



Office of Cannabis Management

KATHY HOCHUL

Governor

TREMAINE WRIGHT

Cannabis Control Board Chair

JESSICA GARCIA

Board Member

HOPE KNIGHT

Board Member

CRYSTAL J. RODRIGUEZ DABNEY

Board Member

JENNIFER GILBERT JENKINS

Board Member

FELICIA A. B. REID

Acting Executive Director

Meeting Minutes

Title:	New York State Cannabis Control Board Meeting
Time & Date:	December 10, 2024 at 11:00 AM
Location:	Empire State Plaza Concourse, Meeting Room 3, Albany, NY 12242, SUNY Morrisville, Bicknell Hall, Room 212, 80 Eaton St., Morrisville, NY 13408, Community & Outreach Center, 907 Michigan Ave., Buffalo, NY 14203, 59 Maiden Ln., New York, NY 10038 and Virtual via Webcast

Attendance

Board Chair:	Tremaine Wright
Board Members Present:	Hope Knight
Board Members Present (virtually):	Crystal Rodriguez-Dabney, Jessica Garcia, Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins
Board Members Absent:	N/A
Others Present:	Celena Ditchev, John Kagia, Patrick McKeage, Felicia A. B. Reid, Tabatha Robinson

Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Welcome and Opening Remarks
- III. Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 12, 2024 Board Meeting
- IV. OCM Year in Review – Acting Executive Director, Felicia Reid
- V. Consideration of Adult-Use Applications for Approval
- VI. Consideration of Adult-Use Licensee Location or Tier Change Amendment Requests
- VII. Consideration of Violations, Hearings and Enforcement Regulations
- VIII. Consideration of Administrative Law Decision Appeal – The Rezz v. OCM
- IX. Consideration of Administrative Law Decision Appeal – 360 Garden Delight, Inc. v. OCM
- X. Consideration of Administrative Law Decision Appeal – World of Exotic Inc. v. OCM
- XI. Consideration of Administrative Law Decision Appeal – Cross Bay Snacks Inc. v. OCM
- XII. Office of Cannabis Management Report
- XIII. Public Comment
- XIV. Adjourn



Office of Cannabis Management

Action Items

Resolution No. 2024-119:	Resolution to Issue Certain Adult-Use Cannabis Licenses.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
Resolution No. 2024-120:	Resolution to Approve Certain Cannabis License and Permit Amendment Requests for the Purpose of a Change in the Location or Cultivation Tier of a Licensee or Permittee’s Licensed Premises or Study Site.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
Resolution No. 2024-122:	Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to File a Notice of Adoption for 9 NYCRR Part 133.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
Resolution No. 2024-123:	Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal The Rezz v. OCM, Inspection No. 112202306130016, Affirming the Decision and Order of the ALJ.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
Resolution No. 2024-124:	Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal 360 Garden Delight Inc. v. OCM, Inspection No. 115202405230003, Affirming the Decision and Order of the ALJ.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
Resolution No. 2024-125:	Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal World of Exotic Inc., v. OCM, Inspection No. 205202405220002, Affirming the Decision and Order of the ALJ.	Passed, Unanimous Vote
Resolution No. 2024-126:	Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal Cross Bay Snacks, Inc., v. OCM, Inspection No. 105202405300001, Affirming the Decision and Order of the ALJ.	Passed, Unanimous Vote

Notes & Comments

- Chair Wright commented that New York State’s (NYS) cannabis market is thriving and that they have just over 260 adult-use dispensaries open and operating. She stated that she knows that you may be thinking that there are over 19 million people in New York, and that they only have 260 retail stores, yet even with that ratio, they are on the verge of surpassing the \$1 billion mark in retail sales, which is a significant achievement for this industry. She noted that New York’s cannabis program continues to serve as a benchmark for others. She stated that the performance of New York’s equity centered model has catapulted sales to levels that confirm their premise. She commented that success in cannabis can and should keep social and economic equity at its core. She noted that over half of all adult-use licenses have been awarded to equity applicants, and that cultivation, processing and retail operate across each region of their state. She commented that New York cannabis is fostering opportunities for communities and people historically impacted by cannabis prohibition to thrive in this growing industry. She stated that this holiday season, please consider giving the gift of community support by shopping at your local licensed dispensaries. She further stated that purchasing from New York’s cannabis businesses not only ensures product safety and quality, but it also uplifts their entrepreneurs and strengthens local economies during this festive time of the year.



Office of Cannabis Management

- Upon a motion from Board Member Hope Knight, and a second from Board Member Crystal Rodriguez-Dabney, the Minutes of the November 12, 2024 Cannabis Control Board (“CCB” or the “Board”) Meeting were approved unanimously.

- Felecia A. B. Reid, Acting Executive Director for the Office of Cannabis Management (“OCM” or the “Office”) commented that she is thrilled to be joining you today to give the Executive Director’s Report and not only that, but to share with you OCM’s Year in Review. She stated that through dedication and strategic collaboration, OCM has continued to shape New York’s cannabis industry into a model of economic strength, regulatory excellence and economic and social equity. She noted that in June of this year, she was tapped to lead the agency at an across-the-board transformation and that she does not need to recap the reasons why, and certainly, all that has been written about OCM could fill volumes, so she would actually like to frame today’s presentation going back to a matter that she spoke on this past August, the matter of trust. She stated that then at that time, she asked whose trust does OCM have, whose trust is OCM’s to lose, whose trust have they lost, and whose trust must OCM work to repair. She stated that the last six months have been telling and these are realities that she and the agency navigate every single day. She noted that she knows trust is not a word, particularly in these political days, that people associate with government, least of all, with the shift of an economy from below to above ground or with the cut and dry of regulation. She stated that the work of an agency is broad, and they know that the business of regulation does not mean making everyone happy always, forever and ever, Amen, but it does mean that OCM has the obligation to move with intention, information and fairness. She stated that she sees more clearly than ever that trust, consistency and reliability are the most important things for them as a regulatory agency, and although OCM has done tremendous work in strengthening its foundation, sharpening its operations and engaging deeply with the cannabis community, she is often reminded that they have far to go before the Office has the full confidence of their community and their stakeholders. She commented that she accepts that for what it is, and she is happy to do and to lead that work to keep building the most vibrant, healthy and above all equity driven cannabis market in the world. She stated that in taking account of the last year, her hope is that in this wider view, you see New York cannabis, as she does, as an ecosystem, one where they know the plant and the canopy, and where they both adapt for today while planning for the unknowns of tomorrow. She stated that this year in review is a moment in time and one of many milestones in the year to come. She noted that 2024 has been a year of incredible firsts, proving just what OCM can accomplish when vision, responsivity, market engagement and a passion for the development of cannabis collide. She stated that this year, they have seen substantial growth in agency operations from a rework of their license process, wider community engagement, compliance and lab inspections, expansions in patient care resources, and continued focus on centering social and economic equity and licensure. She further stated that she is always conscious that what they do today impacts tomorrow, and this collection highlights a foundational strength that is critical as the agency moves forward.
- At the end of 2023, OCM reached several key milestones in New York’s cannabis market with 41 dispensaries open and retail sales surpassed \$160 million. This year to date, New York has 261 dispensaries open and nearly \$760 million in retail sales, which means a quadrupling



Office of Cannabis Management

of tax revenue, a portion of which goes right back into community reinvestment. To date, there are 224 Conditional Adult-Use Retail Dispensary (CAURD) with final licenses, 198 cultivators, 282 processors, 170 distributors, 225 microbusinesses, 294 AU dispensaries, 9 Registered Organizations (ROs) and more than 3,200 active hemp licenses and permits.

- In October 2024, OCM implemented a Single Point of Contact (SPOC) licensing review model that streamlines and centralizes the licensing process. This effort enhanced transparency for stakeholders by providing applicants with a clear point of contact throughout the review. It also makes official communications more consistent and customer friendly. Contacts are assigned once OCM begins reviewing an application. By consolidating all license review functions under OCM's licensing team, the SPOC model eliminates the previous multi-team system, ensuring applicants have a dedicated examiner to guide them through the process from start to finish.
- In Spring 2024, with the support of Governor Hochul and the Legislature, OCM gained expanded enforcement authority to combat illicit cannabis operations. OCM conducted over 1,200 inspections, padlocked over 400 stores, seized almost 17,000 pounds of illicit cannabis, and issued more than \$15 million in fines. The Office partnered with over 20 State agencies to implement uncompromising measures to address illicit cannabis trafficking. These efforts led to real impacts protecting consumers from unregulated products and increased revenue from licensed cannabis dispensaries.
- Since the adoption of the adult-use cannabis regulations on September 27, 2023, the Office has completed over 170 onsite inspections, spent 468 hours at licensee locations completing inspections, issued 513 findings to licensees, and received 434 corrective action plans to address the inspection findings.
- OCM has made significant progress in their Medical Cannabis Program. There are nearly 8,500 registered caregivers, more than 4,450 certifying providers, and 21 medical dispensaries across the state. In September, the Office partnered with Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center, to host New York's first Medical Cannabis Symposium in Buffalo. This event fostered important discussions on cannabis' impact on patient care. OCM also approved new ROs for the first time since 2017, increasing medical cannabis availability for patients, launched the Medical Cannabis Data Management System (MCDMS) third-party portal, and issued the first Cannabis Research license in 2024.
- On the public health and safety front, it has been incredibly important for the agency to have a perspective and an approach to engaging with the public. The Office has tailored resources, such as Know Your Concentrates, How Adult-Use Cannabis Taxes Support Your Community in New York and Adult-Use for Older Adults. OCM has a robust ongoing data monitoring using a variety of sources that range from population-based surveys to a healthcare data to sales data in collaboration with partner agencies. OCM has continued to partner with DMV and the Governor's Traffic Safety Committee to help monitor and educate New Yorkers about traffic safety and cannabis.
- One of the biggest things that the Office is incredibly proud of is the launch and release of the Legal Online Cannabis Activities Locator (LOCAL) map and the Seed-to-Sale rollout. The LOCAL map provides proximity reports and licensee search capabilities for industry stakeholders. It also offers a consumer-oriented dispensary map to locate licensed



Office of Cannabis Management

dispensaries, ensuring access to safe, tested, and regulated cannabis. The Office also rolled out the Seed-to-Sale process to implement the state's cannabis tracking system. To support this initiative, the Office covered the first year of BioTrack (Seed-to-Sale system) tag costs for cannabis cultivators and processors. OCM also launched BioTrack NY API for licensee integration to assist with compliance and operations.

