked what the mandate from the Office is for blackening out the windows of the retail stores.
- John Kagia commented that the restriction is around the visibility of product in the store, not visibility into the store.
- Chair Wright asked what the mandate from the Office is regarding destroying artwork that may exist near the spaces.
- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that the rules require that the exterior design does not have any graphics that are attractive to children.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins asked what the telephone number is to contact the office.





## Office of Cannabis Management

- Executive Director Chris Alexander commented that he would get the telephone number.
- Members of the public were provided the opportunity to address the CCB during the Public Comment period. Participating individuals must limit their remarks to two minutes and remarks should be related to agenda items. Public Comments are listed in Appendix A.
- The CCB adjourned the meeting.



**Appendix A**

**NYS Cannabis Control Board 2/16/2024 Meeting – Public Comment**

	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Organization (If Applicable)</b>	<b>Public Comment</b>
1.	Eli	Enzensperger		Hello, I just wanna say hi to the board and thank you. I want a CAURD license in April, and it's been a learning experience and say, it's probably been the hardest year of my life, and I went to prison. I just appreciate everything you guys have done. I know it's a hard job, and there's a lot of criticism. I wanted to be somebody to stand up and say something positive about the whole thing, that this has been a long road, and that it takes time and energy that you guys have all put into this to make this happen, and to get to the point where you can start releasing the regular licenses. Everything before this was pre rollout. This is the rollout. So thank you.
2.	Pete	Longo	Longos Legacy LLC	Members of the Cannabis Control Board. I'm here today to express my deep concerns and respectfully ask for your help in addressing critical issues regarding the current state and direction of the cannabis licensing process. My name is Pete Longo and I'm the owner of Longos Legacy LLC. We've submitted an application for a nonprovisional retail license. My journey at this point has been difficult, urgent, and costly, unnecessarily so, and I'm probably one of the lucky ones it involved negotiating of commercial real estate lease in a remarkable short span of 2 weeks, a task that typically could take months. This effort was fueled by the understanding as supported by the OCM FAQs released just days before the application window open and initial communications throughout the application process, indicating that having site control would result in an application being prioritized. So my team pushed, and I signed my lease a mere hours before the application window, close driven by the fact that my business isn't just a side project or hobby. It's my livelihood. We pushed, knowing, knowing and appreciating the fact that those CDI's and SEE applicants would have priority, and hoping that our efforts to obtain site control would be enough to secure us one of the remaining 1,000 licenses at stake. And we were encouraged at the Cannabis Advisory Board meeting on December 12, 2023. It was stated that even more licenses might be awarded, however, then we heard rumors of only 250 provisional licenses being available. This information came from just one letter to the editor and a brief clip on a local news station. So we tried not to



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				worry and continue to invest thousands of dollars into, to ensure. So to ensure we'd be ready when the OCM was so, when confirmation that merely just 250 licenses would be given to the more than a thousand applicants who pushed just like us have left this bewildered and discouraged. Therefore I, like many others, and seeking clarification on why this number had been drastically reduced, and the process of selecting applications so dramatically change. Except this change affects not only potential licensees, but also the broader implications for the market and community at large, understanding the rationale behind this decision is crucial for all stakeholders involved, and with greatly aid in the maintaining and maintaining a sense of transparency and trust in the process. Many of us have been part of this legacy for years, and don't want to continue in realms of smoke shops or legal dispensaries. We are responsible operators, eager to transition into a legal framework.
3.	Paul	Suits	LakeHouse Cannabis	First, I just want to congratulate those awarded any licenses today. The Lake House team is genuinely happy for you. Through a simple search is worth pointing out that 2 of these awarded retail licenses formed their companies in the last week of November seventeenth application deadline. Application 1,456 was formed on November 13th. It was on a queue as Number 26. Applicant, 2,026 was formed on November 15th. It was on a queue is 13. We've been a company since 2021 and applied on October 4th, and we were applicant number 62. Now we're coincidentally in a lottery as 2,026. You have to understand how this feels in our shoes. And I want to implore you to please listen to Dr. Gilbert Jenkins on her mention of the 250. That is not something OCM employees are allowed to set. That is at the Board's authority. I don't know where it's coming from that certain people have that authority. It is completely unfair to get people invested after 3 years, and then tell them. Hold on, Nope. Never mind.
4.	Trent	Paskins	Happy Goat Dispensary	Hi, there! I'd like to start off like the first speaker, and I want to thank you guys. I'm a CAURD licensee. I'm 30 years deep in this industry, and my entire family has suffered for that. I am part of legacy. I'm a cultivator. I'm a master cultivator. I've been part of 5 rollouts in 5 different States. And what Chris was talking about this balancing technique. If we don't do this, we're gonna be like Colorado. Okay, people are out of jobs. People don't have money there in the cannabis industry. What you guys don't understand is there is a balancing technique. We can't put



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>out because we had a lot of cultivators backed up. We can't put out a bunch of dispensaries right away. It doesn't work like that as good as it sounds to everybody. It doesn't work like that. I'm not here for myself. I'm here for my good friend that's Dominican. He's from Corona Queens, and he's got no help. I look at all the social equity stuff going on there. There's no contact for him. He's not able to be here because he lives 3 hours away, and he's a single father, and he's got a job. But he's he gets no feedback from the OCM. He's got nobody to contact, and I'm the only person here that's trying to put out his voice form because he can't be here. So I love the numbers are up there. They they're excited. Okay, this is unique. What we did here in New York, this social equity, this CAURD licensing. You can discredit it all you want. But we're the first people to do this all right, and to give these guys as much crap as you guys do, for that is entirely wrong of you. If you guys were part of this industry as long as I have been, you would understand what they are doing is amazing. But do not forget about these social equity people because right now my friend has nobody to contact. And, Chris, I know you know me. We've talked to before. You're amazing. I've always complimented you. Okay. But right now my friend needs help, and I'm hoping that somebody contacts comes to me after this and gives me a contact for him for the social equity program, because he hits all the markers except for the veteran, and he should not be left alone there. Okay, I have my own issues, my own problems. I'm not gonna do that today. I'm not telling you guys about that. But I want you guys to know you guys are doing the right thing. Okay? Regardless of what everybody says. Thank you very much.</p>
5.	Charles	Robinson	Hold Up Roll Up	<p>Yeah, it's funny you should say that because I'm gonna piggyback on what he just said. I read the article a couple of weeks ago where your boss said she wasn't happy about the job you're doing. Once I read that article that she's not happy about the job you're doing, you are doing. I realize the job you are doing, you're doing it right. Why are you doing it right? Because she's being pressured by her big donor lists that donor list that contributed to her campaign in the beginning. So when she said your job was, the rollout was slow, and y'all wasn't doing. No, you're doing a fine job. Yes, you are. You're doing a great job, you, the only ones that's supposed to. Please everybody. No, you can't please everybody. It's not the way it works. It's just not the way it works. You're doing a</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>fine job. Keep up the hard work, keep up the good work, and keep up the energy that you're putting forth to make sure the foundation of this whole industry is strong. I'm a carpenter, by nature, and as a carpenter, I understand any building that you build the most important part of that building is the foundation. If the foundation is weak, everything after that is going to be weak. If the foundation is strong, everything after that is going to be strong. So you're doing a great job. Keep up the good work. Now I just want to go back to this right here. I was awarded a license in July, happy like everybody else that got their license in July. But you didn't tell me what to do next. He didn't tell me what to do next. I started this process 3 years ago, when I first started this process, I started this process under the assumption that I was gonna get this loan in order to make it happen. I never got that loan but that's not the problem right now. I got everything invested my whole life, my father's life and my friend's money that he got from his father through death. And now we having problem with our local municipality about getting our building permit when we put next the application for this building permit 3 months ago and it's slowing us up, and I can't call nobody in this office in order to help us make this fruition I'm dealing with a municipality. The only thing they understand is red lighting somebody like me. I need your help. I need your help to help me get my building permit, so I can get open. Thank you.</p>
6.	Mark	Robinson	Robinson's Cannabis Flowers LLC	<p>Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Mark Robinson. I'm a Albany County legislator, representing the 4<sup>th</sup> legislative district in Albany County. Recently, OCM, along with other agencies, conducted inspections in Albany County resulting in settling several illegal smoke shops. Thank you. But we must keep the pressure on. We can't let these illegal shops continue to thrive. A column was written by Joe Rossi in New York Cannabis Insider. He wrote about the number of illegal shops in New York State, and that the only way to offset them is to give everyone who have proven site control a license. I say to you to continue to do your due diligence and do the best that MRTA mission says. You can walk into any neighborhood bodega and buy untested cannabis for the low. A good portion of these applicants are the same ones who operate these illegal neighborhood bodegas because they already have commercial real estate in doing business as. It's preposterous to say just give everyone a license, you must keep the pressure on. I am aware of OCM's position on fentanyl lace cannabis but when you</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				have suspicious deaths in communities with communities, conversations speculating that this fentanyl lace cannabis is being sold from these corner stores bodegas is threatened quality of life. It's so imperative that we have these resources available to put an end to these bad actors. Again, some of them even have applications with the OCM to sell cannabis legally so no way is it a good idea just to give someone a license because they demonstrate site control. I would like OCM to encourage municipalities to stop all the red tape that's making it difficult for these legal CAURD holders to open their shops because everyone is experiencing high levels of stress, just trying to get their doors open. Thank you.
7.	Annique	Monk-Goldsmith	Citruccino, LLC	Thank you so much. I'm Annique Monk-Goldsmith from Citruccino, LLC. We applied in the premises secure group. I'm someone who has had to navigate the criminal justice system for nonviolent cannabis felonies. You've asked those of us who have the least reasons to trust government entities to come to the table in earnest with good faith, and we did. We did not engage in the highly profitable gray market, and we risked everything to participate in this regulated market. I trusted your pre-application guidance, both written and in multiple webinars. I successfully navigated lease negotiations with a ticking clock and no leverage. Now that the list is queued, I have no idea how long I can continue to bear the cost of hope. It's enormous. I also know that I'm not alone in being harmed by the seemingly capricious and on the fly policy making. I implore you to make good on your commitments to those of us who took on economic burdens based on your policy guidance. There is a clear and direct conflict between your guidance in both the prioritization of SEE applicants and allocation of secure privacy, priority licenses, and its execution. I appreciate the desire to maintain a balance between supply and demand, but I believe this is possible without being paternalistic, especially when those paternalistic policies are applied after the application window was closed. The New York State market can handle 2 to 3,000 dispensary licenses. Your own research has shown this. You have the ability to make good on your commitments, to secure premises, and SEE candidates by licensing all the licensing, all those who qualify from that list. Once you remove duplicates, there are only about 1,000 applicants. I do also want to thank Dr. Gilbert Jenkins for her continued advocacy for those of us who submitted applications with secure premises and wait in a nebulous limbo. Thank you.



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
8.	Thomas	Ballistrea	Cannabaceae LLC	<p>What's good? I hope everyone is well. My name is Thomas Ballistrea, Jr. I'm a graduate of the CCTM program, founder, as well as CEO of Cannabaceae LLC. I came here today, first and foremost, to extend my gratitude to all the individuals at the Board and at the office for guiding our community through this inflection point in human history. There's a multitude of topics that I considered addressing with my comments today. But after much consideration, I found that for me, focusing on what is rather than what isn't, was most important and I will address some of my other concerns regarding the rules and regulations and my written comments for the Board's consideration, as there is much work still to be done. For me, this moment provides some answers to the question of how do we start to move forward from the traumas inflicted by cannabis prohibition enforcement? And when does that healing begin? I would say that perhaps your efforts today say that time starts now, and I find it noteworthy that all of you have made a valiant effort to start that healing process for all of us. For that I wanted to sincerely say Thank you. We have made much progress towards normalizing cannabis and attempting to make reparations for the injustices that occurred during cannabis prohibition. My hope is that the significant step forward we make here today will be a beginning to community healing for us all. and a path towards mutual understanding, built off the commonality that we all find in cannabis that will lead us to mutual prosperity. I'm humbled to have the opportunity to become a part of the solution and I can't express in words my gratitude for this privilege. Thank you for your consideration and continued support from me. All the mentees of the CCTM program as well as all of our community. I look forward to writing the next chapter in post cannabis prohibition history with all of you. Thank you.</p>
9.	Scott	Sweeney	Dutchess Roots	<p>Good afternoon, everybody. It's nice to be here. Thank you to the board and to OCM for hosting this meeting today. And it's really interesting to see this all unfold. I look around this room and I see a lot of small businesses, a lot of passion in this room, and it's great to be a part of it. And I just want to commend you guys for doing something very difficult here, and I think, as somebody who's really been in the thick of things watching this industry unroll for the last 3 years. I don't envy you, and it's difficult to stand up a market like this. But I do just wish upon more communication from you and your team. We have to make decisions. A lot of them have financial impacts associated</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				with them. You know, we applied as a nonprovisional applicant, my wife and I, we're local Poughkeepsie born and raised. We have site plan approval. We have our special permit. We're ready to go, and we're paying a lease, and we just don't know how much time we have. And I think, Chris, you said, like we're gonna get to you. And as long as we hear we're gonna get you, that's a good feeling that makes us feel really good. And I think, as this woman pointed out, there's about 1,000 applicants, and we know the barriers to entry here are real, and I think we need to stand up this market to the illicit market, and I just want to be a part of it. And I just want everybody in this room to be a part of it, and everybody to have their fair enough little shot to do this. I think there's plenty of business to go around here, and I think this two-tier system and I'll close was the right way to do this. It stands up the small business. My mother owned a liquor store. It was one. We have a lot of liquor stores in our area, and they were owned by all small business, and that's how this market should play out, and that two-tier system should help do that. Thank you very much.
10.	Johnny	Chebat		Good afternoon. I am the first Us. Born citizen in my family, and at a very early age my mother and my father taught me nobody cares just work harder. Now I pass that on to my kids. So rather than air my grievances today for 2 minutes, I'm gonna use my time to get your attention. I'm gonna work hard at getting your attention. I am ready. Tree Head Culture, 665 North French, Amherst, New York. I've been ready for a few months. I got my proximity protection. I got my municipality approved. The State is approved. I went through my virtual audit. Please let me open Tree Head Culture. I look forward to working with New York State as a great partner. Thank you.
11.	Jeffrey	Hoffman		Good afternoon. I want to thank the Board on behalf of my clients that you've awarded licenses to today. I know it was hard work to get here. There's a lot of hard work to go. The definition of success in the State will be these stores that were giving licenses, getting open and being successful. We all know that is the true, the true goal. But OCM, you're killing it as far as getting this done. As far as I'm concerned, I think the application process for all the complaints, and we can quibble. I think the application process went very well. I've said this at many meetings. I think the OCM staff is fantastic. I've had a tremendous number of interactions with folks all up and down the chain at the OCM. And the staff at OCM is incredibly professional. They're tremendously understaffed. I'm





# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				gonna meet with a lot of representatives here. It's caucus weekend. I'm gonna meet with several assembly members next week in the city. Whatever money you need. Let me know. I want to get these people to give you the money you need to get this job done. I know you're probably half you need double the amount of staff that you have some real quick things. We have some real problems out on Long Island. I know that you met with Babylon to talk with them about what your guidance would be to Long Island about their zoning rules. I have tons of clients out on Long Island that are ready to sue. We need your opinion letter, for those localities about what your opinion is, what they're going to do. And then I'm going to start suing them, because what they're doing out on Long Island is ridiculous. For CAURD, there's about 50 or 60 or so CAURDs that are still waiting to even hear about their license. We need to get them licenses, and we still need to codify CAURD. We're doing a lot of expungement work in the State with the law. I wanna thank the chief equity officer for his assistance in getting some modifications to the law. There's still plenty of judges in the State that are not doing it right. They are not following the expungement law. I have appeals up in the third department where we're gonna fix that. But we're gonna need your help at doing that. Two other things. There's a bill in the Legislature to get funding for the State funded health insurance providers for medical cannabis. We absolutely have to get that passed. I have a bill that I'm talking with many legislators about to require medical professionals to take CMEs about the endocannabinoid system. Medical professionals are going to see more and more people that are willing to talk about their cannabis use. Those professionals need to know about the endocannabinoid system and about cannabis in order to properly give the medical assistance that they're going to provide. Thank you.
12.	Lafonso	Bonner	FRENCHIE HERB LLC	Hello. How's everybody doing today. Thank you, Board, for having this meeting. I represent Frenchie Herb LLC, 20220000728. We were awarded our license July 19th, and, like the gentleman said, since we've been awarded that license, the communication has not been there. We've had little to no direction. We send emails, and then we get email back saying to send the email to another email. I have a daily job. I run my own business. My business partner goes to work every day for the State. We don't have 8 hours to spend on the phone trying to get a human being. When we do get a human being, sometimes the



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>phone does get cut off, and then we have to repeat the process. So thank you, Dr. Gilbert Jenkins for bringing that up. If there's a call waiting system where somebody was definitely gonna call us back, we would get our issues addressed. We submitted August 7th of last year for our property. We've been in a lease agreement ever since then. We have a great location. We've been navigating everything ourselves with little to no direction. We're meeting with the city, planning boards and all of that stuff. We have site plans. We have floor plans all ready to go. We don't even know if it's going to be okay with OCM. Because every email that we've sent has gone unheard. And then we got a message last week where they offered us a building. So we have the property. We are ready to go. We just would like our concerns to be heard. Really like to talk to a human being. And again, this is Lafonso Bonner from Frenchie Herb, 20220000728. We are ready to go, and we appreciate all your efforts. We're not here to bash you. We're happy to be here. We're happy to be part of this process of you know, post prohibition. We believe that we're going to help you make money, so help us help you. And congratulations to everybody who's got a license here, and the cultivators, processors all that. We understand that it's a lot of work, 7,240 applications to review. We would like some help as a CAURD licensee. Thank you.</p>
13.	Ben	Duerr	Raven Dispensaries LLC	<p>Thank you Chair right and thank you to the whole OCM board. My name is Ben Duerr, along with my partner here today, owner of Ravens Dispensaries in Clay, New York. Follow us at ravens joint on Instagram and Twitter. Cheap plug. So yeah, I wanna echo, you know the hard work that everybody's doing, and for any of the CAURDS or anybody listening at home was a Ga. 1-888-OCM-5151 is a phone number. You can go 1, 2, 4 after that, and hopefully one of the great people there can help you. I know Abe's been very helpful. I wanna shout him out Tanya as well as plenty of other people who take our calls over there and deal with me, and I'll no less nice telling some time I'm trying to be better myself. So I wanna say thank you to all those people there's as well as Winston Martin, who did our walk through and my MO's kind of changed coming here today, I just wanted to be a part of the community cause we got some answers in the last 24 h that you know changed what we were gonna do here today. So wanna say, thank you for that. And to everybody who's going through it. Keep your head up. I know that business works a lot faster than government does</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>sometimes, and they're caught in the middle, being pulled back and forth, because with us dollars have to make sense. Right? So I would say, a couple YouTube stoicism videos, Marcus Aurelius might help you out to help my mental state out a lot of times. Mixing some suns who are to war when you need to. But hopefully, we can just get a little advisement today from some of the people on the board before we leave. Just a minute of your time would be much appreciated, as we're right at that stage. Our store has been ready since December 20th. It's week 4 after our walkthrough. So our win is gonna be win for everybody in CAURD. And if you guys have questions, not just another cheap plug hit us up at ravens joint in the DM. We're happy to share that information and that frustration. Let you blow off steam if you can't get to anybody, we're all in it together. The rising tide raises all ships. That's what we're here for. Thank you very much guys.</p>
14.	Lisa	Barone	The Herbal Confectionery LLC	<p>Good afternoon, Madam Chair, the members of the Cannabis Control board, and the Office of Cannabis Management. Firstly, I'd like to show my deep gratitude for the opportunity to be standing here. My name is Lisa Barone, and I am the owner of the Herbal Confectionery. One of the names on the lists of the licensees awarded today. Within our small community of support, with no funding other than the shoes on our feet, this has been 8 years long, of a meticulously planned moment. Operating at a grassroots level of edibles in New York City in the legacy industry we have patiently waited for the legal market to be created. I won't go into detail what it took to get here, but I am proud that we are here. I'm a generational farmer as well in the Hudson Valley, and have watched my fellow small farmers carry the opening of the first leg of the New York cannabis industry rollout. We understand the importance and the urgency to continue building this industry in their favor. This begins with sustainable packaging, and the herbal confectionery chooses to lead by example. We are set to launch a completely plastic, free, fully home, compostable, reusable, and returnable packaging product line. I could talk about the detrimental effects of adhesive. But that's another conversation for another day. What I will leave you is this, the AUs need support, and those coming into the industry in this round deserve a chance to supply the best products that we can possibly offer. We need financially and environmentally sustainability initiatives from our State. Thank you again for this opportunity to</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				step into the legal industry, and we will continue to lead the way. Thank you.
15.	Joseph	Guidarelli		Hi, Joseph Guidarelli. First, I want to say it's a great day in New York long time coming. I want to thank you for your service. I've sat on boards before I was on one for 5 years, and we are in uncharted waters, and things are going to change. Policies are going to change. No one's doing everything right. No one can claim they're doing it right. But, we on the business side need to realize we need to respect the people in this office and our industry. If we want it to work and grow. We need to respect our laws, our procedures. We need to respect the people we work with. We need to look at everyone as partners. We need to respect our business partners, our patrons, our competition. We need to respect the people that don't agree with the cannabis industry and see the benefits of it like we do and want to get behind it. So I wanted to get up to here to say that what prompted me to speak today. So I was speaking with my 92-year-old, mom 93. She just turned 93. And I was telling her, today's a good day. Here's what's happening, and we don't see eye to eye on some things, but it really made me realize we need to respect the people that don't agree with our industry. And you hear about shops that are opened and the traffic that's around them, the disruptions to the other businesses. We need to respect them. We need to respect this industry. We need to respect what you do. I've been in business 40 years, and one thing I know is, things will change, we will all make mistakes. You will make mistakes, we will grow and get better together. And all of us in this industry need to focus on that. Thank you.
16.	Max	Freed		Hello, everyone. I wrote a lot, so you'll have to cut me off, and I'll send in the rest. I'm Dr. Max, Freed, living in Troy, New York. A founder of aspiring New York processing licensees. The possibility of imminent Federal rescheduling of cannabis draws new scrutiny on the guidance documents reporting estimated numbers for the most critical primary extraction, tier one processing licenses to 55 nonprovisional licensees statewide in this round. I deeply appreciate Dr. Gilbert Jenkins comments directly addressing those numbers. Unfortunately, even in the State in isolation, not only does the surprise refusal to grant provisional licenses to disproportionately small bootstrapping operators without premises control bias the landscape in favor of larger entities. It effectively burdens this group of startup enterprises that I'm a part of with microbusiness cultivation requirements we don't need or



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				want. Essentially a second whole business to start up and raise capital for which means less local control by small operators and greater possibilities of being replaced as leaders of our own startups. It's bad for me, and it has to be worse for aspiring SEE applicants. In the larger Federal context, should that starter pistol go off and Federal rescheduling happen, it puts New York at a critical disadvantage against other States, such as Oklahoma, that are easier for Federal operators to start up in. New York manufacturing can compete, but only if allowed to begin by this board. The core of it is that small processors in tier one want to exist, too. I'm kind of confused by the references to heavy extraction equipment, the 3,500 square feet of indoor cultivation we're being pushed towards is more expensive than basic extraction equipment. Never mind the cost of doing both of those things. My barber was doing closed loop extraction for himself in the legacy era, obviously without the full suite of safety measures needed for responsible production. But similarly, a Roz and press can be had for 4 figures, or even 3, in a micro version. From where is this myth that extraction can only be done or is best done by an enormous heavy operator coming from. That hasn't been the experience of other jurisdictions where massive commodity operations have stumbled and lost billions.
17.	Chase	Schuyler		My name is Chase Schuyler, applicant number micro applicant 308 queue number 2,077. I appreciate Dr. Gilbert Jenkins for the questions that she asked regarding the 1,500 applicants that are left pondering, and whether or not we will get a review or not. My wife and I grew up in New York, went graduated from SUNY schools. I've been living out in Oregon for the past 10 years, had a couple of kids and wanted to get them closer to their grandparents, and we saw this opportunity to open a cannabis business to do exactly that. I leased up the space 20 months ago. I've dumped almost \$400,000 into the space and I truly don't know what to do at this point. So just my request is to review everyone that's in the queue, and if they qualify for a license, reward them a license, and they deserve it. Thank you.
18.	Sheldon	Anderson	Public Flower	Hello, everyone. I'll be brief. So I just want to say thank you to the OCM Board, OCM as an agency, to the architects of the MRTA, Majority Leader Crystal Peoples Stokes, State Senator Liz Kruger, and congrats to all of the Awardees, who, you know, got your great news today. I know some people have you know, concerns and frustrations. So my name is Sheldon, Public Flower



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				Dispensary, that is open in Buffalo, New York, in the Allentown neighborhood. And I think one thing that is just a little quick civics lesson is, we've got three branches of government. You know, so it's not designed to be a speedboat. It's supposed to be like a battleship or a carnival cruise. So the best thing to do is just be patient. Think of it like an oven, and not a microwave. Peace and love.
19.	Dasheeda	Dawson	Cannabis NYC	<p>Good afternoon again. My name is Dasheeda Dawson, founding director for Cannabis and NYC. On behalf of the city of New York. I wanna say congratulations. The work continues, in spite of equity being on trial, media spin and our LinkedIn lawyering, the numbers don't lie. If you are a conscious cannabis consumer, intentionally aiming to support social and economic equity, this is the most diverse market from seed to sale. As the former Czar, for the city of Portland, I could not even shop my own market, and so is very proud for me to walk into stores and know that we've done that intentionally. This is the work we set out to do when we set to pass the MRTA. And the city of New York will continue to support with our cannabis, NYC. Loan Fund, lift our tour dispensary days and the help of our fiber coalition leaders to continue technical assistance. This is a critical year for New York market, and as with any experiment. There's always an opportunity for improvement and optimization. So I'll jump right into it.</p> <p>There are, according to our New York City sheriff's office, about 2,000 illegal storefronts in New York City. Our Joint Enforcement task force has done thousands of inspections, over 40 million in fines, over 20 million in products confiscated. But it's not enough. Situation has become dire and presents an incredible risk for public safety. And this equity-centered market that we're actively building. The communities are confused, and they actually think this is legal. And this is not it. So we're calling on the State to act, come back to the city and join us in the joint activity expressly delegate the State's expanded enforcement capabilities to our jurisdiction, and allow local jurisdictions to please pass laws to help permanently close these stores. In addition, we have the provisionally approved licenses, particularly CAURD having challenges identifying available and viable sites that meet the State's buffer requirements, the absence of a map or list and scarcity mindset has made a perfect storm for anxiety, hostility, and even predatory behaviors among licensees. We're calling on the State to publish a map, or at the very least release the list of addresses with protection, and also</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				consider potentially looking at that 1,000-foot buffer being reduced for highly populated cities, such as New York City. Additional comments will come from cannabis, NYC. and be provided in a written form. I'll leave you with you never look good trying to make someone else look bad. Right? So I want to thank this Office of Cannabis Management for your continued dedication and the ongoing work. We stand with you. Thank you.
20.	Jeffrey	Roizman		I would hope my speech is not silenced. However the trust I have for this bureaucratic agency is lower than the MTA and that is saying something with the billions of dollars they waste each year. Upon finding out upon the cancellation of the January meeting, I was appalled that my public comment seemed to disappear deep into the forgotten pit of 1s and 0s. The blatant disregard to follow our Open Meetings Law and silence of speech should have every party responsible feel shameful. How can we even claim to be a New York driven agency when we can't abide by the principles and laws central to how our democracy and government function here in the United States of America. Following the law as it is written, and respecting that, should be at the forefront of every staff member or party involved with the Office of Cannabis Management. I would hope that strives can be made in the future to showcase a willingness to go above and beyond regarding how the agency is following the law. I would also hope that the Office of Cannabis Management will be more transparent all across the board.
21.	Jeanette	Wolfe	Catskill Mountain High LLC	When will you start taking demographics into consideration for Licensing Retail Recreational Dispensaries?
22.	Jessica	Bugbee		Hello, I am a current applicant in the November 17th que. I have waited patiently and have asked the CORRUPT OCM multiple times what number they are on and how they will vet the applicants for false info. I have been in contact with multiple people in the nov 17th window and we will be Sueing the state of NEW YORK if they do not issue more licenses for the first window. the amount of gaslighting and misinformation the ocm is putting out is disgusting!!!! THE BOARD NEED TO DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF LICENSES ISSUED IN THE FIRST WINDOW FOR PEOPLE WITH LEASES! Where is the live video of the supposed LOTTERY QUE????? The real lawsuits are not being filed yet until we see if you are going to be screwing the people in que who had to rent a building. I STRONGLY INCOURGE YOU TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF LICENSES! YOU HAVE MADE ALOT



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				OF PEOPLE MAD IN THIS PROCESS AND WE WILL NOT JUST GO AWAY!!!!!!!!!!!!
23.	Coltin	Barody		Please increase micro licenses for the November 17th window. The state extended the deadline an additional 2 weeks which created a less likely chance of people who applied to get a license. I applied before the extension and executed a lease before the extension. If I knew the state was going to extend the application period and have more people in the que lottery I would not have invested as much money as I did. At the time of the extension there was more people that had applied then the number of licenses being issued. Please increase the licenses to at least double the amount so people who secured real estate have a fair shot.
24.	Gregory	Pereira	Blaze 420 LLC	The location survey link has caused many of us to lose locations. Which exhausts time, money and energy for CAURD Provisional Licensees. It is also tiresome to call OCM for information and when one requests to escalate our questions, we are greeted with someone that is always angry and provides limited information.
25.	Joshua	Friedman	Corner House LLC	We are disappointed and believe we were mis-led. OCM published numbers for this first round of licensing. They said that if we applied by the November deadline, we WOULD BE REVIEWED. It didn't say that if we applied by November, we'd be one of only 250/retail to be awarded. It was misleading from our point of view. My wife and I are excited to enter this new industry. We have invested in creating a business and legal structure, negotiating a legal lease and having it reviewed, and together with our local bank and our insurance agent, did due diligence to make sure that everything was in order to move forward (this took hours of time from our bank's legal department). THERE IS NO WAY WE'D DO ALL OF THIS WORK - AND SPEND THIS MONEY - AND WASTE OUR VENDORS TIME, if we'd been told our chances were out of only 250 licenses available, and not 500-1000 as published. (and, let's be honest, OCM said they might adjust those numbers...with the consistent statements by the board and executives about HOW BADLY WE NEED RETAIL, who wouldn't feel optimistic that OCM would potentially distribute more licenses - not less!!) Additionally, the messages are absolutely mixed up - NY needs retail, but your limiting the group that is ready to go - WHY? PLEASE EXPLAIN. Last week, the media and politicians are reporting on millions of dollars in cannabis





# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				going bad, and the outrageous number of illegal stores. If you would review 1/2 of the November queue, you might be able to start getting rid of the illegal stores. If not, the demand for illegal stores isn't going away. Why on earth are you not approving more? Do you realize that there are many hurdles to opening a store and licensing those who have already done much of that work just makes sense. Thanks.
26.	Teresa	Taggart		Please reconsider placing a weed dispensary on Forest Ave due to its proximity to schools, churches, and mental health facilities, such as RUMC and Silver Lake Half House. This location is unsuitable and could negatively affect our neighborhood's safety and well-being. I urge you to find an alternative location away from these sensitive areas. Thank you for your attention to this matter.
27.	Wilmer	Villalobos		It is very concerning to have a cannabis dispensary next door to my property where I'm raising my children. These types of stores will open the doors to more criminality and substance abuse in our neighborhood. We have a drug abuse problem in Staten Island and allowing these types of stores to come to our neighborhood is not going to help solve the problem. This neighborhood is family oriented, and we cherish that.
28.	Suzette	Hinds	Thurston Hall Partners	As a SEE applicant and someone who was able to secure property, I feel the lottery is unfair. Is there a push internally to review all applicants with real estate secured?
29.	Marion	White		As a long-time resident of West Brighton, our family is OPPOSED to the proposed cannabis locations on Forest Avenue in Staten Island (463 & 465 Forest Avenue as well as Forest Avenue and Sharon Avenue). These are both within a strongly residential area; easily walking distance to churches, a Temple and schools. Establishing such a business in these locations would impact the quality of life in West Brighton enormously. Instead, please strongly consider applications for businesses that can be located in a more commercial area.
30.	Caroline	Keller		When will we get the fingerprint requests? When will we receive the lottery list?
31.	Neil	Anastasio	Forest Regional Residents' Civic Assn (President)	The proposed licenses for 465 Forest Ave and 386 Forest Ave Staten Island, NY should NOT be granted licenses for the following reasons: 1. this neighborhood is not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
32.	James	Newman	Forest Ave Regional Residents Civic Association	I am expressing my concern over the proposed cannabis locations at 465 and 386 Forest Ave. I feel that they are too close to residential neighborhood, too close to each other, and our elected officials and residents have not been properly notified, or had any input on this important matter.
33.	Johnny	Chebat	WNYC II, LLC DBA TREEHEAD CULTURE - Confirmation and Request for consideration   WNYC II, LLC - OCMCAUR DP-2023-000078	As the inaugural U.S.-born member of my family, I inherit a legacy steeped in ambition and resilience. My parents, immigrants fueled by hope, instilled in me an unyielding work ethic from a tender age. Embracing the principle that dedication and a positive outlook invariably lead to success, I've navigated life's challenges with these values as my compass. Fast forward 48 years, and this ethos bore fruit when I was granted my CAURD license—a milestone that initially felt like a dream realized. Within days of this achievement, I secured a building, received municipal assurances of approval, and meticulously prepared for launch—ordering equipment, furnishing the space, and ticking off every prerequisite. My venture was on the brink of blossoming. However, this dream swiftly morphed into a distressing ordeal as the OCM withdrew and ceased all communication. For nearly half a year since obtaining my license, I've been met with silence, transforming what once felt like a lottery win into a precariously looming financial disaster. Now, teetering on the edge of bankruptcy, I implore the OCM to complete the finalization process of my application. The urgency to open our doors cannot be overstated. With a dedicated team of a dozen employees at the ready, we are poised to commence operations immediately. This plea is not just for the survival of a business, but the fulfillment of a lifelong endeavor rooted in the very essence of the American dream—perseverance, opportunity, and hard work.
34.	Elise	Lupari		I would like to voice my disapproval for cannabis dispensaries to be located at 465 Forest Avenue and 386 Forest Avenue both in Staten Island. NY 10301. These locations are only two blocks from each other in an already highly saturated area with bars and liquor stores. This is can't be allowed. Please hear us and do not allow this to occur.
35.	Karen	Kelly		465 and 356 Forest Avenue. With in this 10 block corridor the area is oversatutated with bars and liquor/beer stores already. Adding a Cannibus store would simply ruin the neighborhood.



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
36.	Kathleen	Boyer		There is no reason to allow TWO marijuana dispensaries to open in our walkable, family -friendly neighborhood. the one at 386 Forest does not provide sufficient parking, and the idea of a drive-through is insanity. There is not enough room, per NYC law, and it would back up an already busy one-way intersection. These dispensaries are not compatible with the needs of our community. One would replace two very valuable and beloved stores (bagel shop/deli and card/gift shop) and the other would attract dirt, noise, backed up traffic. These NUISANCES are not wanted in this neighborhood. This was wished on us in a cowardly, sneaky way with NO community input. I join many neighbors and business owners in my implacable opposition to ANY cannabis retail outlet on Forest Avenue between Hart and Bement Avenues.
37.	Laurie	DiMaiuta		This is in reference to 386 and 485 forest ave for a cannibus stores. First of all we don't need 2. That's ridiculous. I take offense to it being so close to schools, playgrounds, and a community that doesn't want it in the neighborhood. I also take offense that no one was notified and we didn't have a say on this. The neighborhood has enough bars and we have 2 liquor stores blocks within each other. What's next a heroin station. I was born and raised here. I'm furious this is even a discussion. This should be put in a commercial area not near homes. I can think of a lot of areas it would be appropriate with parking but not here.
38.	Thomas	Balukas Jr		As a resident of this neighborhood and father of young children and growing family, we strongly oppose the opening and Permit of Cannabis dispensaries at 465 and 386 Forest Ave, Staten Island. Myself and many other family's young children walk everyday in this area to school, and the park. These locations are way too close to private homes and this area is not ideal. There are also churches and Jewish houses of worship a few hundred feet away, with many children attending daily. We should not have any business like this, let alone two so close to each other. There are already an excessive amount of bars, illegal smoke shops, and liquor stores in close proximity to each other down Forest Ave. Unlike a Bar, where patrons drink and stay inside, users of marijuana largely find it appropriate to walk out in the open, loiter in parks, and use marijuana in their vehicles parked outside others homes in this highly residential area. The overpowering odor emanating from their habit, is a nuisance to all, and a poor example to the youth. I urge the powers that be, and our local elected officials to



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				strongly reconsider allowing these two business' to open at either 465 or 386 Forest Ave, Staten Island, NY.
39.	Jessica	Kenul	Home owner	Keep dispensaries out of residential areas! Put them in industrial/ commercial areas!
40.	Denise	Dulligan		I am against this opening in our community. It is close to a church that holds AA meetings and should be in an industrial area which SI has.
41.	Catherine	McLaughlin		The addresses of 465 and 386 Forest Avenue are located in a residential neighborhood where there are many children passing by in a high volume on a daily basis and are located too close to schools and houses of worship. Please do not open this facility in our neighborhood!
42.	Shawn	Dulligan		Very against a cannabis dispensary on Forest Ave at either 465 and/ or 386 I am against granting a permit to these locations for a multitude of reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
43.	Eileen	Magnuski		I am opposed to the proposed cannabis sites at 465 and 386 Forest Avenue in Staten Island. They are too close to residential houses. They are also in a traffic corridor which many children use to commute to and from school.
44.	Shawn	Dulligan		I'm Against granting a permit to 465 and 386 Forest Ave. it is too close to residential housing and also too close to a house of worship that also hosts AA meetings.
45.	Jill	Bruen		485 and 386 Forest Ave is a corridor that sees high volumes of children walking up and down with friends. There was not enough input by the community on this application for these pot shops. We don't want them!!! Way too close to residential homes!!!
46.	Eric	Allen		The addresses of 386 and 465 Forest Avenue are being considered, if not already granted, licenses/permits for cannabis dispensary. And let's not mince words here. Years ago, this was called pot, and you were arrested for possessing or selling it. Nothing has changed, but cute terminology now that the City and State can earn revenue by being the new drug dealers. This neighborhood is not zoned for high-volume commercial businesses. In addition, it is a very residential neighborhood, which would put the dispensary extremely close to homes. The proposed addresses are only 2 blocks away from each other. Right across the street is a house of worship which



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				doubles as a 12-step program for those seeking recovery from addition, and many schools nearby within a very short radius of the proposed addresses. This is a busy corridor, where children walk to and from school, church and necessary merchants, in high volume; not to mention the over saturation of bars and liquor/beer licenses already present in the immediate area. The residents were not given proper notice nor were we given sufficient input on the application. The area cannot sustain such a thing (I won't even call it a business and give it that dignity because, as said, I'd be in jail just two years ago if I were selling pot) for a multitude of reasons, not the least being a tremendous negative impact on quality of life for the community and its children, or there being egregious zoning issues.
47.	Amy	Zuntag		I am against the Cannabis Stores being opened on 465 and 386 Forest Ave. they should not be granted a permit for the following reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently Thank you.
48.	Brendan	Lee		To close to residential housing and kids pass to close
49.	Amy	Terjesen		I am against the Cannabis Stores being opened on 465 and 386 Forest Ave. they should not be granted a permit for the following reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently Thank you.
50.	T	Pendergast		We don't want this
51.	Kara	Romeo		I am against granting permits to open cannabis stores at 465 forest avenue and 386 forest avenue for all of the below following reasons: 1. These locations are in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. These locations are too close to residential housing 3. These locations close to each other (2 blocks) 4. These locations are too close to schools, houses of worship 5. These locations are in a busy corridor where



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				children pass in high volume daily 6. This 10 block corridor is already oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. Finally there was insufficient local community input on the application and the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
52.	Cory	Mcvey		Don't want a marijuana store in a neighborhood right near a school PS 45 where parents are walking forest avenue with there kids. Also S and T bagels and card and gift has been part of this community for 20 years. I think the bagel store owners are former cops as well there was not enough input from the community for this most people from here do not want it. Location 465 forest and 385 forest.
53.	Gregg	Thomson		386 and 465 Forest Avenue, Staten Island, New York. Too close to schools, houses of worship. In a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily
54.	Aileen	Dulski		This is specifically for 465 and 386 Forest Avenue, I am against granting a permit to these locations for all of the following reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
55.	Greg	Pinciotto		465 Forest Ave is literally 50' from my home. If I can smell the bacon from the bagel store can you imagine what the smell will be from a cannabis store.then placing another less than 2 blocks away with families right there.
56.	Tina	Tricomi		I am opposed to 386 and 465 forest Ave being granted a permit to open. Not my best work, but feel free to plagiarize : The addresses of 386 and 465 Forest Avenue are being considered, This neighborhood is not zoned for high-volume commercial businesses. In addition, it is a very residential neighborhood, which would put the dispensary extremely close to homes. The proposed addresses are only 2 blocks away from each other. Right across the street is a house of worship which doubles as a 12-step program for those seeking recovery from addiction, and many schools nearby within a very short radius of the proposed addresses. This is a busy corridor, where children walk to and from school, church and necessary merchants, in high volume; not to mention the over saturation of bars and liquor/beer licenses already present in the immediate area. The residents were not given proper notice nor were we given sufficient input on the



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				application. The area cannot sustain such a thing (I won't even call it a business and give it that dignity because, as said, I'd be in jail just two years ago if I were selling pot) for a multitude of reasons, not the least being a tremendous negative impact on quality of life for the community and its children, or there being egregious zoning issues.
57.	Jeff	Franzreb		The Cannabis shop that is planned for the West Brighton section of Forest Avenue in Staten Island will negatively impact a family rich neighborhood. There is a church directly across the street and a public elementary school (PS 45) less than a 1/4 mile away as well as, 4 other K-8 schools approximately 1 mile away from this proposed shop. It is a high traffic area for families and children walking to and from school or just walking with friends. Normalizing a business like this to impressionable children and young adults is a terrible idea. I don't believe that Cannabis should be legalized for the sole purpose of generating money for New York State in the first place but, that ship has sailed! If you care about the future of the children of West Brighton, you will move this to a more commercial neighborhood where it can blend in and NOT force it into a family neighborhood where it will stand out! This is a terrible place to put a cannabis shop and I would hope that you would reconsider this his decision.
58.	Lorraine	Scanni		Do NOT grant a cannabis dispensary license to 465 Forest Avenue. It is too close to residential homes. My front door is 50 yards away from this location. It is also near a school and a church and is a storefront that is heavily trafficked by children and is right next door to a liquor store. .
59.	Lorraine	Scanni		Do not grant a cannabis license to 465 Forest Avenue. The community was not notified about this. It is too close to residential homes - my front door is 50 yards away. It is next to a liquor store in an area already over saturated with bars and restaurants. It is near a school and a church and is a storefront heavily trafficked by children and teens.
60.	Sarah	Yuster		The stretch of Forest Ave between Hart Blvd and Bement Ave has been branded "The Strip". People from other parts of the island come here to party at the multiple bars and restaurant/bars. There's a balance between good business, a lively neighborhood and nuisance, noise, brawls, etc. The addition of smoke shops and new liquor stores compounds this as they supplant more community oriented business. Cannabis dispensaries are legal, a part of society and ought not to be problematic were it not for the fact that they'll create even less opportunity for a



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				scope of services and goods for those who are not persistently in pursuit of a high. 386 and 465 Forest Ave are both locations that will undoubtedly create even more of a traffic clog. 386 is quite close to Temple Israel and 465 close to the church in Bard on Forest. The former is right on the route home for IS 61students who of course wouldn't be able to enter them, but with the ubiquitous, well entrenched liquor stores here, the tenor of the area will become largely one of substance acquisition and use. Legal or not, this creates an atmosphere for young people that becomes part of their psyche. We don't have a produce market, a fish store, gift shop, clothing, jewelry store or any number of other typical local shops. This seems unfortunate and avoidable
61.	Lorraine	Scanni		Do not grant a cannabis license to 465 Forest Avenue, Staten Island. The community was not notified about this. It is too close to residential homes - my front door is 50 yards away. It is next to a liquor store in an area already over saturated with bars and restaurants. It is near a school and a church and is a storefront heavily trafficked by children and teens.
62.	Vincent	Romeo		I'm writing this message to state that I am against granting a permit / license for a cannabis dispensary for both 465 and 386 Forest Avenue on Staten Island. This neighborhood is not zoned for high-volume commercial businesses. In addition, it is a very residential neighborhood, which would put the dispensary extremely close to numerous homes which are mainly families with children. The proposed addresses are only 2 blocks away from each other and maybe less than 1000 feet apart. Our neighborhood does not need one dispensary let alone 2 in this such close proximity. Right across the street is a house of worship which doubles as a 12-step program for those seeking recovery from addiction, and many schools nearby within a very short radius of the proposed addresses. Most of the foot traffic along this corridor is that of families with children and residents who have lived in this neighborhood for decades. This enclave of Forest Avenue has been cornerstone of Staten Island since the early 1900s and cannabis dispensaries would hurt the quality of life for its residents. The residents were not given proper notice nor were we given sufficient input on the application. The area cannot sustain such a thing for a multitude of reasons, not the least being a tremendous negative impact on quality of life for the community and its children, or there being egregious zoning issues. There is no need for this type of business in our neighborhood and





# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				I'm sure an overwhelming amount of our residents would be against this permit and license being granted. Thank you for your time and I hope these dispensaries are not approved for the sake of our children and our neighbors.
63.	Anthony	Scanni		Do not grant a cannabis license to 465 and 386 Forest Avenue. The community was not notified about this. It is too close to residential homes - my front door is 50 yards away. It is next to a liquor store in an area already over saturated with bars and restaurants. It is near a school and a church and is a storefront heavily trafficked by children and teens.
64.	Anthony	Scanni		Do not grant a cannabis license to 465 Forest Avenue. The community was not notified about this. It is too close to residential homes - my front door is 50 yards away. It is next to a liquor store in an area already over saturated with bars and restaurants. It is near a school and a church and is a storefront heavily trafficked by children and teens.
65.	Jackie	Massa		The addresses of 465 and 386 forest avenue should not be granted a permit to dispense cannabis for the following reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
66.	Thomas	Cavanagh		The addresses of 465 and 386 forest avenue should not be granted a permit to dispense cannabis for the following reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
67.	Melissa	Halloran		I am STRONGLY AGAINST 386 and 465 Forest Avenue in Staten Island NY being granted a permit fir the following reasons 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
68.	Nancy	Nix		I'd like to comment specifically on the locations at 465 and 386 Forest Ave. I am against these locations being granted a permit (cannabis dispensary) for many reasons. Forest avenue is a main route for the neighborhood - a very busy corridor. It's in the middle of a residential area and is close to churches and schools. I don't believe it to be an appropriate location for our neighborhood! as we are not zoned for high volume commercial businesses. Thank you for your consideration!
69.	Robert	Davis		I am happy to see LEGAL dispensaries open in my area.at 465 and 386 forest ave in Staten Island Please crack down on the illegal shops in the area that bring a bad element to the area Regards
70.	Allison	Roberts		I am specifically writing about 465 and 386 Forest Ave. that wants to put a cannabis store there. I am a community member who has lived here for 55 years and I live down the block from those stores. I am highly highly highly AGAINST putting a cannabis store in at that location. This is a very family oriented community/neighborhood. I am fully against granting a permit to these locations for the following reasons: 1. This neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. It is too close to residential housing 3. It is too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. It is too close to schools, houses of worship 5. It is in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. The 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. There was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently Thank you
71.	Maureen	Marlow		I am opposed to licenses being awarded for marijuana dispensaries at 386 and 465 Forest Avenue, Staten Island, because this neighborhood is not zoned for high-volume commercial businesses, and because these addresses are too close to residential housing. The only other adult-use marijuana dispensary on Staten Island, at 3022 Veterans Rd. West in Charleston, is located in a high-volume commercial area far from residential housing—it is located in a shopping plaza next to the ShopRite store at 3010 Veterans Rd. West. The same regard given to the residential communities of Staten Island's South Shore must be accorded to the residential communities of Staten Island's North Shore.
72.	Michele	McNeely		I am Against the addresses of 465 and 386 Forest Avenue being granted a permit to these locations for being too close to residential housing Additionally , there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
73.	Susin	Garcia	Saint George Civic Association	<p>Economic Benefits The legalization of cannabis dispensaries in Staten Island can bring several economic benefits to the area: 1. Tax Revenue: Legal cannabis dispensaries contribute to the state and local tax base. New York State projected \$56 million in marijuana-related tax revenue for fiscal year 2023, although this figure has been impacted by the presence of illegal markets[2]. Nonetheless, legal dispensaries can generate significant tax revenue when operating within the legal framework. 2. Job Creation: The opening of dispensaries creates new jobs for local residents, ranging from retail positions to management roles. This can help reduce unemployment and stimulate economic growth in the community. 3. Business Opportunities: Legal dispensaries can stimulate the local economy by creating opportunities for ancillary businesses, such as security services, professional services (legal, accounting), and construction services for building and maintaining dispensary sites. 4. Market Regulation: Legal dispensaries operate under state regulations, ensuring that cannabis products are produced, grown, and tested to meet safety standards. This can prevent the sale of unregulated products and protect consumers[3]. Social Benefits 1. Social Equity: New York has made efforts to award licenses to individuals with past marijuana-related offenses and to businesses focused on social equity. This approach aims to rectify past injustices associated with the criminalization of cannabis and to foster a diverse and inclusive market[3]. 2. Community Development: Cannabis dispensaries can be part of community development initiatives, providing funding for local projects and contributing to the overall improvement of the area. Health Benefits 1. Medical Access: For patients with qualifying conditions, medical marijuana can provide relief from symptoms such as chronic pain, chemotherapy-induced nausea, and multiple sclerosis spasticity symptoms[1][4]. Dispensaries offer a regulated source of cannabis for medical use. 2. Holistic Treatment: Medical marijuana is seen as a holistic approach to treating various conditions, offering an alternative to traditional pharmaceuticals that may have more severe side effects[4]. 3. Controlled Substances: Legal dispensaries ensure that cannabis is dispensed in controlled dosages and formulations, which can be safer for consumers compared to unregulated sources[4]. In conclusion, the presence of cannabis dispensaries in Staten Island can bring economic, social, and health benefits to the area. These include increased</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>tax revenue, job creation, support for social equity, community development, and access to regulated medical marijuana for patients in need. Citations: [1] <a href="https://www.silive.com/news/2024/01/what-are-the-health-risks-benefits-of-legal-weed.html">https://www.silive.com/news/2024/01/what-are-the-health-risks-benefits-of-legal-weed.html</a> [2] <a href="https://ny1.com/nyc/all-boroughs/news/2023/06/22/ny-to-lose-millions-in-cannabis-tax-revenue-due-to-illegal-market">https://ny1.com/nyc/all-boroughs/news/2023/06/22/ny-to-lose-millions-in-cannabis-tax-revenue-due-to-illegal-market</a> [3] <a href="https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-hochul-announces-new-adult-use-cannabis-dispensaries-opening-end-year">https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-hochul-announces-new-adult-use-cannabis-dispensaries-opening-end-year</a> [4] <a href="https://sharonneurology.com/marijuana.php">https://sharonneurology.com/marijuana.php</a> [5] <a href="https://pix11.com/news/local-news/staten-island/legal-cannabis-dispensary-opening-on-staten-island/">https://pix11.com/news/local-news/staten-island/legal-cannabis-dispensary-opening-on-staten-island/</a> [6] <a href="https://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/how-high-and-how-soon-projecting-the-growth-of-the-legal-cannabis-market-in-new-york-city-august-2023.pdf">https://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/how-high-and-how-soon-projecting-the-growth-of-the-legal-cannabis-market-in-new-york-city-august-2023.pdf</a> [7] <a href="https://www.silive.com/news/2023/07/5-new-weed-shops-approved-for-staten-island.html">https://www.silive.com/news/2023/07/5-new-weed-shops-approved-for-staten-island.html</a> [8] <a href="https://bestores.com">https://bestores.com</a> [9] <a href="https://rockinst.org/issue-area/the-economic-impact-of-developing-the-adult-use-cannabis-industry-in-new-york/">https://rockinst.org/issue-area/the-economic-impact-of-developing-the-adult-use-cannabis-industry-in-new-york/</a> [10] <a href="https://www.thecity.nyc/2023/11/01/legal-weed-dealers-social-equity-fund/">https://www.thecity.nyc/2023/11/01/legal-weed-dealers-social-equity-fund/</a> [11] <a href="https://www.nyc.gov/site/doh/health/health-topics/marijuana.page">https://www.nyc.gov/site/doh/health/health-topics/marijuana.page</a> [12] <a href="https://www.nysenate.gov/sites/default/files/admin/structure/media/manage/filefile/a/2023-11/nughub-ny-llc-testimony.pdf">https://www.nysenate.gov/sites/default/files/admin/structure/media/manage/filefile/a/2023-11/nughub-ny-llc-testimony.pdf</a> [13] <a href="https://www.nyc.gov/site/sbs/about/pr20231004-cnycfasttrac.page">https://www.nyc.gov/site/sbs/about/pr20231004-cnycfasttrac.page</a></p>
74.	Lorraine	Scanni		No dispensary at 465 forest avenue. My house is only 50 yards away from this establishment. the community was not informed and there is a school and a church a block away.
75.	Antionette	Kirk		I support the dispensaries on Forest Avenue
76.	Lisa	Fitzgibbons		The addresses of 465 and 386 forest avenue should not be granted a permit to dispense cannabis for the following reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
77.	Kevin	John's		How come I have not heard a peep since applying? Disabled veteran holding a lease for 4 months now like



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				nys asked of me? Spot in the right location we need answers now
78.	Erika	Pappino		How can THE OCM tell us they will go through a 100 applicants a week? Which has not happened we would be in the 1200's by now this is not right what you have done to your so called "see applicants" 8,000 illegal shops out there and you wanna fight it with as little as 250 from these applicant holding leases?
79.	James	Orielly		How can you guys tell us to get a lease and start paying and then say we may no even look at your application? Won't most of these applicants turn their shop to illegal?
80.	Melissa	Ferrari		Regarding the proposed locations of 465 and 386 Forest Ave, S.I., I am not in favor of granting a license to these locations for the following reasons: 1. It is too close to residential housing 2. It is too close to schools, houses of worship 3. It is in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 4. There was insufficient local community input on the application / the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently.
81.	Paul	Eisenhardt		I do not want this cannabis store in my neighborhood
82.	Joanne	Hollan		I do not care what any data says in that promoting the use of marijuana is a helpful and positive decision for any person or any community. It is not. Removing two well known and positive businesses from our community to install legalized drug use is irresponsible and harmful to all young people and to a decent community. Marijuana is a gateway drug that can lead to serious addiction to other lethal drugs. It corrupts people's lives, destroys families, and destroys communities. We love the two businesses that have served this community for years and, now, because of pure greed, we have them replaced by a business that promotes addiction. No! This is total irresponsibility.
83.	Michael	DeCarlo		I am opposed to the proposed cannabis location for 465 and 386 forest Ave as being against granting a permit to these locations for any of the following reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently Thank you, Michael DeCarlo
84.	Ilene	Pappert	Forest Regional	I am a senior citizen living in this neighborhood for 44 years. The properties at 465 and 386 Forest Avenue



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
			Residents Association	10301 Staten Island are being considered to become Cannabis Dispensaries. There are so many reasons this is unacceptable and will change the nature of this community. Just a few of the reasons are the dispensaries are too close to each other where children pass in high volume. This is not a neighborhood zoned for high volume commercial business. In the 10 block corridor there are many bars and liquor stores. Please consider the long lasting impact this will have on this neighborhood. There are better places to build cannabis dispensaries on Staten Island. Thank you
85.	Andrea	Pappert-Tenzer		I am against 465 Forest Ave and 386 Forest Ave on Staten Island being granted a cannabis license. I have lived in this community for 40 years and believe that cannabis stores that these locations would be detrimental to the community. Cannabis should be legal in NY, but the stores should not be located so close to residential housing, houses of worship, schools, and in an area already oversaturated with businesses that sell alcohol.
86.	Eileen	Montanez		I am opposed to the licensing of two dispensaries at 386 and 465 Forest Ave in Staten Island NY. They are too close together, are adjacent to residences and community concerns have not been considered. One is located in a strip mall with a popular liquor store and will kick out two local businesses which have been there for over 20 years!
87.	David	Salvatore		If a store meets all the regulations it should be allowed to open. A reason it might be a high volume commercial businesses is from the lack of other legal cannabis shops due to licensing delays or lack of turn key financing. Staten Island now has over 500,000 residents. Except for our wonderful parks, almost everywhere is close to a home, school or house of worship. Children pass by the illegal shops in high volume daily, the legal shops I have been in are very careful not to let in minors. No advertising on the windows etc. The 10 block corridor is saturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses which has been this way for at least 30 or 40 years. New ones seem to open all the time with no problems. If proper legal notification to local community for input on the application process - if even required, was given and not acted upon it is not the fault of the business.
88.	Donna	Casale	New Brighton community board	No dispensary by churches, supermarkets, neighborhoods, put them by a freeway or industrial area



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
89.	Dawn	Diaz	New Brighton	Put by highways away from our neighborhood, these are not welcome, gateway drug , we have a drug prob, go away
90.	David	Slvatore		my previous comments were in regards to the granting a permit to stores located at 465 and 386 Forest Avenue, Staten Island NY. A community organization wanted me to "Voice your concern TODAY - DONT WAIT. LETS CRASH THE SITE with our strong opinions for or against." Then advised "You need to specifically mention the addresses of 465 and 386 as being against granting a permit to these locations for any of the following reasons: " and then listed 7 opinions against and none for. 1, Cannabis dispensaries are no more high volume that the tobacco / lotto / card store or bank that operate / operated at these locations. 2 & 4, Staten Island now has over 500,000 residents, everywhere is close to a home, school or place of worship. 3,5 & 6, New bars and restaurants open on this corridor all the time. Some new, some replace prior establishments. 3 or liquor stores operate within blocks of each other. Children walk past them in high volume daily with no problems. 7 Not being aware is not the same as not following legal notice requirements. I'm not sure how FRRCA and it's members would benefit from "crashing this site" nor am I confident they would id themselves as FRRCA members while replying. Hate and yelling never solved a thing.
91.	Zhana	Krot		I am strongly AGAINST the cannabis dispensaries! We don't need our youth be exposed to this; they need to be focused in schools. And if you think no one will try to commit crimes insides these establishments - you are mistaking.
92.	Pamela	Silvestri		1.) Can you tell me who are the press contacts for the OCM? I have sent multiple emails from silvestri@siadvance.com to press@ocm.ny.gov on deadline and received on 2/1 a terse "background" answer by "Taylor Randi Public Affairs Coordinator." That person did not follow up on further correspondence. 2.) This leads me to ask: Do you have a press secretary for OCM and exactly what date was that person appointed? Please let me know the person's name and email address for future correspondence. 3.) I have addressed this lack of communication out of professional educative concern (and out of desperation with regard to deadline) to Pascale Bernard herself at a recent Community Board 1 meeting. She deflected and that makes me investigate this more on a lack of transparency and/or structured organization of OCM. I left my work email address twice for her to get



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				back on the information privately and still have not heard back after two days. In the meantime, thank you for assistance in connecting me with a proper press contact at the OCM and answering my questions. My number is 917-887-0436.
93.	Mark	Hudson		Permitting Cannabis dispensaries to open at either 365 or 386 Forest Avenue should not be allowed for a number of reasons: First and foremost, this is a residential area; there are numerous schoolchildren living in and passing through the area; this area already has high concentration of bars, restaurants, liquor stores and smoke shops; the locations are very close to houses of worship and schools. Furthermore, this will bring additional vehicle traffic from out of the neighborhood into an area that is already very congested at most hours of the day. It should be obvious to OCM that the West Brighton/New Brighton community do not want this type of establishment in this area of the community. Lastly, the community members, the Community Board and our elected officials apparently did not receive the mandated 30 day notice of the license process.
94.	Gerald	Massa		It has come to my attention that there are plans to establish cannabis dispensaries at 386 Forest Avenue and 465 Forest Avenue in Staten Island. I, as well as most residents within our local community, are appalled and adamantly opposed to these establishments being developed here. I understand these establishments are legal entities, however, for the following reasons, I do not believe they are appropriate for our locality: 1. The proposed establishments will bring an influx of people to the area who are not residents. This area is not zoned for high commercial businesses. 2. The proposed locations are centrally embedded within a dense residential area. Being that these are not businesses that serve the needs of the local community such as a supermarket, deli, or bank, they are far too close to residential housing. 3. The proposed locations are far too close to each other. These proposed sites are literally within a minute's walking distance of each other. 4. The proposed locations are within walking distance of a church and an elementary school. 5. The proposed locations are a central corridor for families and young children as per the aforementioned reason. 6. This area is already oversaturated with businesses that cater to vices, with bars, beer and liquor stores, and vape shops on nearly every block within a ten-block strip. 7. the local community had no input into the





# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				application and our community was not sufficiently notified of the intentions to develop these establishments.
95.	Lynda	Massa		Please be advised that I am adamantly opposed to Cannabis Dispensaries being granted licenses for the following locations: 465 Forest Avenue and 386 Forest Avenue, Staten Island. These dispensaries would be too close to residential housing with many young families and too close to schools and Houses of Worship and would bring people to the area who are not residents. These establishments would not be appropriate for this community. This is a family-oriented community and I strongly object to cannabis dispensaries being established here. Thank you
96.	Catherine	Carbin		Good Morning, After attending an informative Community Board 1 meeting ,learning of applications for a cannabis dispensary license for both 386 AND 465 Forest Ave Staten Island NY 10301 I am opposed to a cannabis dispensary in either of those locations 465 forest only zoned c1-1,386 Forest zoned c-1 2 Mainly both properties border home residences Both properties are in a walking paths of 2 High Schools,(St. Peters& Notre Dame) 2 intermediate schools,( IS 27 & 61) 4schools grades pre k-5 or 8 . (Sacred Heart, Our Lady of Good Counsel, PS45, Notre Dame Academy ) and SpecialEd (Sensory Studio) The area is ALREADY oversaturated with 3 liquor stores, 5 beer stores, 11 restaurants serving alcohol and unfortunately 3 "smoke shops" The local elected officials Senator Jessica Scarcella,or Assemblyman Sam Pirrizollo were not notified of applications as required. . In all due respect Cannabis Dispensary laws need to be REEVALUATED Pascale Bernard along with Phillip Rumsy presented knowledgeably NYC 'sRoadmap to Adult Use Cannabis Management yet NYC needs to do better The sole thought of a site can be allowed for a dispensary if it is connected to a school downstairs or a church with an operating senior center is ABSURD PLEASE DENY cannabis licenses for the family oriented 386 Forest Ave AND 465 Forest Ave both Staten Island NY 10301 And while at it, Please take a look at your laws for ALL future cannabis Dispensary Sites These dispensaries do not belong in ANYONES residential back yards I live about a mile away from both above locations yet frequent above area on a daily basis Thank You, Catherine Carbin
97.	Mary	Blaich		The proposed cannabis dispensary location is very close to a church and schools. The traffic situation now is out of control. This business that is evicting two important



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				neighborhood businesses is going to compound that problem. The community of West Brighton has been strong and united for decades trying our best to preserve a livable, safe neighborhood for all residents. We previously rezoned the neighborhood ourselves. We work very hard to make this happen and not to have what is not appropriate forced on us. That is why this hard working community of city workers stay strong together. Many families have lived here for many generations. A cannabis dispensary is so inappropriate when added to the numerous bars already on the strip from Bement Avenue to Hart Boulevard. This is a family neighborhood and not one we want children to be constantly exposed to.
98.	Jessica	Scannapie co		The canon is dispensaries are too close to each other as well as to private residences
99.	Jessica	Scannapie co		The dispensary locations on forest Ave in West Brighton Staten Island are too close to one another and to private residences
100.	Christopher	Decastro		Dear Members of the New York State Cannabis Control Board, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposal to establish a cannabis dispensary in our neighborhood at 386 Forest Avenue as well as 465 Forest Avenue in Staten Island, New York. As a resident of this community, I believe that allowing such an establishment would have significant negative impacts on our neighborhood and the well-being of its residents. First and foremost, the presence of a cannabis dispensary in our neighborhood could potentially increase crime rates and attract undesirable elements to our area. While I understand that cannabis legalization is a reality in our state, the introduction of a dispensary in a residential area like ours raises concerns about safety and security. Furthermore, the establishment of a cannabis dispensary could have adverse effects on property values in our neighborhood. Many residents, myself included, have invested time and resources into making our homes a safe and comfortable environment for our families. The presence of a dispensary nearby could detract from the desirability of our neighborhood and potentially decrease property values. Additionally, there are concerns about the potential impact on the youth in our community. The proximity of a cannabis dispensary to schools and parks could normalize cannabis use among young people and make it more accessible to minors, which is something we should strive to prevent. Moreover, I believe that there are more suitable locations for cannabis dispensaries within the city that would not pose the same risks to residential



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				neighborhoods. Industrial or commercial areas may be better suited for such establishments, where they would have less of an impact on the daily lives of residents. In conclusion, I urge the New York State Cannabis Control Board to carefully consider the concerns of the residents of our neighborhood and reject the proposal to establish a cannabis dispensary in our community. There are too many potential risks and negative consequences associated with such a decision, and it is not in the best interest of our neighborhood or its residents. Thank you for considering my viewpoint on this important issue. Sincerely, Christopher Decastro
101.	Laura	Kimmins		I AM OPPOSED TO THE ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT FOR CANNABIS STORE AT 465 AND 386 FOREST AVE STATEN ISLAND. THESE SITES ARE 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficient!
102.	Jonah	Helmer		What is the timeline for the license review process? What other documents will be required to be submitted before applicants are issued a full license?
103.	Jonah	Helmer		If an applicant has control of a property but applied after the November 17th deadline where will they be in the queue for the next round of licenses to be reviewed?
104.	Marion	Hudson	Member of community for almost 50 years	As a longtime member of the community, I am vehemently opposed to granting permits for cannabis dispensaries at 465 and 386 Forest Avenue in Staten Island, NY 10310. Our neighborhood is not zoned for high volume commercial businesses. There are private homes right behind these buildings. These homes will be subject to increased parking problems since available parking in front of the stores is small, and overflow will go in front of these homes. In addition, the area will be subjected to smell of cannabis smoke! The proposed sites are within 2 blocks of each other. The area is already over saturated with bars and stores that sell liquor and beer. The community does not need businesses that will attract numerous customers from outside the area. It is a very busy stretch of Forest Avenue . These proposed sites are too close to schools and houses of worship. The kids walk home along this stretch of the Avenue in large numbers every week day. I have 7 grandsons and I'm very



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				concerned about the effect it could have on their quality of life. Lastly, I am appalled that the neighborhood people did not receive sufficient notification the community has had no input on the application. We only found out about it when we heard the stores were being forced to close. Apparently, as we were informed at the February 13 meeting, our elected officials were not kept in the loop either! The CCB needs to follow its own rules. West Brighton is not the right location for a Cannabis Dispensary. I strongly urge your committee to find a more suitable site for it.
105.	Jonah	Helmer		Can a microbusiness located in a municipality that opted out of retail dispensaries operate a delivery only operation from their location?
106.	Patricia	Cohen		Strongly opposed to cannabis sites at 465 and 386 Forest Avenue. Our beautiful community will be negatively impacted. Schools, Temple, Lutheran Church all within one block. Please do not bring here. A natural location would be in an industrial area, i.e. Richmond Terrace. Thank you.
107.	Gerard	Curran		No Smokeshops in school areas. Specifically on Forest Ave in SI.
108.	Steve	Nardone	Private Citizen and Taxpayer	The proposed DISPENSARIES represent highly undesirable and unsavory presence in otherwise bustling and vibrant, and safe, areas on Forest Ave. Two specific addresses in question are 465 Forest Ave and 386 Forest Ave. It is unimaginable that these DISPENSARIES would ever be allowed in close proximity to BANKS, other shopping, schools, restaurants, pharmacies, grocery stores, and even bars. I personally regularly experience panhandling by repeat individuals when using banking services and cannot imagine anything less than a massive increase with harassment from patrons of these DISPENSARIES or even criminals hanging out around these DISPENSARIES. Already, private residents of these areas deal with increased foot and vehicular traffic frequenting already busy streets. Inevitably, these same residents would be exposed to the unsavory characters that DISPENSARIES will most certainly draw. The rights of those seeking the products of these dispensaries would not be impacted if these locations are REJECTED and the DISPENSARIES are then required to seek locations which are far from residential, schools, banks, shopping, and other far less volatile occupancy. There is already a Smoke Shop at 420 Forest Ave which remains open at hours disturbing the neighborhood. I therefore strongly



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				recommend that these DISPENSARIES be wholly denied any permission to occupy these locations.
109.	Laura	McCarthy		I am opposed to the location of the proposed dispensary 386 Forest Ave and 465 Forest Ave on Staten Island, NY because of the zoning laws on this main avenue and the inappropriateness of this type of business with pedestrian traffic. Further, both sites are within close proximity to churches and schools that serve children. While I welcome cannabis dispensaries as a means of streamlining distribution safely, they must be appropriately located in the community. This strip is already inundated with restaurants, bars, and liquor stores as well as an abundance of smoke shops that illegally sell cannabis.
110.	Justin	Rebollo		Why has the office moved the reopening of the Processor Type 3 license twice this year? Initially it was stated to reopen in late January, and then it was updated to reopen on February 26th, and now it states the application will reopen in early March. Can the office state a concrete date and stick to it especially for a license type that is much simpler than the other licenses?
111.	Kevin	Hicks		Displacing two businesses to place a cannabis dispensary at 465 Forest Avenue and also at 386 Forest Avenue is a terrible idea. This is a community that is growing, renovating and improving its family residences in a very positive way. As it was, there were too many bars in a small area and that has changed and will continue to change. There are elementary schools within walking distance of both addresses. This is a small community that has enough of these sorts of businesses (bars, liquor stores, etc.) One or more cannabis dispensaries would ultimately destroy what is a rebounding family area. What next? A gambling parlor??? There are dedicated retail shopping areas that should handle this type of business. It will not benefit the vast majority of local residents.
112.	Meghan	Wieber		Please do not put any more cannabis shops in these residential areas . It's garbage
113.	Danielle and Johnny	Chebat	WNYC II, LLC - OCMCAUR DP-2023-000078	July 2023- Received provisional license July 2023 - Secured location and received approval from municipality August 2023 - lawsuit that shut down CAURD program August 2023 - In an attempt to squeeze through we handed in all documents requested to prove readiness. Hand delivered the documents to the OCM in Albany. The attempt was later unsuccessfully presented to the judge. November 2023 - CAURD was reopened December 19, 2023 - All items turned into the OCM December 29, 2023 - Virtual Audit completed Wednesday, January 17, 2024 12:01 PM - Received Proposed Location Proximity



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				Protection Approval Letter I need to be on the next round of openings. I have an entire team trained and ready. I can't afford to continue paying bills without revenue. I am desperately begging that you allow me to open immediately. Thank you kindly, Johnny and Danielle Chebat
114.	Linda	Dentice	Cannabis Crafters LLC	I applied for the micro-business on October 7th and I was number 121 and now in this lottery system I'm 1137 to be reviewed, and others are in multiple times? This is wrong, I have everything I need in place, the lease agreement, the land, the greenhouse. This isn't fair. Why do I have to wait to be reviewed. Should be first come first served. Seems like this was done to put favorites first. I have been in a holding pattern and want to start growing.-Linda Dentice, Cannabis Crafters
115.	William	Lavasseur	Home owner	I and my family do not want any cannabis dispensaries in my neighborhood. This will cause my problems and currently we have enough issues with narcotics in our area.. please deny the permit or license for this business.
116.	Saladin	Amir		How are you handling the provisional licenses for micro business?
117.	Johnny & Danielle	Chebat	WNYC II LLC DBA TREEHEAD CULTURE - OCMCAUR DP-2023-000078	Dear Office of Cannabis Management: We are a small, family-owned dispensary; a dream planted years ago, nurtured with love, dedication, and the vision to bring something truly special to our community. From the moment we were awarded the opportunity to serve, every waking day has been a step towards creating a space that reflects our family's values: trust, quality, and community. Our story isn't just about opening another dispensary; it's about opening doors to education, understanding, and the countless benefits that cannabis can offer to those in need. It's been a journey with its share of challenges. The anticipation since the day we were awarded has been both a test of patience and resilience. We've faced gaps that seemed insurmountable - regulatory hurdles, preparation intricacies, and the silent echoes of our empty store waiting to be filled with the vibrancy of our community. Yet, our resolve has only strengthened, our family bond deepened, and our commitment to our people even stronger. To the Office of Cannabis Management, we are ready. Ready to open, ready to serve, and ready to make a difference. We humbly ask for your support and approval to allow us to bloom. Let us turn the page from preparation to action, from waiting to welcoming. Our small family dispensary is not just a business; it's a force of our family's love for the community and belief in the power of cannabis to make lives better. Let us move forward, together, into a



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				future where our community can thrive with the benefits we know we can provide. Thank you for considering our story, our dream, and the opportunity to serve.
118.	Mark	Salzillo		We live on Sharon Avenue. Just a few houses up from Forest Avenue. We have a 6 year old daughter. We couldn't be anymore opposed to a dispensary opening on our corner. Not a single person in this neighborhood is in favor of a cannabis shop. We will be selling our house and moving if a shop opens in West Brighton.
119.	matthew	delaney	port richmond glass (business owner on forest avenue)	We welcome a licensed cannabis dispensary in our neighborhood, especially one that is granted to a family member of another fellow long time forest avenue business owner. Hopefully we can have more licensed dispensaries and WEED out all of the illegal smoke shops that are flooding the streets with low grade, non-tested cannabis
120.	Mary Ellen	Tirone		The proposed site for the dispensary is not appropriate. Opening of the dispensary must be denied.
121.	Scott	Sweeney		I'm writing to ask that the permits for 465 Forest Avenue and 386 Forest Avenue, both in Staten Island, be rejected. We already have enough bars and liquor stores in the neighborhood. Also, if you go to both sites during the day and in the early evening you'll see the high number of children walking past both addresses. Granting these permits will have a very negative affect on this neighborhood. Thank you.
122.	Maria Christine	Romanelli		I am against 465 and 386 Forest Ave, Staten Island being granted a permit for cannabis sale due to the following reasons/concerns; It is: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently Thank you for your consideration.
123.	Luciano	Romanelli		I am against 465 and 386 Forest Ave, Staten Island being granted a permit for cannabis sale due to the following reasons/concerns; It is: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently Thank you for your consideration.
124.	DANIEL	Snoke	DANK VALLEY GROWERS LLC	<p>Dear Members of the Board, I am writing on behalf of a group of concerned citizens who have been closely following the recent developments in the cannabis licensing process in our state. We are deeply frustrated with the current system and feel compelled to voice our concerns. Firstly, we believe that the number of licenses granted to individuals with leases is insufficient. There are many potential licensees who have secured leases and are ready to contribute positively to the industry, yet they are being overlooked due to the limited number of licenses available. We urge you to consider increasing the number of licenses to accommodate these individuals. Secondly, we have serious reservations about the fairness of the lottery system that the state has implemented. While we understand the need for a selection process, we feel that the lottery system does not adequately consider the qualifications of the applicants. There were numerous well-qualified applicants in the first window who will not be considered under the current system, which we believe is unjust. We are also frustrated by the lack of communication from the Office of Cannabis Management (OCM). Our inquiries and concerns have been largely ignored, leaving us feeling unheard and in the dark. We request that the OCM improve its communication with the public and respond to our questions in a timely and comprehensive manner. Lastly, we would like to see more transparency in the review process. Specifically, we request that the OCM provide regular updates on the queue number they are currently reviewing. This will give applicants a better idea of the timeline and allow them to plan accordingly. We understand that the licensing process is complex and that the OCM is working under challenging circumstances. However, we believe that the changes we have suggested will lead to a more fair and transparent system. We look forward to your response and are hopeful for a positive change in the near future.</p> <p>Sincerely</p>
125.	CHARLES	BLAICH		<p>I am against permitting a Cannabis Shop at both Forest Ave addresses of 465 and 386 because: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient</p>





# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
126.	John	Anderson		How can we be holding spots for months sitting in the 700 on que agenda is out and there people in the 1000's and 2000's up for approval? We haven't heard a peep need answers now!
127.	Arlene	Egan		Please DO NOT PLACE A CANNABIS DISPENSARY ON FOREST AVE IN WEST BRIGHTON, Staten Is, NY!! Not needed or wanted here!!!
128.	Penelope	Joan		How are people on the que in the 1000's and 2000's up for retail approval when I'm in the 600's and have not heard a peep?
129.	James	Johnskn		How are people on the que in the 1000's and 2000's up for retail approval when people much lower in the que have not heard a peep?
130.	Kelly	Eagan		I am against the issuance of a cannabis dispensary permit to 465 Forest Avenue, Staten Island, New York 10301 and 386 Forest Avenue, Staten Island, New York 10301 for the following reasons: 1. Both locations are in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. Both locations are too close to residential housing, including my own. I am a resident living within .3 and .4 miles respectively of both locations. 3. The two locations are only two blocks away from each other and are too close to each other 4. Both locations are too close to multiple schools with both pre-school and elementary-age children and houses of worship, multiple denominations. 5. Both locations are within a 10 block corridor that is already oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 6. Both locations are too close to various Staten Island mental health care institutions that care for a vulnerable population of our community who would be at risk 7. There was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified.
131.	Chelsea	Johnson		How can you tell us to get a lease and hold it and now months later and bills stacking up and I still have not heard anything from ocm?
132.	Erik	Johns		IM SITTING NUMBER 793 and I see people in the 1000's up for approval? Why? How did you skip me?
133.	Edward	MCVey	Community member	We DO NOT WANT A CANNABIS DISPENSARY ON FOREST AVE, WEST BRIGHTON, STATEN ISLAND, NY!!!!
134.	Kevin	Pollard		I am a disabled veteran holding my location by living pay check to pay check when will I hear something? you guys are bleeding us all dry
135.	Kyle	Johnston		With over 8,000 illegal stores, how can you not give out the 1000 retail PROMISED at EACH MEETING?