- OCM's work in 2024 has also included advancements in energy and sustainability. The Office launched the PowerScore Energy & Environmental Sustainability platform. This platform aligns the cannabis industry with New York's climate mandates. It also helps licensees analyze their resources consumption, operating costs, and profit potential.
- Between October 2021 and Spring 2024, OCM faced challenges due to a lack of internal systems and accountability controls. In July 2024, the Executive Office established an Audit and Internal Control Unit to review agency operations, create system controls and minimize vulnerabilities. In the Summer of 2024, the Office began work on conducting a systematic evaluation of OCM's technology infrastructure to identify system weakness and areas to invest in for long term future operations and success.
- OCM launched numerous programs in 2024 to support Social and Economic Equity (SEE) applicants and licensees. The Office continues to achieve the goal in the Cannabis Law, awarding 50% of licenses to SEE applicants. This year, the Office expanded the CAURD Accelerator Program to provide services to all SEE retail dispensary applicants and also launched the Cannabis Hub and Incubator Program (CHIP) to provide technical assistance and help applicants with the application process. Under the direction of the Cannabis Advisory Board (CAB), the Office launched the Community Reinvestment Program. Through this program, \$5 million in grants were made available to support neighborhoods historically under-resourced, underserved, and over-policed. This funding provides 50 grants of \$100,000 each to 501(c)(3) youth-serving organizations focused on mental health, housing, and workforce development.
- In 2024, the Office continued engagement with the cannabis community and stakeholders across the State. The Office kicked off a seven-stop 'Office Hours' tour, whereby OCM's Executive Office, sat down with stakeholders and communities to discuss opportunities, upcoming initiatives, and issues of concerns to the industry. The Office hosted dozens of meetings with local municipalities, community boards, and elected officials and with the CCB, held 12 official CCB meetings in 2024 throughout NYS, and worked with the CAB, who held 6 official CAB meetings in 2024 throughout NYS.

- Patrick McKeage, Chief Operating Officer for OCM, provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-119, a Resolution to Issue Certain Adult-Use Cannabis Licenses. Before the Board today, is the eleventh cohort of adult-use cannabis licenses which have cleared the multistep review process and are being recommended for approval by the Board. These applications are from the application window that opened on October 4, 2023, and closed for all application types on December 18, 2023. The 70 applicants include 15 retail dispensaries, 6 microbusinesses, 2 cultivators, 21 distributors and 26 processors. These applications represent a similar mix from the November queue conditional licensees that are transitioning and a handful of December queue supply side licensees. If approved, this will make 1,394 adult-use cannabis licenses.



Office of Cannabis Management

- In the November queue, the Office is up to 1,734 in the queue order. This leaves less than 300 unique applications that still remain in a “submitted” status from the November queue, which means the Office has not begun the review on those applications yet. For those applicants whose queue number is shortly after 1,734, look for a deficiency e-mail from the Office in the coming weeks. The main deficiency for application review continues to be getting all of an applicant’s True Parties of Interest (TPI) disclosures submitted in a timely manner. Each TPI that is listed on an application is responsible for submitting their own TPI disclosure which often requires the individual to also be fingerprinted. The Licensing team will not continue reviewing the rest of someone's application if there is still TPI disclosures that are outstanding.
- The Office is working very closely with the CCB to provide data on the cannabis production output and consumer retail sale through demand based on current and anticipated capacity in NYS’s market to help inform a data driven recommendation on the December queue and anticipates being able to provide a further update on that at the January Board meeting.
- Chair Wright stated that one of these applicants that has been sent to them, in particular 1332, has received a negative opinion from the municipality and asked what the results were from the enforcement investigation because they have allegations from the municipality stating that there were problems, and they did not get any details for it.
- Patrick McKeage stated yes and that just to confirm this is Free Thinkers LLC.
- Chair Wright stated yes.
- Patrick McKeage stated that there was actually a news article about this application yesterday, so he is happy to address this. He stated that their Enforcement team visited this location twice before, doing regulatory inspections, suspecting illicit activity and that during those inspections, the team found illicit activity. He stated that however, when they were reviewing this application, there is no affiliation between this applicant that has now control over this property and the previous entity that operated the illicit dispensary at the location. He further stated that the team actually went there this week and confirmed that none of the TPI's matched up between the two entities and that is why they are recommending approval for this particular applicant.
- Chair Wright stated that their letter to the municipality does not actually state that. She asked if they could actually be clear in the letter to the municipality, have it updated, to actually state that the entities that were operating previously are not the people who they are licensing because that is not what was in the draft.
- Patrick McKeage stated absolutely, they can do that.
- Chair Wright asked how many retail or dispensary applications remain.
- Patrick McKeage stated that it is a little less than 300 that remain in the November queue.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins asked if they were all dispensaries.
- Patrick McKeage stated that there is a mix of micros in there, but it is predominantly retail and that 80/20 is like a good ratio to think of for that queue.
- Chair Wright stated that they keep hearing about the slowdown because of the need for people to submit their third-party information and asked are they able to do that prior to them beginning the review of the application.



Office of Cannabis Management

- Patrick McKeage stated yes and that once an application receives a deficiency, you will be able to update that.
- Chair Wright stated that that is after they begin the review and asked are they able to update their information before they begin because if they are waiting for it to come up in their review, they have already waited a significant period of time, and then they want to send a deficiency and hope that they have seen it and wait again. She then asked are they changing the process so that people can submit and update their application so that once it comes up for review, it might actually be complete.
- Patrick McKeage stated that he would double check on that to ensure when the TPI pin for the individuals who are owners on the application, but not the actual person who submitted the application, are able to submit and they will have a message sent out to the applicants and the CCB just so everyone is on the same page.
- Board Member Crystal Rodriguez-Dabney asked where they are in the queue for the supply side given the difference in the property requirements from November to December.
- Patrick McKeage stated that that is one of those ones where they are looking at a lot of the data in the analysis of market capacity, in terms of how to essentially approach the remainder of those supply side licenses in the December queue, and they have essentially reached their preliminary licensing targets that were disseminated when the application window first opened, and he thinks that will be one of the areas to get further direction from the Board on in terms of how far down the December queue to go.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins stated the Board did not give them any licensing targets and that no such thing exists. She then stated that she does not think that was the question that Crystal asked.
- Patrick McKeage stated that they are on 50 in the cultivator queue.
- Chair Wright asked 50 on the December cultivation queue.
- Patrick McKeage stated correct.
- Chair Wright stated that there are no more processing applications pending in the November queue and asked if that is what she is to understand.
- Patrick McKeage stated that there are no processing applications in the November queue, they are all part of the December queue, and there are a handful of processing applications pending.
- Chair Wright stated that so no processing in November, and they are on 50 in the cultivators in December.
- Board Member Crystal Rodriguez-Dabney asked with respect to number 1,734 for November, if people were numbered earlier than that, is there an email that they can contact to find out about their license if they say that they have not received any notification from the staff.
- Patrick McKeage stated that it is AUlicensing@ocm.ny.gov and including their application number and business name is the best way to reach out for that communication.
- Chair Wright stated that she noticed that they did not receive any information related to who these applicants are that are Processor 3 applicants and that they just have names. She then asked why that is.
- Patrick McKeage stated that he is happy to provide any additional information that might be helpful.



Office of Cannabis Management

- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins asked if they have a list of tiers for them.
- Patrick McKeage stated that for the Processor Type 3 brand license, there is no real tier and that the brand license essentially allows them to become a brand as a cannabis product to partner with a processor who has a physical facility, who would then manufacture their products on their behalf, so it does not actually authorize any plant touching activity, and that in their regulations, they require that everyone who is a brand in their cannabis market to essentially be affiliated with a licensee. He stated that they have two options, they can either partner and become a TPI in an existing processor or get a standalone Processor Type 3 brand license, which then allows them to disclose their TPI's, their ownership interests, so that they can capture that information and essentially ensure that the two-tier market and their other prohibitions are able to be enforced against.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins stated that it is not truly a processor license it is just the brand.
- Patrick McKeage stated exactly, yes.
- Chair Wright stated that they are processing their licensing agreement essentially.
- Patrick McKeage stated exactly, yes, giving them the authorization to then enter into those.
- Chair Wright stated that she would like to see who is in parties to this agreement, the terms of these agreements, who else they might have agreements with, if anybody else in the state, because they got two in front of them, but they have no information other than their names and that is a little bit problematic for her, so she is actually also going to ask that they remove them from this list because other than a name, she does not know what they are approving.
- Patrick McKeage stated that they made it through the pre-application process, and that he would be happy to provide with additional information, especially if this was requested prior to the meeting.
- Chair Wright stated that she wanted to get clear on what it was because they do not have any information, they see two names on this list that was provided to them and nothing more, not even an address where they are operating.
- Patrick McKeage stated that there is no physical address associated with the processor brand license.
- Chair Wright stated that somebody has to have an address to have submitted documentation to this because they have to have a way in means to connect to them and that at this moment, what the Board has been presented with is incomplete.
- Chair Wight asked if they could amend their resolution to remove the two Processor 3 applicants that had been listed on the approval lists.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins asked do you need a second for that.
- Chair Wright stated yes.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins stated that she will second that.
- Board Member Jessica Garcia asked to clarify what motion they are voting on. She then asked are they voting on amendment to the resolution or are they voting on an amended resolution already.
- Chair Wright stated that she would like to amend the resolution to update the letter to the municipality for applicant Retail 1332 to include a clearer rationale of what came out of the



Office of Cannabis Management

enforcement findings, as well as removing the two Processor 3 applications and that is what the amendment is that is before them right now.

- Patrick McKeage stated for the record it is Processor Type 3 0005 and Processor Type 3 0013 that are being removed.
- Chair Wright stated that Mrs. C Botanicals and Sky Blue Stables that are being removed.
- Board Member Jessica Garcia asked to clarify that they are voting on an amended resolution period with the amendments you just listed and that they are not voting on amendments, they are voting on the amended resolution.
- Chair Wright stated yes, that includes all of the approvals as well as the edits that they just discussed.
- Upon a motion from Chair Wright, and a second from Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins, an amended Resolution No. 2024-119, a Resolution to Issue Certain Adult-Use Cannabis Licenses, was approved unanimously.
- Patrick McKeage stated that for the record, as soon as an applicant submits their application, they receive an email to file their applicant TPI disclosure. He stated that upon submission of that TPI of disclosure, and if you include all the owners in that, that is when you get your trigger pin. He further stated that for folks who did submit their TPI disclosure, they will receive their pins and their emails to fill out before they get to their application in the queue, but if they do get to their application in the queue and they have not submitted that entity TPI disclosure, that is when it could also trigger it there.

- Patrick McKeage, Chief Operating Officer for OCM, provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-120, a Resolution to Approve Certain Cannabis License and Permit Amendment Requests for the Purpose of a Change in the Location or Cultivation Tier of a Licensee or Permittee’s Licensed Premises or Study Site. The Cannabis Law and Regulations allow the Board to authorize amendments to cannabis licenses. The Office launched an amendment survey in August, which allows adult-use cannabis licensees to request certain amendments, including location changes, which require Board approval. The Office has begun the review of these amendment requests and will be reviewing the requests on a rolling basis as they come in. The amendment requests before the Board today include supply side licensees and retail licensees. In total, there are 16 licensees who have requested a location change or tier change in some form. The licensees have provided all necessary information in accordance with the cannabis regulations and are being recommended for approval by the Office. The Office will only process amendment requests received via the amendment survey which is located on their website under the “Licensing tab”. E-mail submissions of location change requests will not be considered.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins, and a second from Board Member Hope Knight, Resolution No. 2024-120, a Resolution to Approve Certain Cannabis License and Permit Amendment Requests for the Purpose of a Change in the Location or Cultivation Tier of a Licensee or Permittee’s Licensed Premises or Study Site, was approved unanimously.

- Patrick McKeage, Chief Operating Officer for OCM, provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-122, a Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to File a Notice of



Office of Cannabis Management

Adoption for 9 NYCRR Part 133. The regulation package before the Board today, is for Part 133 of the Violation, Hearing and Enforcement Regulations. The Board is considering to make these regulations effective in the State Register. The Board last voted on these regulations at the September Board meeting where they were issued as Emergency Regulations. The package also simultaneously went out for the mandatory 60-day public comment period. Following the public comment period, the Office is now recommending the adoption of these regulations. These regulations will allow the Office to continue to enforce and inspect against illicit cannabis businesses with the increased authority granted to the Office in last year's budget, allowing them to go after entities and businesses that do not have a license under their regulatory scheme.

- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins asked if this is where they were asking for a clear timeline of when they will be able to vote on the fixes to this that are necessary.
- Patrick McKeage stated that the Office is working on that timeline, and it is with their counsel's office. He further stated that it will likely takes some time to make sure that they have these edits and socialize them, but they will be looking forward to presenting the Board with those recommendations in the new year.
- Chair Wright stated that she thinks that everybody appreciates how far this set of regulations has pushed them and allowed them to tackle the very evident problem that is going across the state, but it is also giving them eyes into places where they can improve their process and that they can make sure that they are moving more efficiently. She further stated that they are looking forward to being able to tackle the next step, the next iteration of these regulations, and that she looks forward to that as well.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Hope Knight, and a second from Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins, Resolution No. 2024-122, a Resolution Directing the Office of Cannabis Management to File a Notice of Adoption for 9 NYCRR Part 133, was approved unanimously.

- Celena Ditchev, Associate Counsel for OCM, provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-123, a Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal The Rezz v. OCM, Inspection No. 112202306130016. Pursuant to the Cannabis Law, the Board is charged with the responsibility of issuing a final determination when a decision issued by an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) is appealed. Today, there are four resolutions before the Board for consideration. There are approximately 14 appeals remaining and those matters are being actively and expeditiously reviewed. The instant matter before the Board is an appeal from a decision issued by an ALJ with OAH following an enforcement hearing. A regulatory inspection was conducted, and a subsequent hearing was held before the OAH. The presiding ALJ determined that there was unlicensed cannabis activity and assessed the business a \$10,000 civil penalty. The proposed recommendation and resolution to the Board is to affirm the ALJ's decision and order.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Crystal Rodriguez-Dabney, and a second from Board Member Hope Knight, Resolution No. 2024-123, a Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal The Rezz v. OCM, Inspection No. 112202306130016, affirming the decision and order, was approved unanimously.



Office of Cannabis Management

- Celena Ditchev, Associate Counsel for OCM, provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-124, a Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal 360 Garden Delight Inc. v. OCM, Inspection No. 115202405230003. Before the Board today, is a proposed decision for an Administrative Appeal submitted to the Board for review. This matter stems from an Administrative Hearing before the OAH. The proceeding stems from a regulatory inspection that was conducted at a business where there was unlicensed cannabis activity. Following the regulatory inspection, the appellant requested a hearing, and an emergency hearing was held. After the hearing, a decision was issued in which the Order to Seal issued by OCM was extended for one year. The appellant filed an appeal to the ALJ's decision. The proposed resolution and decision before the Board is to affirm the ALJ's decision.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Crystal Rodriguez-Dabney, and a second from Board Member Hope Knight, Resolution No. 2024-124, a Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal 360 Garden Delight Inc. v. OCM, Inspection No. 115202405230003, affirming the decision and order, was approved unanimously.

- Celena Ditchev, Associate Counsel for OCM, provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-125, a Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal World of Exotic Inc., v. OCM, Inspection No. 205202405220002. Before the Board today, is an Administrative Appeal submitted for review. This matter comes to the Board for review following an administrative hearing on an Order to Seal. A regulatory inspection was conducted at the appellant's place of business by OCM. Following the inspection, the business was sealed and an Order to Seal was issued to the appellant. The appellant requested a hearing, and an emergency hearing was held. The presiding ALJ determined that there was unlicensed cannabis activity and ordered that the Order to Seal be extended for one year. The appellant has filed an instant appeal and seeks to have the decision of the ALJ vacated. The proposed resolution and decision before the Board is to affirm the ALJ's decision.
- Upon a motion from Board Member Crystal Rodriguez-Dabney, and a second from Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins, Resolution No. 2024-125, a Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal World of Exotic Inc., v. OCM, Inspection No. 205202405220002, affirming the decision and order, was approved unanimously.

- Celena Ditchev, Associate Counsel for OCM, provided an overview of Resolution No. 2024-126, a Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal Cross Bay Snacks, Inc., v. OCM, Inspection No. 105202405300001. Before the Board today, is an Administrative Appeal submitted for review. The matter stems from a regulatory inspection that was conducted and a subsequent hearing held before the OAH. There was a regulatory inspection conducted of the appellant's business by the Enforcement team. There was a determination that there was unlicensed cannabis activity, and the business was padlocked. The appellant requested an emergency proceeding with the OAH. The presiding ALJ determined that there was unlicensed cannabis activity and issued a decision in which the Order to Seal was extended for one year. The appellant has filed an appeal requesting the ALJ's decision be reversed and the Order to Seal vacated. The proposed resolution and decision before the Board is to affirm the ALJ's decision.