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
136.	Nicolas	Leeper		Can we get an update on the December deadline applications? It was my understanding that the queuing process would occur within 2-4 weeks and we're now 8 weeks out.
137.	Megan	Fuller-Fattorusso		I am against the dispensaries at 465 and 386 Forest Ave on Staten Island because it would be: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses
138.	Jayme	Buonviaggio		I am against 465 and 386 Forest Ave, Staten Island being granted a permit for cannabis sale due to the following reasons/concerns; It is: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently Thank you for your consideration.
139.	Margaret	Licursi		I am against 465 and 386 Forest Ave, Staten Island being granted a permit for cannabis sale. It is: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily Thank you for your consideration.
140.	Chris	Curley		As a matter of public safety and many other factors, I am strongly against addresses of 465 and 386 Forest Ave. Staten Island, NY being granted a permit. These businesses are incredibly close to one another and for the following reasons I object to their existence in these spaces: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools and houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
141.	Karyn	Fitzgibbons		Good Afternoon... Like many of my neighbors, I am writing with concern about the influx of cannabis retail stores in our area. I do understand the selling of this product is legal and I neither question that, nor one's choice to indulge. I



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>ask, however, that better care is taken with the allowed placement of such stores. The particular area we are concerned with at the moment is West Brighton, predominantly Forest Avenue between Hart Blvd and Bement Avenue. This is just one of the wonderful family oriented, walkable areas in Staten Island. Yes, this area has a decent commercial presence but it is a close knit, safe feeling neighborhood where the store owners know your name and kids names as well. Within the last few years, two "smoke shops"/"convenience stores" have opened at 420 Forest Avenue and 520 Forest Avenue, which are about 3 blocks from each other. Drive past and they boast bongos in the window and vaping, exotic snacks, etc on their signage. We are now told two more "legal" shops are being considered for 386 and 465 Forest Avenue, which would make 4 cannabis stores within 5 blocks. I think most people will agree that is ludicrous and counter-intuitive. While our grammar and high schools host speakers who are dedicated to teaching the kids about the perils of drug use (because they've been there themselves), their communities allow the new legal status to seemingly push the product. What is this saying to our children? Resisting the urge to start something new like this becomes harder when it's so visible and easily accessible. While your position may be that this product is different from other drugs, you must admit we really don't need young children so overly exposed to it. Please kindly think about that. PLEASE do not allow more stores like this to infiltrate a gem of a neighborhood. It becomes harder to keep good people in New York when lawmakers act without thinking things through and so we appeal to your rational side and common sense. With regard to 465 Forest Ave, the landlord is actually kicking out a bagel store and card shop, which have both been in that spot for decades. Apparently they are not in arrears on their rent, the landlord simply sees a new payday with cannabis sales. Fabulous. The landlords often do not live in the area where they own buildings and DO NOT CARE about such issues. But someone has to! My suggestion would be to put such stores in higher commercial zones or other places that are less walkable, where you need to get in the car and drive to. You should be an adult to enter such a store, so you can certainly drive there. Also, why aren't higher fines imposed upon the illegal stores so that your legal ones can do their job? The illegal stores do not do enough to dissuade children from entering because they</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				sell items like soda and snacks. Please help us save our neighborhood, our children and the future of this island.
142.	Ellexcion	Ojo	El barrio legacy group	Allow more micro license's , allow more space and opportunities for SEE applicants . Thank you in honor
143.	Garry	Dugan		I spent thirty four years in law enforcement. I saw and experienced how marijuana affects people. No one can convince me that a person who has used this cannabis can think normally while under the influence. What is more important is that this is the first stepping stone to more serious drugs. How dare anyone to allow these cannabis stores to come into existence where there are thousands of children, many schools and churches. People will be using this cannabis and will be driving their automobiles . That alone is a real disaster waiting to happen. I believe that the people who are allowing this to happen should be held accountable for these actions .
144.	Grzegorz	Plaszewski		Absolutely agains it. Already busy area with businesses. High crime potentially, as other areas with this type of business model/dispensaries show.
145.	Bill	Althoff		No to the weed store
146.	Kathleen	Caffrey		We don't need anymore Cannabis Stores. Don't you see our city and Staten Island is going down the drain. Cannabis only brings problems. People are driving high. Parents aren't watching their children because they are getting high and people are being killed working at these stores and robbed It's just horrible what i've seen.
147.	John	Mazzella	Forest Regional Residents' Association	I've lived in this community of West Brighton for 47 years and have seen the neighborhood in both good and bad times. Now the plan to open two cannabis dispensaries, one at 465 Forest Ave and the second at 386 Forest Ave is lunacy. I say this for the following reasons: 1. this neighborhood is not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. the two sited locations are too close to residential housing 3. both sites are too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. the sites are too close to schools, houses of worship 5. they are in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor where the sites are situated are oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
148.	Hanane	Dbajat		I'd like to express my opposition of granting a license to the following locations : 465 and 386 Forest Avenue.
149.	Angela	Cifuni		How can you change the number of retail to so little and have us spend money and not even get a response



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
150.	Diane	Mazzella	Forest Regional Residents' Association	I've lived in this community of West Brighton for 47 years and much of what I'm seeing doesn't please me. A multitude of bars, convenience stores and smoke shops are an eyesore. The idea of opening two cannabis shops makes the whole situation worse. The plan to open one shop at 465 Forest Avenue and a second at 386 Forest Avenue will significantly make the community even less desirable. Accordingly, I am opposed to this plan for any of the following reasons: 1. this neighborhood is not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. the two proposed sites are too close to residential housing 3. they are too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. they are too close to schools, houses of worship 5. they would be situated in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is already oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
151.	Jason	Lewis	Stoned in Brooklyn, Inc	I would like to know, how are applicants with higher Queue numbers being referred for a license prior to my own. I am queue number 218 and I have a full/ complete application and have successfully sufficed the required document requested of me during my deficiency period responded swiftly with fingerprints as well did not take more than 1 week to cure. In a non scored licensing round, however it appears I've been skipped or overlooked in this round of licenses. Would someone be able to explain why this is and what this means for my application as OCM has verified that my application is complete and still valid. Very specific Numbers 238 Glass House Farms, LLC , number 243 Untergang Inc, & number 260 Nautical Cannabis, LLC all of which have great numbers that me in the queue. What happens if one of these licenses happen to be within 1000 feet of my location ? What would be the remedy ? Please advise here thank you. Greatly appreciated and thank you for everyone's help.
152.	Theresa	Roman		I am AGAINST granting a dispensary license for the following locations at 386 AND 485 Forest Ave. The addresses are too close to each other - how can you but them both here? These locations are in a residential neighborhood - the dispensaries would be in an area where residential housing and schooling (PS 45) and a Synagogue exists. This neighborhood is overly saturated with bars & liquor stores- do we need these dispensaries in the area? I THINK NOT! There was insufficient community input - why weren't we informed sooner? We are not zoned for high volume commercial businesses!



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				You must rethink about granting licenses for these dispensaries here, they would be a detriment to our neighborhood.
153.	Donyal	Svilar		The decision to place the dispensary is flawed for a number of reasons; it is an area that is prone to traffic issues, has limited parking and displaces essential neighborhood stores when there are numerous empty storefronts lining Forest Avenue. There was barely any community input and it was done in a manner that was insensitive to the current shop owners and prevented them from making alternative plans. There are larger shopping plazas nearby with more parking and that are not so close to residences on Forest Ave.
154.	Linda	Graves		We don't need this type of business here!'
155.	Michael	Peters		Granting permit or license to these dispensaries at 386 or 475 Forest Ave is crazy. The existing neighborhood is JUST THAT - a neighborhood filled with homes and families.5 The area is already overwhelmed with bars & liquor stores. This neighborhood can't handle the amount of foot and car traffic that would come in should these dispensaries be granted licenses. I do NOT want licenses granted to the owners of the dispensaries- the owners do not care what happens to this neighborhood! The People care!
156.	Judy	DeRenzo		This type of business does not belong in this type of neighborhood, it should be put in an industrial area away from schools, churches and areas with many children. This will, in my opinion, ruin this close knit family oriented neighborhood.
157.	Sherryll	Clark		Thank you for bringing dispensation to this side of Staten Island. Looking forward to supporting
158.	Gail	Checkett		I i'm writing to oppose putting 465 and 386 Forest Ave out of business. They have both served the needs of the community for many years. I am opposed to placing a cannabis dispensary in a residential area. It is in advisable to have this business where there are young people living on the street where it would be located. It would seem that the dispensary should be established in a commercial area and not in a family neighborhood.
159.	Keith	Titmus	KBAT Enterprises	What is the plan for the remainder of the licenses that will be awarded. I along with many others have laid out a lot of money to secure locations in order to apply for general licenses. Now the slow process in the initial roll out from the OCM is strangling everyone. This needs to be addressed and anyone who applied with a location should be receiving licenses in the very near future. I am nearing the end of my option period for my location, and it would



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				be terrible to lose my location due to the OCM not releasing licenses in a timely manner. We all need a definite answer on exactly how many retail licenses will be released and by what date. It's absolutely crazy that it is now 2/15/24 and the OCM could only come up with 38 retail licenses to release? How is this possible?
160.	Zachary	Sadiki		Approve the dispensary! What's the difference between a dispensary opening up as opposed to a liquor store? I'll tell you- nothing! Unless of course you want to talk about the massive health risks of consuming alcohol as opposed to the comparatively minimal (while still present) negative effects of cannabis.
161.	Kerri	Trotta		Closing the bagel store and card store on Forest Ave to open a dispensary is not good for a family oriented neighborhood. Legal or not I don't want my children exposed to it . We have enough bars and delis/ smoke shops . I vote NO!
162.	Adam	Sabella		The dispensary should not be allowed in this neighborhood. This is a family neighborhood for the last 100 years. We already have illegal cigarette stores all over forest ave that invite all kind of crap up here and a dispensary will be no different or much worse. I do not want my kids around this crap legal or not.
163.	Cynthia	Del Pino		I have been living in the West Brighton community for over 28 years. I am aware that there is a plan to open a cannabis dispensary at 386 and 465 Forest Avenue. I am AGAINST having cannabis dispensaries open in my neighborhood. In addition to being only two blocks away from each other, they will be in a community full of children walking to the nearby elementary school PS 45, and Middle Schools IS 61 and IS 27. At least one of the planned locations is within 200 feet of a place of worship which is in violation of an existing law. It is bad enough that this short strip on Forest Avenue is oversaturated with bars that were not here when I first moved into this neighborhood. This is a residential neighborhood that should not be subjected to this type of activity. Like me, many of my neighbors are raising our children here and want our voices heard. We DO NOT want these dispensaries in our neighborhood.
164.	Ana	Del Pino		I have been living in the West Brighton community for over 28 years. I am aware that there is a plan to open a cannabis dispensary at 386 and 465 Forest Avenue. I am AGAINST having cannabis dispensaries open in my neighborhood. In addition to being only two blocks away from each other, they will be in a community full of children walking to the nearby elementary school PS 45, and



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				Middle Schools IS 61 and IS 27. At least one of the planned locations is within 200 feet of a place of worship which is in violation of an existing law. It is bad enough that this short strip on Forest Avenue is oversaturated with bars that were not here when I first moved into this neighborhood. This is a residential neighborhood that should not be subjected to this type of activity. My neighbors and I want our voices heard. We DO NOT want these dispensaries in our neighborhood.
165.	Christina	Syvertson		I am aware that there is a plan to open a cannabis dispensary at 386 and 465 Forest Avenue. I am AGAINST having cannabis dispensaries open in this neighborhood. It will be in a community full of children walking to the nearby elementary school PS 45, and Middle Schools IS 61 and IS 27. At least one of the planned locations is within 200 feet of a place of worship. This is a residential neighborhood that should not be subjected to this type of activity. Many of my neighbors are raising children here and want our voices heard. We DO NOT want these dispensaries in our neighborhood.
166.	Barbara and John	Andersen		We are against a Cannabis License being granted to the 465 Forest Avenue location as well as the 386 Forest Avenue location. There's already an over saturation of bars and liquor stores in this area. The location is not only close to residential area's, there's a church as well as young school children in close proximity, PS 45 as well as Notre Dame High School. Presently these two shops/stores operate as a deli/baked goods shop and the other is a card store, and the deal is to replace them with a Cannabis Shop ?? I can't find any neighbors that were aware of this. Was this decision made in private ?
167.	Byron	Downer		I have been living in the West Brighton community for the past 20 years. It has been brought to my attention, that there is a plan to open a cannabis dispensary at 386 and 465 Forest Avenue. I am AGAINST having cannabis dispensaries open in my neighborhood. In addition to being only two blocks away from each other, they will be in a community full of children walking to the nearby elementary school PS 45, and Middle Schools IS 61 and IS 27. At least one of the planned locations is within 200 feet of a place of worship which is in violation of an existing law. This neighborhood is already oversaturated with bars. The last thing we need is a dispensary that will endanger the lives of our children. This is a residential neighborhood that should not be subjected to this type of activity. Like me, many of my neighbors are raising our





# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				children here and want our voices heard. We DO NOT want these dispensaries in our neighborhood.
168.	Laura	Meyer		Thus dispensary should not be permitted to open in our neighborhood. There are pot stores up and down Forest Avenue already. This location is very close to a schools. Not to mention ruining our neighborhood by closing 2 beloved staples of our community.
169.	Jeanette	Benfante		I have lived in the West Brighton/Silver Lake area since 1988, thirty-six years. I raised my children in this neighborhood. I am totally appalled that a cannabis dispensary would even be considered to be placed in our neighborhood at all, nevertheless at 386 Forest Avenue and especially 463 and 465 Forest Avenue, S.I., NY. To displace businesses who have serviced our area for so many years (namely the Bagel Store and Card Shop), who are considered family to all of us, is just despicable! To put respectable businesses out on the street, only to be replaced by a cannabis dispensary, which is just a fancy name for a legal drug joint, is so incredibly disheartening, since it can be prevented. But we as a community were not given the opportunity to speak our discourse. I raised my children as I am sure others have, to say "NO" to drugs and now the little ones and the curious teens, will walk by every day from school or churches and think it's okay to smoke pot and be high every day of their lives, which is basically what this new law is teaching them. I cannot speak for the others who might feel the way I do about the possibility of this pot shop being thrown in our faces, but I can say on my behalf and that of my family, that the other businesses in our area will suffer as a consequence as well. Because I know as a consumer and resident, I will not put myself in a place where I will no longer feel safe. The element that this cannabis dispensary will bring, disgusts me! There are other neighborhoods, namely industrial and empty solitary spaces that can be used for that purpose. Drug users will go just about anywhere to get their drugs, they don't belong in our beautiful West Brighton/Silver Lake area. I pray that consideration be given to save our neighborhood and our children. The fact that there was insufficient input by our community since there was never notification to us, in and of itself is totally wrong. We all have voices and deserve to be heard. I can assure you that this community as a whole does not want their lives disrupted, the freedom to walk our streets, the traffic congestion this will bring, the element of people it will bring and the rights we as longstanding businesses and homeowners will have be taken away. We pay high