Office of Cannabis Management

- Upon a motion from Board Member Crystal Rodriguez-Dabney, and a second from Board Member Hope Knight, Resolution No. 2024-126, a Resolution to Render a Decision for Administrative Appeal Cross Bay Snacks, Inc., v. OCM, Inspection No. 105202405300001, affirming the decision and order, was approved unanimously.
- John Kagia, Senior Director of Policy for OCM, and Tabatha Robinson, Acting Chief Equity Officer and Executive Deputy Director of Economic Development and Research for OCM, provided the following OCM report.
 - Market Update
 - New York has sold \$918.7 million in legal cannabis. Total sales since the market launched are on pace to hit \$1 billion by year end.
 - Green Wednesday’s (Wednesday before Thanksgiving) surge pushed weekly sales to a record of \$29 million, bringing the 2024 year-to-date total to nearly \$760 million, with four reporting weeks left.
 - More stores are reporting revenue but revenue per location has declined.
 - Padlocking efforts reignited growth, especially for downstate stores, where the city and state were working together on law enforcement efforts.
 - Non-flower products now account for 55% of sales, fueled by strong demand for vapes and edibles.
 - Registered Organizations (ROs) now account for one-quarter of flower sales, fueled by a focus on larger package sizes.
 - There are over 1,070 strains on the market. With the increase of strains, no strain now has more than 2% of sales.
 - Infused flower products account for two-thirds of concentrate sales and are priced at over two times the uninfused equivalents.
 - Gummies are dominating edible sales as flavor profiles have diversified significantly.
 - There are roughly 500 brands on the market. Brand saturation has leveled off with competition most intensive in flower and preroll categories.
 - Adult-Use Application Review Update – November Queue
 - The Office is prioritizing the review of the November queue and is reviewing applications in the order of the queue.
 - To date, the Office has started the review of up to number 1,719 in the queue review order.
 - Currently, 1071 dispensary locations are receiving proximity protection.
 - Licensing Update
 - There are currently 224 CAURD with final licenses, 294 adult-use retail dispensaries, 115 provisionally approved retail dispensaries, 225 microbusinesses, 198 cultivators, 282 processors and 170 distributors.
 - There are currently 261 dispensaries open for business across NYS. The breakdown includes 152 in upstate and 109 downstate.
 - Seed-To-Sale Update
 - In preparation for the upcoming BioTrack STS integrations, the Office announced scheduled BioTrack training webinars for licensees and



Office of Cannabis Management

integrators for the following dates: 3rd Party Integrator API Overview, December 17, 2024, Cultivation API Overview, January 7, 2025, Testing Labs API & GUI Overview, January 9, 2025, Manufacturing & Processing, January 14, 2025, Retail, Dispensation & Delivery API Overview, January 16, 2025, and 3rd Party Integrator Q&A, January 23, 2025.

- An email containing instructions on how to register for trainings was sent to all licensees on December 9, 2024. Recordings will be made available to licensees to accommodate those that cannot attend or would like a refresher. Forward any questions to compliance@ocm.ny.gov.
- Community Reinvestment Program Grants Update
 - The Community Reinvestment Program is designed to ensure equitable distribution of resources throughout NYS, with at least one grant awarded in 13 priority counties and each Empire State Development (ESD) region.
 - The application window for the Community Reinvestment Program remains open and the deadline has been extended until December 18 at 5pm.
 - This solicitation aims to support 501c3 Organizations serving young people ages 0-24 years old. OCM is accepting applications that address three specific program areas: Mental Health, Housing, and Workforce Development. The total available funding for this grant opportunity in 2024 is \$5 million. Each individual grant award will total \$100,000.
- Social and Economic Equity (SEE) Update
 - To date, 54% of adult-use licenses are SEE owned. The breakdown includes 38% Minority-Owned Business, 36% Women-Owned Business, 2% Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Business (SDV), 8% Distressed Farmer, and 16% Communities Disproportionately Impacted (CDI).
 - To date, 38% of Adult-Use Cultivators, 45% of Adult-Use Processors, 38% of Adult-Use Distributors, 58% of Microbusinesses, and 81% of Adult-Use Retail Dispensaries, are held by SEE licensees.
 - The Office has been leading an interagency Veteran Taskforce with support from DOL, DOH, OGS, New York City Housing Development Corporation and internal participants, to learn more about veteran needs. The taskforce was present at the Veterans in Economic Transition Conference (VETCON) on December 3-4, 2024. At the conference, the taskforce distributed a Veterans and Cannabis one-pager with information related to VA benefits, employment, and cannabis consumption.
 - Key program statistics for the CAURD Accelerator Program and OUR Academy include 750 CAURD and SEE participants, 91 free educational sessions delivered by December 15, 2024, a total of 92 hours of teaching time delivered as of September 2024, 650 hours of one-on-one engagement recorded between Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and licensees, over 130 pro forma models prepared as of September 2024, and over 280 hours of personalized walkthroughs of pro formas, enabling clarifications, updates, and scenario testing. Licensees can still have



Office of Cannabis Management

access to online course and workbook material after the program ends.

Licensees have access to live virtual Office Hours until December 15th.

Office hours are held Thursdays at 5pm. For more information to access live Office Hours, contact high@thisisourdream.com with license details.

- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins asked how they are validating that the products in stores are actually coming from NYS. She stated that rate of inversion in this market is the dirty secret that everybody is talking about, that they are not bringing up in these slides here, and that the amount of product that is coming in to their legal authorized dispensaries from out of state is displacing New York product and that she would love for them to be able to try and track that a little bit better and focus some enforcement on supporting their New York growers and their New York processors so that they are not telling the story that there are not enough stores open and or conversely, that they have too many farms, because she does not think that that is a fair picture and that they need to actually look at are they truly selling New York products and that is something that they need to gather data on.
- John Kagia stated that they take any charges, allegations or claims of inversion or diversion for that matter, extremely seriously and that they will pursue those very intentionally, and it is something that they will not tolerate, but this market was intended to be for New York grow, New York bred product, and they remain immovably committed to that point.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins stated that she wanted to point out that on the slide with the picture of the graph that shows that the revenue per month is decreasing, that they are still at stores making \$450,000 a month, and that is a significant amount of money for each individual store to be making monthly on average and she would like to not blink at those and say, look at that line going down, and that is still quite a strong, robust amount.
- John Kagia stated that the averages are actually being buoyed by the outsize performance of a small subset of operators.
- Board member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins stated that she would like to see the enforcement data by region instead of being upstate versus downstate.
- John Kagia stated that they will be providing a much more comprehensive regional breakdowns moving forward and that part of the reason why they have been reluctant to do it to date is retail density and that they literally did not have enough dispensaries in enough regions to be able to provide those splits without indicating how individual performers were doing because they only had one or two of doors open in a few of the regions.
- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins stated that a bunch of graphs looking at percents of sales for a variety of different things were presented, but they were all based on one week of data in November and asked if they have looked at the other weeks.
- John Kagia stated that every week all of their licensees submit to them a very detailed retail inventory spec sheet of everything they have in their inventory, how many of those units they sold and then how much was left either because at the end of the week based on either things they got delivered or things that were left over from inventory they had on onsite that did not sell and that the challenge with creating a longitudinal profile of these data is the reports that they are getting can vary by week from each individual retailer almost based on who was doing the data inputting at their retailer.



Office of Cannabis Management

- Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins stated that for all of these cultivars and varieties that were reported on, she thinks that they have to be a little bit careful about saying how much variety that they have in the market because there is not a true way of registering these genetics.
 - John Kagia stated that there are some of the gold standards of these strains, the Blue Dreams and Girl Scout Cookies, the Golden Goats and the Pineapple Expresses, where there is a fairly well-established expectation for what the experience under those genetics is going to be at but that particularly in a novel market, where either the plant was grown a little bit differently or it might have been crossbred with something, the names may be indicators, but consumers should really be much more paying attention to the experience or effect.
 - Board Member Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins asked do they have any data on how participants in the CCTM program are a part of those social and economic equity licenses that have been given out or what the status is of applications of people who participated in that program.
 - Tabatha Robinson stated that she will get that number on how they have fared in terms of licensing.
-
- 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 should only be related to specific agenda items. Public Comments are listed in Appendix A.
-
- The CCB adjourned the meeting.



Appendix A

NYS Cannabis Control Board 12/10/2024 Meeting – Public Comment

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
1.	Crystal	Peoples-Stokes	Majority Leader, NYS Assembly	Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. And I just want to congratulate you all on moving this process forward. As you know, there are still a lot of wrinkles and a lot of bumps that we have to go through. I hope that we're being mindful of those. And I particularly want to mention those CAURD applicants who were supported by the fund that they are now needing to repay that debt and it is having a negative impact on them. So I'm hopeful that some of those RO dollars that will be collected that was mentioned earlier that could be used for the veteran's piece. I'm hopeful that some of that can be used to help those CAURD applicants who are stuck with these overly high-priced loans that they have to pay back for the properties that they have. And I also want to mention that there still are a number of people who are paying rent for locations. They have locations they did not apply for the fund, but it's costing them money. So the sooner we're able to get them actually not just licensed but opened, it would be really great. Some of these people were literally almost sending them into poverty and that's not what we want here. So again, thank you for the work that you guys are doing. I look forward to continue to support you. Just so happen to be in Albany for the reorganization of our conference and I often get all the questions from my colleagues about what's happening with the Office of Cannabis Management. And so I'm really delighted that my colleague, Grace Lee, came with me today because she's one of those that always ask questions and so she should present those issues to you and perhaps you all can get back to her and help with some expediency on issues she has before her on her district. Thank you.
2.	Grace	Lee	Assembly Member	Good afternoon. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. I am Assembly Member Grace Lee and I represent the Financial District, Lower East Side, in Chinatown, where we've had some really wonderful new stores that have opened, including the first Asian-American woman owned dispensary in Manhattan. And



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>the first. Yes, you should clap for that. The owners in the room today, as well as the first Dominican formerly incarcerated person owned dispensary that staffs 100% of their staff from justice impacted individuals which is ConBud. So we have seen some incredible entrepreneurs who are investing back into their community and also giving back to the community in many ways in the way that we envisioned the legal cannabis market to be doing. These entrepreneurs are still in a place, though, where they have invested years of their time and thousands of dollars into their stores and are still working to build their business and get it to a point where it can thrive. Yet at the same time, our local community boards are now getting an influx of applications from potential licensees who are looking for a waiver of the thousand-foot rule between stores. So they are looking to increase the concentration of stores within our neighborhoods. One of those applications really stood out to the community board and also to the local entrepreneurs. It is a multi-state, multibillion dollar company that is looking to extract from our communities, not give back, but extract from our communities and open within less than 1000 foot of our currently existing cannabis stores run by local entrepreneurs. We are at a point right now where we really need to be protecting our local business owners. We need to make sure that they have an opportunity to thrive before we start flooding the market. In addition, we are still impacted by illegal cannabis stores that continue to operate and do not follow the 1000-foot rule, of course. So we are in a place where the legal market still is not under control in Lower Manhattan and the legal businesses really need an opportunity to be able to succeed. So I am asking that we put a moratorium on any applications asking for a waiver to the thousand-foot rule. This is not good for the market. This is not good for the people who we intended this legal cannabis market to benefit. In addition to that, once it is considered, these waivers are considered. We really need to be talking to the local community boards who understand the neighborhoods, who understand the dynamics of what the market is doing in their local districts before we allow just the whole market to be flooded with stores where the market cannot sustain it. So that is my request today. I would love to have a further conversation about this after</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				this meeting. But, you know, we came from the assembly retreat because this is something that is so important to my community right now to make sure that we have a thriving legal market in lower Manhattan. Thank you.
3.	Tristan	Sanders	S&S Cultivation, Inc.	Well, I don't see many smiles today in the room we're sitting in. I try my best to keep smiling myself. I'll introduce myself. My name is Tristan Sanders, owner of S&S Cultivation, Inc. My business partner sitting next to me. He'll be speaking next. And I am proud to be in the New York cannabis market. I've always been proud to be here in New York. That's why we started this process. Although there's not a lot of local interactions, as the person who spoke right before me was saying, I think she is 100% correct that we need to be reviewing with local governments that know the communities and know what they need. There are a lot of issues I'm going to try to touch on these very quickly. We have been in this December queue for almost a year, waiting and process without any review. We were lease required. We are continuing to spend money on rent that we no longer know if we're going to get reviewed. We haven't received a phone call. And it's very, very disheartening and hard to keep smiling. But I want to be in this market. And so do many people, some of the worst things we're going through right now is that without any ability to conditionally operate, we are spending money day after day waiting for review. There is also no time frame for applicants if they have applied or when they're going to get reviewed. So if you apply, you know, a year ago, we have no idea if this is going to take two years, if this is going to be in the next month. So that also does not help. In addition, when we call the Office, we cannot get any answers on whether or not they've come up to the application review number that we're at in the queue process. And today was the first time we actually got an answer. So thank you. Thank you so much for asking that question during the meeting. Although I'm not confident that 150 is accurate or where they are in the list, that seems like a roundabout number. We would have really liked to know an exact number, so that way we know how long it's going to take us and how long we expect to keep paying. And again, I keep smiling. There are a lot of processors that just that were just approved in the Type three licensing that have only just