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				taxes to live in this neighborhood. We did not do time for a drug conviction and then as a consolation prize be granted a license to now sell the very drug they were convicted of. Ask them how many years they've been paying taxes!! I can assure you it will be zero! I can write my opinion for days and days. I just hope what I did write, does not fall upon eyes that will not see what will happen to this neighborhood and its people if any such cannabis dispensary license is granted. Thank you.
170.	Nancy	Woodman		So disturbing that cannabis dispensaries are coming to our neighborhood. As far as I am concerned, and I'm sure most of my neighbors agree with me, this is a most unwelcome addition to a very nice family oriented area. So many children pass by 465 and 386 Forest Avenue daily. This is the beginning of the downfall of an entire generation. Don't let the children and adults of this area become addicted, yes I said addicted, to this drug. Please do not issue permits to these dispensaries. They are not welcome here.
171.	Catherine	Carbin		Good Morning, After attending an informative Community Board 1 meeting and learning of applications for a cannabis dispensary license for both 386 AND two blocks away at 465 Forest Ave Staten Island NY,10301 , I need to let you know , I am opposed to a cannabis dispensary in either of those locations. 465 Forest Ave only zoned c-1 1 386 Forest Ave. only zoned c-1 2 Mainly, BOTH properties border home residences , Are in walking paths of 2 high schools ( St.Peter's and Notre DameAcademy) 2 intermediate schools (IS 27 & 61) 4 elementary schools pre k-5 or 8. (Sacred Heart, Our Lady of Good Counsel, PS 45, Notre Dame Academy) and a Special Ed School (Sensory Studio) Chirch (Freedom In God Ministries) The area from Bement Ave to Hart Blvd is ALREADY oversaturated with 3 liquor stores, 5 beer stores, 11 restaurants serving alcohol, & unfortunately 3 "smoke shops" The local community elected officials specifically, Senator Jessica Scarcella -Stanton Along with Assemblyman Sam Pirozzolo were NOT notified of license applications as required. In all due respect Cannabis Dispensary Laws need to be REEVALUATED Pascale Bernard along with Phillip Rumsy presented knowledgeably NYC 's Roadmap to Adult Use Cannabis Management yet NYC needs to do better. The sole thought of a site having exceptions for approval if a dispensary is connected to a church with a senior center is ABSURD Please deny licensure for the Family Oriented West Brighton Community specifically 386 Forest Ave



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				Staten Island New York 10301 465 Forest Ave Staten Island New York 10301 Both are with in 2 blocks of each other Thank You Let us get this right Catherine Carbin C6hicks@verizon.net
172.	Mary	Jane		Will there be additional applicants approved in a timely manner and what timeline if so. 25 retail licenses is a far cry from 250. We are a woman owned SEE approved applicant for retail and financially secure not needing any SEE funding or DASNY assistance. All OCM requested items have been completed and we were in the top 150 in Nov Queue with an existing lease in an existing cbd store with zero legal actions ever placed... no cease and desists, no raids, Municipality approved location. I am very disappointed at what I'm seeing here. Please explain!
173.	Deirdre	Cruz		It is unsafe. I do not support this for 465 and 368 forest avenue. Too close to residences, schools and local businesses.
174.	Jean	Fischer		I am against a dispensary being placed in either location at 465 or 386 Forest Ave. These addresses are both located in a residential area that does not support the traffic that may come with this business. I also do not think 2 should be situated so close together when there is a limited amount of licenses available in the whole city?
175.	Margaret	Lorczak		I am writing for the CCB not to grant permits for dispensaries at 465 Forest Avenue and 386 Forest Avenue, Staten Island, NY 10301 for the following reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently These dispensaries would be detrimental to the West Brighton community and quality of life.
176.	Dolores	Brennan	Elm Park Civic Association	We do not want any Marijuana dispensaries on Staten Island in any neighborhood!!! There is NO REASON to sell pot to the public. We do not need our children smelling this crap as they walk to school. We don't need people smoking pot while driving. We don't need people smoking pot outside restaurants, bars, bus stops, Department stores and more. Marijuana just makes you more stupid!! We have enough people running around that are stupid already because they haven't been educated properly. Maybe our site should concentrate on teaching much, reading, Grammer and history and maybe a side dish of a



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				high school building class (shop). Could do some good here.
177.	Tom	Marlow		Having cannabis dispensaries in 386 Forest Avenue and/or 465 Forest Avenue in an area that is saturated with bars, restaurants and liquor stores will only add to the congestion already in an area with limited parking. In addition, school age children are walking to and from their schools along this street which doesn't have traffic lights at every intersection.
178.	Lisa	Morrella		What is happening to our community? These are two valuable stores that are used constantly in our West Brighton community. I have lived here my whole life. 60 + years. We do not need a weed dispensing store in a location that is a shopping location for many West Brighton residents.
179.	Catherine	Anastasio	Forest Regional Residents' Civic Assn	I am writing to express my concerns with application for 2 dispensaries in my neighborhood. The locations are 386 Forest Avenue, Staten Island and 465 Forest Avenue, Staten Island. Siting of a dispensary in either of these locations does not comply with the zoning. They both fall in C1 zoning which is defined as businesses to support the needs of the "Local" community. C1 zoning does not permit drive through access which would attract customers for beyond the local community and will require a Variance for NYC Planning. Unlike to location of the other dispensary on Staten Island, at 3022 Veterans Road Staten Island which is in a C-4 zone and by definition serves a Large community. The 2 locations on Forest Avenue have limited parking, esp that location at 465, which shares the parking lot with a dry cleaner, liquor store and bank. Either location will also add to traffic and vehicular congestion in the immediate residential area. Please consider the Zoning resolutions of the municipality in which the OCM is issuing dispensary licenses.
180.	Valerie	Sanchez		I don't believe this is the right location for this business to conduct business in.
181.	Chad	Kolinsky		You guys originally said you can go through 100 application a week, what happened to those statistics?
182.	Mary	Haugen		I am against placing cannabis dispensaries on Forest Avenue for several reasons including oversaturation, the likelihood of increased traffic in an area that is already difficult to navigate, odor concerns, and their proximity to several schools and churches. The portion of Forest Avenue between Silver Lake and Bement Avenue has largely remained a corridor with a hometown feel for the entire span of my 56 years as a resident of West Brighton and I fear that these businesses will begin to erode the



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				sense of community we have all worked to maintain, and the reason why many families have chosen to live In the area for generations. There are other localities on Staten Island that offer easy accessibility to those wishing to frequent these establishments that are not situated close enough to homes where they would disrupt the daily activities of and impose unwanted olfactory experiences on nearby residents.
183.	Jeffrey	Wieseman n		The dispensary is not going to be good for our neighborhood. It is the FOREST AVENUE BID, not an industrial area. FAMILIES LIVE HERE AND THIS STORE IS DISPLACING TWO THRIVING STORES.
184.	Chase	Schuyler	Alpine agronomy llc micro applicant 308	Please reward more non-provisional licenses. My wife and I grew up in New York and graduated from SUNY school. We moved out west for the past ten years. We ran a very successful hemp business. When New York legalized cannabis we saw it as an opportunity to come back home to raise our two kids. We have been paying a lease on a micro retail/grow location for 20 months at \$7500 a month. We have no investors or loans. We have used most our life savings to do this. The facility is 90% completed in the buildout. We are at queue 2077 which means we have little to no chance to get a license under current numbers. Please review all non provisional applicants and give licenses to everyone that qualifies. It will not change supply in the market that much if you reward a license to everyone but what it will change if you don't is the quality of life for my children. We have spent \$400,000 on the buildout. We CANNOT afford wait for another application period later this year. Please reward licenses to every priority applicant that qualifies. It's just common sense. Thank you. I would be there in person but the kids school was delayed because of snow.
185.	Domenick	Villamagna		This area is not suitable for a dispensary. There are enough issues with the Bara in the area.
186.	Ed	Mooney		No dispensary in Forest ave
187.	Lorraine	Santangelo		I'm in favor of a legal marijuana shop on Forest Avenue. Then I won't have to go over bridge to NJ and can keep \$\$ on Staten Island.
188.	Patrick	Chesney	Cannalabs	The randomized sequence process in the "Queue" that determined applicant position & review order was implemented by what agency? If OCM, what Standard & methodology used? & who did the audit? where are those audit results? Was any of this process in direct oversight & inspection by the NYS Gaming Commission?
189.	walter	iwachiw	wee4ustice	Constructive AI insight: The Business express portal failed twice First in CAURD, permanently, then in SEE freezing



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				for nearly a month, which finally affecting the approval of the application for this meeting. Disappointed. On the other side the OCM will be receiving a significant budget increase and I recommend that all the emails and applications and communication be sequestered as training material for an AI sandbox on AI conversion of the Business Express portal as applied to the immense challenge of processing thousands of applications on short order. The addition of AI will reduce labor needed and accelerate the timeline for the review process. Currently, a multiyear process to get a license for us and lost income potential and lost first mover advantage. The Business Express portal lacks a review section which would allow for back and forth communication with the reviewer AI and addition of response upload section all within the Business express portal which apparently is a requirement. Recently, as in days, significant advances have occurred in the AI capabilities and technologies available to the average user and being incorporated into phone handsets, as in my "CANNA Phone " an upgrade from my 2007 patent granted just days before Apple that had bought the 2006 stolen patent tech and used it for a template for the Iphone development team. Don't waste the opportunity to advance with AI.
190.	Karen	Moskal		Please do not allow this in our neighborhood. Children safety
191.	Jude	Paulemon		I am writing to address a matter pertaining to the Office of Cannabis Management (OCM) and the General Licensing Application Tour conducted by OCM. During the inaugural event held in Harlem on October [insert date], Deputy Executive Chris Alexander made an on-the-record statement regarding the process for submitting licensing fees. Specifically, Mr. Alexander advised attendees, including myself, not to remit any licensing fees until after receiving notification from both OCM and the respective municipalities, subsequent to the establishment of one's business on NewYorkBusinessExpress.gov. This statement constituted a verbal agreement, recorded and acknowledged during the event. In strict adherence to the instructions provided by Mr. Alexander, I proceeded to complete the necessary steps, including the establishment of my business on NewYorkBusinessExpress.gov and the dispatch of certified letters to both OCM and my municipality. However, despite fulfilling all prerequisites, I have neither received confirmation nor notification from either party. Subsequently, approximately three months following the aforementioned event, I received an email



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				from OCM indicating a failure to receive payment for the licensing fee. In response, I provided evidence in the form of a video recording capturing Mr. Alexander's statement made during the Harlem event, reaffirming the directive to withhold payment until receipt of notification. It is evident that OCM's failure to acknowledge receipt of payment despite adherence to prescribed protocols constitutes a breach of contract by means of a verbal agreement. OCM has failed to fulfill its obligation as communicated during the event. In light of the foregoing, I hereby request immediate resolution of this matter, including the expeditious processing of my licensing fee. Furthermore, I seek assurance that appropriate measures will be implemented to prevent recurrence of such discrepancies in the future. Please treat this correspondence as a formal demand for remedial action within a reasonable timeframe. Failure to address this matter satisfactorily may necessitate further legal recourse to safeguard my rights and interests. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I anticipate a prompt and favorable response.
192.	Ronald	Loock		Too many dangerous liquor stores and bars. No legal dispensaries
193.	Sharon	Brooks		The voters have already spoken and this issue and the license should be granted.
194.	Wayne	Miller		I have lived within three blocks of 465 Forest Ave and 386 Forest Ave for almost 73 years. I attended and was confirmed in Our Saviour Lutheran Church on the corner of Bard and Forest Avenues. The projected site at 465 Forest Ave is too close to the church to allow a "dispensary" to be located. In addition, that particular community is saturated with bars and liquor stores and is frequently the site of public intoxication and other results of consumption of alcohol. There is no need for an additional source of mood altering drugs to be added to the mix. I earnestly request that the plans on licensing establishments in that community be rejected. Thank you.
195.	Janet	Donchik		I was opposed to legalization despite the fact that I do smoke pot because We do not need to have another drug being made so easily accessible. And we certainly do not need two dispensaries so close to each other on Forest Avenue specifically 465 and 386. N i m b y and not in my city either, but I guess it's too late for that.
196.	David	Nicponski	Freshly Baked NYC	Congratulations on (presumably) licensing additional AU licensees during this meeting. This was an important step forward. The industry needs this progress, and it needs it to be sustained progress. You're seeing calls like this from Albany with increasing volume, and it will continue. Let us



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>recall that New York State, the CCB, and the OCM are still named defendants in at LEAST three outstanding lawsuits, each attempting to shut down or lock up part or all of the state's cannabis program. This program is STILL VULNERABLE, clearly. Considering that the OCM was willing to request, and the CCB willing to honor that request, for an emergency meeting for the purpose of (attempting to) license two out-of-state, multi-state organizations, it would be unconscionable to treat the licensing of dozens or hundreds of actual local, New York businesses with any less urgency. *** I strongly encourage the CCB to call emergency weekly (or at minimum, biweekly) meetings over the next two to three months, to proactively license the dozens applications that the OCM has newly processed and made eligible during that week (or two week) period. *** Pretending that we are still in the "normal &amp; ordinary course of business" and relying upon the normal, monthly-scheduled CCB meetings to license these applicants would demonstrate a reckless carelessness about the reality of the state's vulnerable position; would demonstrate disdain for the actual local, NY small businesses that are trying to enter the market; disdain for the NY consumers who are eager for a real industry to be established, and especially a complete inversion of priority, where out-of-state entities are given "implicit special priority and consideration" by the CCB, while real local NY businesses are left to gamble on the outcome of these pending lawsuits. These outcomes, let us remember, have historically not been positive for NYS nor the industry. Do not leave the industry hanging. Do not leave the consumers hanging. Treat NYS businesses with the same level of respect and priority that out-of-state entities were afforded. *** Meet weekly, biweekly at least, and issue licenses rapidly until the quotas are exhausted and this licensing period is over. *** Thank you for your attention, sense of urgency, and for ideally meriting the trust that the state, industry, and market have placed upon you. -David Nicponski CEO, Freshly Baked NYC</p>
197.	Maureen	Fisher		<p>465 and 463 Forest Ave are established businesses. Putting a cannabis dispensary at this location is highly inappropriate! This is a residential neighborhood, with schools nearby, in an already busy location. I strenuously object to granting this permit in a family-oriented area. Why did we not have prior notification of this to submit OUR opinions prior to reading about it in the local newspaper? NO to this project!!</p>





# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
198.	Justin	Rebollo		With the eventual approval of the home cultivation, will businesses be allowed to sell small plants e.g. live immature cannabis plants, to consumers?
199.	Michael	McVey . M.T. Sr.	Self	Current saturation (retail liquor licenses) is and has been overwhelming with a pitch toward youth for decades. ENOUGH !!
200.	Julie	Monzi		This is concerning the proposed cannabis dispensary's at 386 and 465 Forest Avenue, Staten Island, NY. 10301
201.	Timothy	Murphy		In regards to the NY State cannabis control boards evicting the shop owners from their premises on Forest Avenue, West Brighton, Staten Island, NY. As a tax paying citizen I find it reprehensible that the state is not only supporting the spread of cannabis but also promoting and profiting from its use. NY State has set aside money for rehabilitation programs for individuals who need help overcoming drug addiction. Now the State wishes to profit from introducing entry level drugs into our community. Both ends are working against the middle. NY State policy makers should have a more cohesive agenda dealing with the drug scourge. On today's news an item described as an initiative by the Governor who is In support of "take out" drinks from bars and restaurants. Perhaps these initiatives by NY State leaders is to make the citizens high and inebriated so as not to notice the terrible work they are doing.
202.	Nicholas	Carlson		I hope you are considering the community's input before granting permits for the proposed dispensaries at 465 and 386 Forest Avenue in Staten Island. I am STRONGLY against the proposed locations because they are: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently
203.	Josh	Friedman		What is the OCM hiding. Why has it been so evasive about the number of retail from the November queue? How can the staff not have an answer for a board question that is really simple. A real lack of transparency!
204.	Julie	Monzi		This is concerning the proposed cannabis dispensaries for 386 and 465 Forest Avenue, Staten Island, NY. 10301 Hopefully you are aware that these 2 locations are less than 2 short block's from each other. You can actually see one location from the other. This is an old, well established small town neighborhood with many children and families



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				walking to schools and shopping. The streets are small and congested. With limited street and parking lot parking. Homes are surrounding this street. This neighborhood is not zoned for high capacity commercial businesses. Especially businesses that will be a destination for many, many miles around. There is currently only one dispensary on the other side of Staten Island. I understand one of the dispensaries is already a done deal. So why would a second one so close even be a possibility. I'm asking you to please respect our neighborhood and do not approve either location but certainly not 386 Forest Ave. I hope you will actually see the location so you understand how absurd 2 locations are. I hope my local politicians understand what this type of business will do to our community.
205.	Max	Freed	Zuuld (FRMIDA LLC)	Hello, I'm Dr. Max Freed, living in Troy, NY, and founder of aspiring NY processing licensee, Zuuld. The possibility of imminent federal rescheduling of cannabis draws new scrutiny on the guidance documents reporting estimated numbers for the most critical primary extraction tier 1 processing licenses to 55 non-provisional licensees statewide in this round. I deeply appreciate Dr. Gilbert Jenkins' comments directly addressing those numbers. Unfortunately, even in the state in isolation, not only does the surprise refusal to grant provisional licenses to disproportionately small, bootstrapping operators bias the landscape in favor of larger entities, it effectively burdens this group of startup enterprises with microbusiness cultivation requirements we don't need or want – essentially a second whole business to start up and raise capital for, which means less local control by small operators, and greater possibilities of being replaced as leaders of our own startups. It's bad for me and it has to be worse for aspiring SEE operators. In the larger, looming federal context, it puts NY producers at a critical disadvantage against other states, such as Oklahoma, one of several states which are less restrictive and would welcome aspiring federal operators to get started more quickly and easily. NY manufacturing can compete, but only if allowed to begin in time by this board. Here's the core or it: Small processors in tier 1 want to exist too! I'm confused by the references to heavy extraction equipment today. The 3500sqft of indoor cultivation we're being pushed towards is more expensive than basic extraction equipment, never mind the cost of doing both. My barber was doing closed loop extraction for himself in the legacy era, obviously without the full suite of safety measures



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>needed for responsible production, but similarly, a rosin press can be had for four figures or even three in mini form. From where is the myth that extraction can only be or is best done by an enormous heavy operator coming from? That hasn't been the experience of other jurisdictions, where massive commodity operations have stumbled and lost billions. Similarly, pure processors do not create biomass and structurally cannot contribute to a biomass glut - the opposite, we could have helped farmers cope. If we processors were allowed to exist, we could at least turn that flower into far more shelf-stable formulations than giant bags of flower: NY farmers' livelihoods going stale or worse. Listed on a presentation slide today was the statement: "Small batch craft cannabis production will be the defining feature of New York Market". How can this be reconciled with limiting craft extraction, with pushing small producers into building cultivation we should plan to abandon in a year or two? Please, give us what we need to work, to start building NY's capacity regardless of the retail limitations of right now, regardless of the limit of in-state as soon as rescheduling happens, should it happen. In NY there's currently a glut, but as soon as hundreds of legal retailers open up, we could end up in a worse world of shortages, mirroring the rollout experiences of other states. The public claims of existing bulk processors that there is no need to license any competitors because they can produce massive amounts of the cannabis equivalent of boxed wine and serve the market adequately that way were made in other jurisdictions too, particularly Canada, and were proven to be misleading self-dealing in the years following. Five years after legalization in Canada, there is still insufficient high quality craft processing capacity to meet demand, and Canadian legacy operators have decades of supply-side experience that NY lacks. We need time, and we can't start without your permission. New York small businesses need your help, we need you to let us work in the license types that make sense for us, more quickly than currently thought possible. Please also</p>
206.	Pete	Longo	Longos Legacy LLC	<p>My name is Pete Longo, and I am the owner of Longo's Legacy LLC. We have submitted an application for a non-provisional retail license. My journey to this point has been difficult, urgent, and costly – unnecessarily so. And I'm probably one of the lucky ones. It involved negotiating a commercial real estate lease in a remarkably short span of two weeks – a task that typically could take months. This effort was fueled by the understanding, as supported by</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>the OCM's FAQs, released just days before the application window opened, and initial communications throughout the application process, indicating that having site control would result in our application being prioritized. So, my team pushed, and I signed my lease a mere hours before the application window closed, driven by the fact that my business isn't just a side project or hobby; it's our livelihood. We pushed, knowing and appreciating the fact that those from CDIs and SEE applicants would have priority, and hoping that our efforts to obtain site control would be enough to secure us one of the remaining 1,000 licenses at stake. And we were encouraged when, at the Cannabis Advisory Board meeting on December 12, 2023, it was stated that even more licenses might be awarded. However, then we heard rumors of only 250 non-provisional licenses being available. This information came from just one letter to the editor and a brief clip on a local news station... So we tried not to worry and continued to invest thousands of dollars to ensure we would be ready when OCM was. The confirmation that merely 250 licenses would be given to the more than 1,000 applicants who pushed, just like us, has left us bewildered and discouraged. Therefore, I, like many standing next to me, am seeking clarification on why this number has been drastically reduced and the process for selecting applications so dramatically changed at the 11th hour. This change affects not only potential licensees but also has broader implications for the market and the community at large. Understanding the rationale behind this decision is crucial for all stakeholders involved and would greatly aid in maintaining a sense of transparency and trust in the process. Many of us have been part of this legacy for years and don't want to continue in the realms of smoke shops or illegal dispensaries. We are responsible operators, eager to transition into a legal framework and contribute to the economy through taxes. And after years of hard work and significant investments, we are ready. But the current licensing approach, particularly the decision to award provisional licenses to applicants without site control while overlooking those who have secured properties, is confusing and frustrating. This process has not only caused undue stress but also significant financial strain. It took us two years to find a suitable location for my business, and without a license, I stand to lose this property. Should this happen, the prospect of finding another location, especially with a landlord willing to engage in this business, seems almost</p>



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				impossible. In conclusion, I implore the board to provide clear, transparent guidelines and reconsider the current approach to licensing, taking into account the efforts and investments of applicants like myself who have long prepared for this opportunity. As you know, under Section 10 of the Cannabis Law, you have sole discretion regarding the number of licenses to award. Please think about us as you exercise it. Transparency, fairness, and recognition of the efforts and investments of applicants like myself who have long prepared for this opportunity. As you know, under Section 10 of the Cannabis Law, you have sole discretion regarding the number of licenses to award. Please think about us as you exercise it. Transparency, fairness, and recognition of the efforts of applicants who have demonstrated their readiness and commitment must be at the forefront of your decision-making process. Thank you.
207.	Karen	Zanelli		This neighborhood already has more than its fair share of bars and liquor stores,( 5 bars, 2 liquor stores, a pizzeria that sells beer and wine, and 3 delis and a supermarket that sell beer within 5 blocks). Adding one dispensary to the neighborhood within these 5 blocks would be reckless, two would be irresponsible. We already have to deal with the nuisance drunks urinating, vomiting and arguing on our streets and in front of our homes. I find the idea that anyone would consider, much less allow not one but two cannabis dispensaries in this neighborhood unconscionable.
208.	Christina	Conte		This is a residential area. Keep this out of our neighborhood Disgusting !!
209.	ELIZABETH	MURPHY		The location is too close to a number of schools and will be a detriment to the community.
210.	Gretchen	Markel		The proposal to permit a Cannabis business at 463 Forest Avenue should be rejected. This location is close too close PS45, generating the potential for harm to our young people. In combination with the number of liquor stores and bars already in the neighborhood, a cannabis dispensary increases the probability of impaired drivers and other safety hazards.
211.	Thomas	Raffa		A cannabis business at 463 Forest Avenue should be rejected. The neighborhood already suffers from excess noise and rowdy behaviors at nights and weekends due to the number of bars and liquor stores in the vicinity; adding cannabis to this problem will significantly exacerbate an already untenable situation.
212.	Rita	Ghassem		This dispensary will destroy our community and our property values. Crime will occur and traffic from outside



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				our community will increase. It is a community heavy populated with families, children and elderly who do not desire to buy cannabis. It is in a residential area with no room for additional traffic. The area is already too congested with commercial interests , liquor stores , what we need are more hi end groceries , not marijuana. Our community was never advised of this and it appears to be a for profit inside deal by the landlord. Go place this on the outskirts of the island on Richmond Terrace , if necessary.
213.	Tracy	Soast		I am all for the dispensary. It will be good for the community.
214.	Julian	Soast		Staten Island doesn't have enough dispensaries for it's population. These locations need to open.
215.	Nicole	Lamberti		I am horrified by the fact that you would think about placing a dispensary in my community. I happen to live right up the block from where this is going and I do not like it all. I do realize that it is legal now and we should just deal with it but this happens to be a respectful and old school neighborhood. I have a 10 year old son who has to look at this everyday now and he is impressionable. I do not want this sort of store right down the block. People are using this on the jobs, while driving and I find it disgraceful and quite disgusting.
216.	Randy	Schiff		Throwing out to current businesses is wrong. One spot has a tiny parking lot. And the other is close to a house of worship. They should keep looking for another suitable location.
217.	Susan	Goldberg	N/A	I believe that having pot shops will change the character of our relatively quiet and peaceful community, bringing drug addicts and criminals around our seniors, children, and others. Please put it elsewhere. I can't stand the smell of weed, and I think it will introduce a criminal element into our neighborhood, who might engage in stealing packages from porches and door steps, etc. Whatever happened to fresh air and water? I don't want to smell pot as I walk around. It stinks.
218.	Annmarie	O'hara		This is outrageous to think this should be located in this family oriented community. I am totally against the implementation of this dispensary now or in the future
219.	Arlene	Kuffner	NYS Cannabis Control Board	I would like to be a voice in what may occur in our neighborhood with owners who want to put in Cannabis stores and sends an email to 2 store fronts that have been there for years that they have to get out by March 31. We have a church across the street of the stores. We have 3 liquor stores, several restaurants, bars, and several schools. We also have a home in the area that has residents that walk around asking for money. I think that



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				the community should have a voice in what happens in where we live
220.	Judith	O'Donnell		Please reconsider polluting this forest Ave strip With 2 dispensaries for marijuana. You are dealing with a residential area with high volume of elementary and middle school Children of both public and parochial Schools. Small stores in a walkable neighborhood. Please don't destroy us ,
221.	Cheri	Sparacio	No to the dispensary in this neighborhood community	A marijuana dispensary does not belong in a neighborhood such as this. Although I have no issue with a dispensary in a commercial area this is not a suitable location for such a business
222.	Maureen	Mckeever		This is not needed in our community. Will bring nothing but problems in our neighborhood.
223.	John	Eccleston		Allow cannabis shops to operate.
224.	Vicki	Muccigrosso		I am opposed to the proposed cannabis location for 465 and 386 forest Ave as being against granting a permit to these locations for any of the following reasons: 1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently Thank you, Vicki Muccigrosso
225.	Ramon	Guzman		1. in a neighborhood not zoned for high volume commercial businesses 2. too close to residential housing 3. too close to each other (2 blocks) 4. too close to schools, houses of worship 5. in a busy corridor where children pass in high volume daily 6. the 10 block corridor is oversaturated with bars and liquor/beer businesses 7. there was insufficient local community input on the application - the neighborhood was not notified sufficiently 8. Not socially accepted for children to see 9. The neighborhood is saturated with public Marijuana use. 10. The smell of offensive skunk is already unhealthy, excessive second hand smoke
226.	Bonita	Balarin		I don't believe we need a pot dispensary on Forest Ave, (465 & 386 Forest Ave S.I. NY) there are far too many bars and liquor stores, not to mention there are schools, churches, and homes. I believe this is a gateway to more addictive drugs and not something to be accepted.



# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
227.	Craig	Fine		Oversaturated mkt with “convenience” stores already selling CBD products. Additionally, there is no plan for security as there is already 2 nearby liquor stores, one being next door. Lastly, in a residential neighborhood comprised of young kids.
228.	Christine	Jaccarino-torre		Please stop this transaction. Kids pass every day on way to PS 45 and wait on bus stop for IS 27. It's a respectable neighborhood. No kids hanging on corners....no riff raff. Let's keep it that way. We want our card store and bagel store to remain. Take it somewhere else. If government has a hand in it, take it inside Ft. Wadsworth. Thank you! I speak for my husband too.
229.	Nicole	Azzarelli		We cannot have dispensaries at either 386 or 465 Forest Ave on Staten Island. There are multiple schools/centers of learning, churches/places of worship, and high volumes of traffic of impressionable children as well as families passing. Dispensaries would present a negative strain and impact the well-being of our community.
230.	Daniel	Lynch		This dispensary is not wanted nor is it needed in our already struggling community.
231.	Sylvia	Madison		I strongly oppose the opening of another vape/smoke shop on Forest Ave in Staten Island. There is one a block away, residential neighborhood, saturated with children
232.	Ingrid	Keag		Please do NOT open a dispensary for drugs in my neighborhood. For the safety of our children, please keep this drug out of reach.
233.	Lissa	Winchel		Two dispensaries in a residential area with houses of worship nearby, is a poor choice of locations.
234.	jacqueline	parrott		We do not need or want cannabis dispensary . The stores that are here are very important to the neighborhood.
235.	Randy	Schiff		Why are they pushing to small businesses out, when the bank that closed just off the block, and another one opposite Dunkin' Donuts, both are empty and have them on parking lots. Why would we need to dispensaries almost across the street from each other? And especially in forcing one into a very small parking lot. That will definitely hurt the remaining businesses?
236.	David	Mills		Great idea! In a neighborhood that is saturated with bars, and their endemic population of young drunks, parading around, with "bar crawls" often occurring, it is good to have an alternative. For those of us who look towards alternative medical applications, and have found through experience that THC and CBD products help far better than other medical solutions, making these dispensaries available in areas that are considered "safer" places to do their shopping is a giant step forward! Perhaps, if they are allowed to do business in more socially acceptable





# Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				demographic locations, we might take a giant leap forward to making cannabis actually legal, and force it to be downgraded from its current status as a class 1 controlled substance.
237.	Lori	Armstrong		Dispensaries at 386 and 465 Forest Ave Staten Island are way too close to residential neighborhoods.
238.	Susan	Fowler		Re. 465 and 386 Forest Ave. evictions for a cannabis dispensary, both stores are community and neighborhood hubs. Neighbors visit daily, biweekly, weekly and have friendships with the store owners and other customers. The stores are part of the fabric of the neighborhood. A dispensary will NOT be a neighborhood hub or a welcoming spot for most people in the immediate neighborhood. In fact, it will degrade and diminish the neighborhood, and for what? So that a few dozen people can buy marijuana? A dispensary doesn't belong here, between two banks and across the street from a supermarket and a church and next to a CVS Pharmacy.