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>applied. And I think if you guys can do 50 of those in such a small timeframe, it continuously makes me wonder why we have not been reviewed either. Our business is not allowed to operate. There's no conditional operating. So as I said before, there's nothing we can do at this time. While we wait and to touch on some of the sales that. Thank you so much for your time.</p>
4.	Paul	Steinbrucker	S&S Cultivation	<p>First, I'd like to thank Crystal Rodriguez-Dabney and Dr. Gilbert Jenkins for actually listening to some of the stakeholders' complaints and trying to finally address them. I've been picking at this since before May, but with acceleration, since May, with absolutely nothing to show for it. Every time I come to speak at one of these meetings, it cost our company another \$7,000. We are an indoor cultivation tier one applicant from the December 2023 queue, and we are required to have an executed lease to apply at the time. After paying rent at \$7,000 per month for the last 12 months, we are still not even under review yet. This has caused irreparable financial harm and honestly mental harm too. Today you only approved 68 licenses, which is 57 less than you did last month. Having hundreds of applicants, you require to pay rent for a whole year while still not being fully licensed is not something to be proud of. Meanwhile, you're already trying to approve Type three applicants whose application window opened only a mere six weeks ago, and I'd like to applaud not actually approving those today. If this was any other entity but a government agency, this would be considered fraud. I'm really sick of hearing all the market analysis stuff and being told to wait and wait and wait while you guys implement new policies that allow previous stakeholders, previous cultivators to double or triple their canopy size. And then in the same breath, you tell me the reason why we're being slow rolled is because you're worried about market oversaturation. Please don't look at me in the face and call a cow a horse. I'm sick of being lied to and we need something to happen immediately. There is zero justifiable excuse that we have waited, paying rent for a whole year and are still not under review yet. You only approved one license today from the cultivation queue. We need answers. We need speed and we need motion on this issue immediately.</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
5.	Berkay	Sebat		<p>Hi. First of all, I want to thank Grace Lee for coming today. I'm also in her district as well. And we are very concerned about that application that was there that violates the proximity protection. That's primarily why I wanted to speak today. I'm also speaking for my friend Jillian. She was awarded proximity protection on 292 Atlantic Avenue. And there's another store at the other end of Atlantic Avenue at 150, and then you guys awarded. You guys violated the proximity protection of both stores and then put another store at 137 Court Street. I don't understand why there's no transparency about how this is being implemented, because I can't believe the market supports three stores in that area because none of the stores have opened yet. So who determined that this area can have a proximity protection waiver and is supported by the current market data when there's no stores? Also when the proximity protection waivers are being given, the people that are being violated, they don't have any information. They just find out about it on the proximity map. They're not consulted. We don't know what's going on. It's really hard to build a business based on a set of rules and then have those rules change like halfway throughout the year, which has happened a million times in this program. We're used to it by now, but this is a huge, major violation. And I also want to speak about the December queue. I know that there's going to be more licensing going on, and that's fine. But, you know, if 60% of the stores have a less than \$1 million run rate, that's like a failure of a program because in New York City with 280 E tax that's I can't see how those stores could even be sustainable with more licenses coming onto the market. You know, you said there's going to be some sort of analysis done, financial analysis, if there will be some more transparency and how that's going to be done, we'd really appreciate it. You know, there's a lot of different statistics. You can look at it and find a different outcomes based on who's looking at the stats, and that's important. So thank you.</p>
6.	David	Nicponski	Freshly Baked NYC	<p>Thank you. Good morning Board Members and OCM staff. I'm David Nicponski, Director of Business Development, of the New York Cannabis Retailers Association and owner of Freshly Baked NYC a Bronx license retail dispensary. Speaking today to support Assembly Member Lee sentiments and to express</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>the deep concern and frustration of retail licensees regarding the recent approval of locations that significantly encroach on the proximity protection zones of social equity licensees. These decisions are existential threats to the businesses and livelihoods of the equity licensees that New York has committed to supporting. As an OCM Interim Director Felicia Reid just said today in this very meeting, businesses thrive on predictability by approving licenses within these zones, as CCB has undermined the very foundation of predictability that businesses need to thrive and undercut the business value of those licenses. This has a domino effect. The market value of the affected licenses plummets immediately, but more broadly in shock waves of unpredictability throughout the entire licensee community and its pool of potential investors. Proximity protections and enforcement against illegal operators are the two cornerstones of license value. And when either or both of these are compromised, it erodes confidence for operators and potential investors alike destroying that business value. Let me be clear. Businesses in this industry, especially those in equity licensees, are already struggling to secure funding. Social equity fund was an abject failure by any conceivable standards, and operators have to seek private investment in an increasingly uncertain regulatory environment. Cutting even one third the proximity protection zone doesn't just shrink opportunity, it guts it entirely as it cuts the exclusive operation zone by more than 50%. What rational investor would support an already risky business when half its anticipated customer base could be handed to a better capitalized MSO competitor on a whim. These decisions to allow significant incursions are not just disappointing, they're actively harmful. They betray the trust of this very community. They fast forward us to the period of licensees cannibalizing each other that OCM Policy director John Kagia just stated, we're still far out in the future, but they fast forward is there. The retail community is livid about this. Industry groups are mobilized industry and as licensees need predictability and real licensee protections. Thank you for your attention.</p>
7.	Matthew	Robinson	Legacy Dispensary	<p>Good morning, everybody. My name is Matthew Robinson. I'm the owner of Legacy Dispensary, part owner of Our Legacy Dispensary. And I'd like to say thank you to the OCM, Crystal Stokes and everybody that's helped get the stores open. Something I want to bring up</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>are the ROs and the tax. We still need that tax relieved for our medical people that come in with licenses. We need that relieved in the adult use space. It has to go. It's just hurting us really bad. More stores are opening up, which is competition, which is okay. But it's when the ROs are right next to you in certain stores, that they're going to have a lot of problems because they can sell the product at a lower price and help the customer. I'm going to keep saying it every time I'm up here. The OCM is doing their best. For everybody out there, that's sort of like complaining like, I want a license, I want to get open and I want this and that. And just thinking of only themselves. Not everybody can get a license. No market is going to survive if everybody gets a license. So we have to keep that in mind as well as people. I'm not saying don't give licenses, but moderately. It has to be a moderation. People out there just be patient. Wait. If you get a license, great. If you don't get the license, it's okay. I was just denied a license in Minnesota. It happens. Get denied. Move on. There's other things in life. Don't overspend for those that are already doing the rent thing. Got the locations, Got a license. Don't just waste your money. That's just foolish. This is bad decision making. Bad business. Don't be a bad businessman. Be a wise businessman. Think if you don't got a license and you don't know you're going to get license, why spend \$100,000 on a store and you don't know if you're about to get a why spend this on a farm and you don't know if going to get licensed. So don't bash the OCM or come for the OCM like it's their fault because you made a bad decision. I've made plenty of bad decisions in my life, but I can accept responsibility for my bad decisions, and I advise you as well. Thank you very much.</p>
8.	Jeffrey	Hoffman		<p>Good afternoon. My name is Jeffrey Hoffman. I'm an attorney from New York City. I want to thank the board on behalf of my clients to whom you gave licenses today. It is much appreciated. I know you guys are really working diligently to get that done. I do want to raise again two points that I brought up in previous board meetings. Number one, that we have a rash of probably mis-voiced applications. I have several clients where I believe this is the case. I've spoken with many other attorneys that I believe have many other mis-voiced applications. I think</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>we really need to get a process in place before we get too much further into next year, because I don't think these folks are going to sit on their hands much longer in the face of mis-voided applications. Additionally, I do think we need to look into what's going on the local map as far as there are places that we know that people don't have leases that are still on the map. I have several clients that are impacted by that. I know that it's going to open up a can of worms when you take a pin off the map. It's a real kind of there's a lot of people impacted by that that will be around that site. But I do encourage us to really step into that process. I do want to echo what Dave said earlier on, Dave Nicponski said earlier, I'm also on the board of NYCRA and I'm very aware of some of the issues that Jillian and some of the other folks are going to speak about here later today. Let's be very clear. No state has done for equity what you have done. Not even close. Not even close. It is to be celebrated. Okay. But I do want us to keep our eye on the prize. And the prize is not the number of equity licenses given. It's not even the number of equity stores that open. It's the number of those equity stores that are still open a year, five years and ten years down the line. And I just do want to make sure we've got our eye on this. Again, what you all have done for equity has never been done before in the cannabis industry, elsewhere or frankly, anywhere else. Let's just make sure we do have our eye on that. We got to make sure those stores are successful. And really, the last thing I want to say is thank you. I think a lot of people come up here and complain. It's tough for you to hear that, I'm sure. But you are doing the work and off we go. Thank you very much.</p>
9.	Vanessa	Yee-Chan	Alta Dispensary	<p>Hello. Good afternoon, Board members. I'm Vanessa Yee-Chan, owner of the newly opened Alta Dispensary located in Chinatown, Nolita in Manhattan, which I proudly opened just about two months ago. Our store represents my passion and commitment to building a sustainable, responsible cannabis business focused on education. My heart dropped when last month, Curaleaf, a \$2 billion multistate cannabis conglomerate, provided notice to Community Board 2 in Manhattan of its intent to open a dispensary at 210 Lafayette Street. This proposed location violates OCM proximity rules and would destroy</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>the federal legal market created this past year by small business dispensaries like Alta in the area. Curleaf's proposed location violates OCMs 1000-foot proximity rule. It is about only about 600ft from both Alta and a CAURD licensee Flowery, which Berkay had mentioned previously. Legal dispensaries like mine are already struggling to compete against illicit shops, two of which operate just steps away from my front door, one operating between me and Curleaf's proposed location. I'm gravely concerned that Curaleaf will ask OCM for an exemption from the 1000-foot requirement based on public convenience and advantage. More so, I'm scared that OCM would grant a corporate conglomerate like Curaleaf such an exemption. Customer demand for cannabis in our area is not a level support another cannabis dispensary. Particularly one that violates a 1000-foot rule and has deep pockets to outspend and outmaneuver the rest of us. Curaleaf's presence would destroy small businesses like mine, along with four other SEE and CAURD licensees in CB2 that have not opened for barely a year. I, along with New York State Assembly member Grace Lee and Council Member Chris Marte out and surrounding dispensary always Flowery, ConBud, Mighty Lucky, all oppose Curaleaf's application. Our community and I have their signatures here. If granted by the OCM, such variance sets a dangerous precedent for future RODs to be allowed to invade areas with other small business dispensaries. It jeopardizes pioneers of the legal market, local entrepreneurs who enter into astronomical leases to comply with OCM proximity rules. MRTA gave OCM the mission to support small businesses and social equity applicants. The community is watching and the OCM is being called upon to act in concert with the spirit of the law. I respectfully ask that you reject any request in variance for Curaleaf retail location at 210 Lafayette Street. Thank you for your attention and please use this opportunity. Show your support for the small business community. Thank you.</p>
10.	Melissa	Gibson	Herbal Woodstock	<p>Hi. I'm the owner of Herbal Woodstock, OCM Retail License 24-112. I'm here to comment on the proposed public convenience and advantage regulations. In retail, you would never choose a location without knowing who your competitors are, how many competitors there are and</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>where they are, in relative to your location of your business. And yet that is exactly the risk that every non provisional applicant took back in November 23. And if we were lucky, resilient and resourceful enough to get a license, we then doubled and tripled down on that risk, spending hundreds of thousands to actually open. It backwards, choosing a location blind to your competition. But there was one reward for that risk. One advantage to having made it through the rollout gauntlet. And that was the 1000- and 2000-foot proximity protection the regs promised when we applied. Proximity protection is that one advantage, that one pay off for risking it all. It's how small operators like me built pro formas, made financial projections and most importantly, fundraised. A PCA waiver effectively nullifies that advantage, setting up smaller upper operatives to fail. Taking proximity protection away favors deep pocketed business conglomerates, and vertically integrated ROs who can afford to get into a competitive fight just to see who can be the last one standing. PCA waivers should have an extremely high bar with stringent transparent criteria not used as a loophole. The current language of the proposed guidelines overwhelmingly favors the requester, without regard to the affected dispensary. And it's not clear what factors demonstrate a need or prove economic justification. You should ask first. Are there other real estate options that do not violate another licensee's protected proximity? Can the public be served without harming the existing dispensary that's essentially a sitting duck unable to move while the requester takes aim? There should be a time frame before deciding that a dispensary isn't adequately meeting the needs and convenience of the public they serve. 84% of open dispensaries have been operating for less than a year, and at the very least, PCA consideration should require that the license holder whose proximity will be violated, gets to defend themselves before any waivers are granted.</p>
11.	Jillian	Dragutsky	Astro Management	<p>Hello, my name is Jillian Dragutsky. I'd like to thank Berkay and Jeff and Grace Lee. So I'm here on behalf of Astro Management CAURD number 24 10670 sorry. 167. I work closely with the New York Cannabis Retail Association as well. I'm here to speak to you about</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>the proximity protection waivers you have been granting. I was granted proximity protection as a CAURD licensee. I'm weeks away from opening and I checked the local map only to find the general application licensee was granted proximity protection within my 1000-foot buffer. This licensing not only violates my 1000-foot buffer, but that of another CAURD licensee as well. What this means is three legal cannabis stores in a four-block radius in four blocks straight on the same street, on the same side of the road. What the CCB is doing by granting all of these waivers is decimating the market before it even has a chance to stand up on its own. To be clear, I wasn't notified, nor is there a path for me to appeal this. Meaning that before I even have a chance to open my doors, I'm at a disadvantage. There are no high rises around us, no real way to sustain that many dispensaries in that type of a cluster. This clustering is reminiscent of most of a smoke shop mentality, and I'm not the only one who's facing this proximity violation, as you clearly hear. There are dozens of licensees facing the same unreasonable cannibalization. It's too soon to be granting public convenience waivers. There's no way to know what communities will sustain. If you continue to grant waivers, what do you think the New York market will look like in a year? In two years? I'll look like the collapse markets of other states that are oversaturated as well. Make no mistake, the large corporations who can sustain these losses and survive will be the only ones who survive. Social and economic equity and CAURD, they won't. Small businesses and those like me who were harmed by the war on drugs are likely to be more likely to be in financial ruin if this continues. Thank you.</p>
12.	Ian	Burke	Chronic Dispensary	<p>Hello everyone. My name is Ian Burke, and I am the owner of the Chronic Dispensary opening very soon right here in Albany. I just want to say thank you to the board for allowing me to speak today, and congratulations on all the success this year in 2024. It's been a historic year for New York State. I like to start with saying that we need to eliminate the tax for the medical patients at retail shops. It not only allows for patients to not have full access to the medical products that they desire, but it also gives ROs a huge competitive advantage to against retail cannabis dispensaries like myself. And I'd also like to repeat what</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				a lot of people have come up here and said today is that moving on to 2025, we really need to be precautionary about how we roll out the next round of retail licenses. And if you take a look at states such as California or Massachusetts, their biggest enemy, that the number one cause for failure has been oversaturation of the markets. And so you guys have built a great program. And like Jeffrey Hoffman said, it's a historic program in terms of social equity and supporting small businesses. And the last thing that any of us, any of the consumers or the businesses in the state want to see is for that program to not pan out in the next five to 10 to 20 years and beyond. So just please be precautionary moving forward with issuing licenses in the future. Thank you.
13.	Saladin	Amir		Yes. My name is Saladin Amir. I am an applicant on in December queue I'm here to talk about how the December queue is not that much of a threat. And I realize that there are people out there who like to see the December queue dismissed into a study is done on market saturation, but this is really unnecessary being that there is 894 duplicates, making that 3,664 unique applicant ID's on that queue alone. Separating the micro business in a retail that makes the micro business only 916 and retails 2478. This doesn't include the people who have already received a license or for that queue and the special groups like the CAURD and AUCCs who were asked to reapply and taken off that list immediately. This alone makes the queue list much shorter than it appears. Another thing to consideration is that there are license holders who have already given up and they'll sell their licenses and so they won't be active in the market. And there would be those that also who don't make it through. This is not for everybody to make it. So with the industry still in flux, to say that we're reaching any kind of saturation is projector. You can't say that. We're in the beginning stages and we haven't even launched a plane yet. So I just wanted to take my time to say that and OCM's commitment to continuing the process of going through the queue and making sure that people have an opportunity, especially the people who are most impacted, which are the CDI who mostly reside on there. Thank you.
14.	William	Hughes	Blaze LLC	Hi all. My name is Bill Hughes. I'm the holder of a retail license Blaze New York LLC. One, I want to commend



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>OCM for the work that you're doing also Crystal People-Stokes in the legislature for passing the MRTA. But as you guys said, you were doing a listening tour and that's sounds encouraging. But I think more listening needs to be done. When you listen to this room, you hear a lot of talk about a lot of rules and regulations that really apply to downstate, right. When you talk about upstate, I live in Hudson, New York. I applied for a license in Hudson, New York and had to move out because of the proximity rules. We were fine with that. We moved a mile and a half out into a town in Greenport. This is important because the problem is I don't think OCM really understands upstate because they believe that they've given out a lot of licenses in the city of Hudson when in fact they gave out licenses in the area code of 12534. 12534 area code has five towns, one city. And where this becomes important is each one of those towns has its own government, its own zoning laws. In the city of Hudson, they have their own government. And because I am now moved out into Greenport and OCM is thinking that is Hudson, I am operating under a different government. A government that, by the way, has put a moratorium in place after they approved a municipality I mean, a retail store to operate in that municipality. And so we wrote to OCM and asked them, are you guys honoring this moratorium before we filed our notice to that municipality. We got no response. Because when you gave us a provisional license, you put a time period on that. So we felt we needed to move quickly. So we filed a notice with the government, and I sat down to talk to their elected officials, and they told me that, yes, they in fact do have a moratorium, but OCM is not saying that they honor that. Since then, OCM has given me property proximity protection. Great. We've then reached back out to OCM and said, hey, what are our next steps? Or are we waiting to hear from the municipality? We haven't heard anything yet, but yet in all we still have this time period that OCM has put in place on that provisional license. And so what I would suggest is that A) OCM lengthen that time period because you know, you put a time period on us, but there's no time period when OCM is going to respond to the information, on how fast we can get into that location.</p>
15.	Belayet	Hossain		<p>Good afternoon. My name is Belayet Hossain, and this was my fourth time seeing you guys since 2023. Anyway,</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>thank you so much. I received an email yesterday about the approval of my proximity protection. About the location. But I see on that approval there is a mistake is the address is wrong address. But my company name is inaudible Corporation and license number is OCM RET 202300941. But the address is a wrong. I do know something maybe the mistakes. And I just let you know me. So you know I'm on the journey since in the beginning and I'm lucky I still survive up to paying the rent. As for my lease, because my area is very beautiful area and expensive. So I am lucky because I have other business going on, so it's still I can survive. But I am sure other application has very difficult time, especially in Manhattan and but hard for us because I don't see any reason for me to delay. And one more thing I'm sorry to say today I see the data is showing that sales is lower because I'm sorry to say because why it is my location is and I have other business there. I see so many you know, they're selling illegally and OCM is not giving us opportunity to open legally. So people are buying from illegal markets. So this is what is happening I believe OCM would do that first you know help us and you can see the sellers going off I'm telling you. So, I really, you know, like to recourse you guys. If you see, you know, if you see people have the good place and is you know, is good surrounding place, don't delay, please, because we're, you know, suffering. I'm telling you, I'm almost paid, I think nearly 150,000 rent until today. I'm sorry. But thank you. See you guys again. I believe you guys doing hard work on them.</p>
16.	Rickquan	Cunningham	Savant Strains, Inc.	<p>Hello, good afternoon. My name is Rickquan Cunningham. I'm the CEO and founder of Savant Strains, Inc. I'm also a CCTM graduate and excuse me, Provisional Microbusiness applicant. Firstly, I would like to commend OCM for their continued dedication to MRTA in the December queue, despite the efforts of those who would like to see the December queue further postpone due to legal market saturation concerns. I also urge OCM to remain steadfast in the understanding that the legal market is far from saturation. This is merely an attempt to stall any potential competition. I urge OCM to remain steadfast in the knowledge that healthy legal competition is the best means to fight the illicit market. Lastly, I think I can speak for everyone in the December queue when I say any postponement or disregard of this queue would be a tremendous disservice to MRTA and the foundation it has set for social equity. I would argue that the vast</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				majority of the justice impacted community resides in the December queue. These people are entrepreneurs that were far ahead of their time and paid the consequences for it. Adding such brilliant minds to the legal market would allow innovation and competition to thrive. With that, I concede my time. Oh, last comment. Again, I think I can speak for many of us when I say that I am an extremely impassioned individual. I have strategically organized my life up to this juncture in an attempt to seize one of these licenses. And I have been in pursuit of this since I was 17 years old. I'm 33 years old now, so you can imagine how long of a wait. So with that again, OCM, I thank you for your steadfast dedication towards social equity and the licensing process and continue doing your thing. Thank you.
17.	Tyler	Lehmann	Breckenridge Hemp	Good afternoon. Thank you. Ms.. Reid. Ms. Wright now, Ms. Knight, for allowing me to speak today. My name is Tyler Lehmann. I'm the owner of Breckenridge Hemp and Breckenridge Café. I started this business in the hemp cannabis business or excuse me, the hemp business in 2017. I am a felon for selling 3.5 grams of marijuana, which brought me to the dream of equity and brought me to a dream of equality and fairness. I came to New York with a dream. I started stores here. I've never been illicit cannabis. Currently I'm shut down at one of my locations for using the word cannabis with hemp. And basically it would have been a simple change. I could never imagine the consequences of using the word cannabis and hemp together. I am an applicant. I have applied more than a year ago for my licensing. Both stores have been locked away from proximity protections to other locations that are in the locations of a school within the 500-foot radius of the school. While I'm being non-viable. For just information that's not correct. So only thing that I'm looking for is just fairness and equality and understanding that we all started this together. We're all in that business and I want to participate in compliance. I want to participate in being partners. I want to participate in helping everyone. I'm not scared of competition. Let the brands speak for themselves. Let the customer service speak for themselves. That's all I have to say. Thank you.
18.	Colin	Signor	CNR Projects	Hello. I'm Colin Signor with CNR Projects. Our number in queue is 1984. When we first applied in November, we were encouraged to have a location on our application. We did find a location approved by the state and town. We did go through the steps to receive town approval.



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				We have been under contract for our location for over a year. The seller is becoming tired of waiting and we have fought to hold our location. Since there is no communication with us and OCM we just want to let you guys know we were still here. We are ready to help our area with creating a safe market for consumers. Thanks for your time and we look forward to hearing from you soon.
19.	Ronald	Shen	R&R Cannabis	Hi. Good day, everyone. My name is Ronald Shen. I'm a CAURD holder. I'm also the owner of R&R Cannabis in Bushwick, Brooklyn. I'm here today to talk about proximity protection, trust, fairness, commitment, words you guys put out. 522ft. That's the next dispensary that got proximity protection from me, 522ft. I don't know how you guys go over the PCA, but we're in an industrial neighborhood. I'm in a one-story warehouse. The person who was 522ft away from me is in a one-story warehouse. We don't have high rises near us. No big buildings. It's just commercial and industrial, so I don't know how the PCA works. To grant someone 522ft away when there's another licensed dispensary. Seven minutes walking distance from my store. I'm here to add to everybody else about the whole proximity protection. Protect us. You know, like how fast you want the market to crash. You know, it's going to give out more licenses, which is fine. Make it a fair game, but at least stick to something where we have a leg to fight on. Like everyone spent so much money paying for rent trying to lock down these leases, paying the extra tax because we're a cannabis business. So the landlords charged us extra money and now the only thing we have fight on is the 1000 feet. Now we don't even have that anymore to defend us. So, that's all I got to say thank you, guys.
20.	Carl	Anderson		Yes. Good afternoon. How are you guys? I thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Executive Director and the rest of the board, I appreciate you guys time. My name is Carl Anderson. I'm a CAURD winner from 2022. So it bothers me that we're here, that I'm here speaking about proximity protection, which has been the ongoing theme. I think my issue is more related to the lack of response. There seems to be proximity protection that was granted fraudulently. My landlord owns the same location and he's attached to it in an affidavit that we've sent to OCM. We've been paying rent since May of this year, which is upwards of \$25,000 a month. It's unfair. And we only ask that someone look into it. If the landlord is willing to provide proof in affidavits. I'm lost that why we're here.



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>However, I do want to say thank you. You guys have been at least the CCB has been outstanding. OCM has worked diligently in everything that they tried to do. So we certainly appreciate it. I don't want that to be lost on anyone here. It's hard work. I do appreciate what an infancy market looks like. You guys are starting from scratch, but we are hurting for real. And that's just the honesty in it. We're hurting. We need you guys look into this. That's it. Thank you, guys.</p>
21.	Tim	Williamson	Growing hearts green	<p>Dear Office of Cannabis Management Board Members, I hope this email finds you well. As a group of licensees in new york we are writing to urgently request your intervention to prevent Stiiizy (Shryne) from illegally operating in New York under, Omnium Health Inc license# OCM-PROC-24-000047 & OCM-DIST-24-000043 at 1186 Route 109 Lindenhurst, NY</p> <p>According to Section 68 and 69 of New York's cannabis regulations: "No individual or entity with any direct or indirect interest in a licensee authorized for the supply tier (such as cultivators, processors, distributors, Registered Organization Non-Dispensing) is allowed to hold any direct or indirect interest in a licensee on the retail tier (such as dispensing, on-site consumption, delivery) and vice versa." Stiiizy currently holds multiple retail cannabis licenses in California and Michigan. Based on the regulation, Stiiizy is disqualified from obtaining a processor license in New York due to their existing ownership interest in retail cannabis businesses in other states.</p> <p>Additionally, Stiiizy has faced serious allegations of engaging in illegal operations and criminal activities, including running a network of unlicensed cannabis stores and engaging in illicit business practices. It has been reported that Stiiizy's tactic involved flooding the illegal market in New York with their products to gain customer recognition. Such actions are against everything New York stands for in terms of maintaining a regulated and legal cannabis market.</p> <p>Furthermore, Stiiizy has taken advantage of social equity applicants in California and has even sued equity applicants. These actions are contrary to the principles of social equity and fairness that New York aims to uphold in its cannabis industry.</p> <p>Moreover, the owner of Stiiizy is currently involved in multiple lawsuits for illegally operating in Los Angeles, California, for illegal cannabis activities and selling to minors. These allegations further raise significant concerns about their eligibility and suitability to operate</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>within New York’s regulated cannabis market. Additionally, Stiizy is directly hiring for cannabis positions through their verified listings on Indeed. This indicates their active efforts to expand their operations, which could potentially include entering the New York market. As a group of small farmers and micros we urgently ask the ccb to take action against this company and license holder.</p>
22.	NP	NP		<p>What happens to an OCM CAURD holder who is operating a storefront knowingly submitted false tax documents to get approved early into the process within the top 500 to be approved?</p>
23.	Sami	Abdelazim	Hemp Geek LLC	<p>As a hemp license holder for over 5 years I would like to know if the Cannabis board has a plan to help the hemp retail shops by reducing regulations from the devastating 1:15 ratio back to the 1:1 ratio? They do know NY citizens can order hemp products online with high Strength THC much higher than the old 1:1 ratio limit and lots of sales tax is flying out of the state correct? Do they also know it’s just making an inconvenience for older Ny citizens who use product brands like Snoozy can still order them online and NY loses out on sales tax, which our stores used to generate 12-15 grand a month of sales tax with 3 shops and 9 employees and now we have gone down to \$1500 dollars at one shop with one employee, so do they know the damage they have done to hemp retail small business owners and do they have a plan to help us?</p>
24.	Murph	DHaiti		<p>I work the cannabis industry in NYC. One thing I can tell you is that without loyalty points or discounts, the illegal smoke shops will continue to pop up. Stores are struggling to make ends meet because of this. At this rate, the industry will continue to struggle until it fails. Customers are looking for sales, loyalty points, senior citizen and neighborhood discounts. Many customers have told me that with the prices and no sales or discounts, they have been shopping the illegal stores instead of coming to a legal dispensary. Businesses will fail without shopper incentives in many ways and jobs will be lost. I’ve done this for close to a decade now and the failure rate will continue to rise of these changes aren’t made.</p>
25.	Heather	Macdonald		<p>We are Heather and Bart Macdonald, residents of 807 Manhattan Avenue in Greenpoint. We are writing to express our strong opposition to the cannabis license application by Altitude NY LLC for a dispensary and smoking lounge at the Greenpoint Savings Bank, a historic landmark.</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>As parents of young children, we chose Greenpoint for its strong community, safety, and character. Our building, which houses 29 families, is home to many young children and has a shared entrance with the bank, raising serious safety concerns. The potential risks of increased crime, traffic, and safety issues for our families are significant, especially given the proximity to schools, daycares, and youth facilities.</p> <p>Additionally, we are concerned about the potential violation of our building's offering plan, which prohibits businesses like dispensaries from operating in the bank space. There are also numerous other dispensaries in the area, and we question why this historic building is being considered for such a business, especially by operators who do not seem connected to the Greenpoint community. We urge the you to deny this application and find a more suitable location for a dispensary that will not harm the character or safety of our beloved neighborhood and families.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>
26.	Jonathan	Stone		<p>I am extremely concerned with the way medical marijuana patients like myself are getting treated. The medicine has been difficult to obtain and pricey and the dispensaries want to get rid of the medical side which would eliminate all discounts that we can get by having SSI Medicaid food stamps etc. if that happens I won't be able to afford the only medicine which has helped me survive and fight back against my disease and I can't even get it delivered. New York state needs to do something about it asap. My only income personally is SSI and SSD and there's not enough help for people that are poor and need this medicine to survive on a daily basis. The state has severely neglected the medical side which is detrimental to the disabled community and frankly it's discrimination and can't be tolerated. I've been on it for 5 years myself and the treatment has been horrendous. From the dispensaries and from the state, the OCM and even some of the doctors. I do want a response back too because I'm tired of being ignored and if I have to I will start the legal route against the cannabis board and new York state for failing to help those in need like me.</p>
27.	Kristin	Esposito	807 Manhattan Ave Condominium Board	<p>Dear Board Members,</p> <p>I am writing to formally express my opposition to the application for the proposed cannabis dispensary, Altitude NY LLC at 807 Manhattan Avenue (Greenpoint Savings Bank – a landmarked historical property). While I acknowledge the evolving landscape of cannabis</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>legislation and its potential benefits, I believe that this historic location is not suitable for such a business. The residential and commercial spaces of this property are intertwined and one connected non-smoking property. 807 Manhattan Ave, the landmark Greenpoint Savings Bank, is the commercial component of the same block and lot number. The buildings bylaws and declaration expressly prohibit this sort of smoke / head shop from conducting business at this location. To be clear, this is not a 'party-wall' situation; several residents' units and our building gym are in the bank. When the bank's roof leaks, it floods our units and ground floor, and there is required egress between the residential and commercial sections for roof access and emergencies. We are the same building. Also, the building, which shares the same tax designation and physical space is located on the same block as a public school, PS 31. I would also like to add that this business has not fully disclosed all intended uses and required documentation in their permit application with Community Board 1, thus I request that this application be denied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of Transparency in application: Since the October 2024 Community Board 1 meeting when Altitude NY LLC represented documentation for their license request, they have been missing required forms. Since then, months later we are still waiting for proper and required documentation. I ask you, OCM to perform / mandate the following actions: <p>Independent Verification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Names and contact (phone and email) of each individual associated with this business and their role, ownership, and title • Business model/proposal with lease details and date/term • Independent audit of applicant's operations, including any past violations and allegations of illegal activity at Flynnstoned <p>Compliance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required permits with the Landmark Preservation Commission (LPC) and providing the Department of Buildings (DOB) Letter of No Objection (LNO) • Proof of proper DOB documents confirming the structural integrity and viability of the premises as well as a detailed flood mitigation and safety plan (this building is very prone to flooding and has caused flooding issues on the residential side) • Confirmation from FDNY addressing the many concerns



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>related to the egress between the residential and commercial space</p> <p>Security and Crime Prevention Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a full security plan that includes measures to prevent burglaries, mitigate risks associated with the primarily cash business model, atm, and deter spillover crime impacting neighboring residential buildings and businesses. • Include how these safety measures will be addressed to the physical space / building as well as in Personnel / trained security professionals. • 807 Manhattan is a commercial unit within and attached to a condominium complex, 1080 Lorimer Street, therefore all secondhand smoke will negatively impact and potentially harm the adults and children/infants that reside in that condominium. The Board of 1080 Lorimer was not consulted about this lease and there are a number of prohibited uses per the 1080 Lorimer NYS Attorney General Offering Plan, which includes use as a 'head shop' and any venue that creates loud music or noisy events. • Nearby Schools, Youth, and Places of Worship: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PS 31 is only 300 feet away – 807 Manhattan Ave rear entrance. We are the same block/lot. <p>I urge the Community Board to deny the permitting for the Altitude NY LLC dispensary at 807 Manhattan Avenue and to prioritize locations that are more appropriate and pose fewer risks for this community and the surrounding environment.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerns.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kristin Esposito</p>
28.	Neil	Anastasio	Forest Regional Residents' Civic Association	<p>Our civic association once again urges the board to revoke the permit for CAURD retail # OCMCAURDP-2023-000086 located at 465-69 Forest Avenue, Staten Island. THIS SITE IS A DESIGNATED SUPERFUND CLEAN UP SITE (see DEC # 243042) which OCM was unaware of when the permit was granted, The applicant did not disclose this fact on their application. REVOKE THIS LICENSE !</p>
29.	Martin	Kamornik	OV Enterprises llc CAURD 2022-000282/OC MCAURDP-2024-000101	<p>We respectfully request your approval to grant a waiver for our proposed location(212 e14 st New York NY 10003) based on the grounds of public convenience and advantage under the factors set forth in the Cannabis Law section 64 and Title 9 New York Codes Rules and Regulations sec 119.4, as well as the considerable distance from the nearest approved dispensary,</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				please vote on our approval in the upcoming meeting thank you
30.	Amber	Lee	PYNNS GREEN LLC - OCMPROC 24-000151	Thank you to the board for approving my Processor Tier 3 license. I appreciate all your hard work and I'm excited to get started building my canna brand in NY. As a Tier 3 Processor, since I am not also a cultivator, I am not currently able to touch and process flower based products directly. I am hoping the board will consider updating the Tier 3 license so both cultivators and non cultivators (white label licenses) can package whole flower and pre rolls (with pre ground flower) directly. This would satisfy the current GMP Audit Conditional Exemption Application requirements for Processor Tier 3 and Micro Business licenses and would allow businesses like myself that have commercial spaces ready for manufacturing to get started without the added cost and operational complexity of outsourcing these lower production products. I am currently being reviewed for a distribution license which would allow me to deliver my products. Being able to touch flower directly would allow small operations and brands like myself more choice and flexibility to enter the market quickly and with little overhead. With the added ability to process flower directly, myself and other Tier 3 brands would be able to procure ground and whole flower from local cultivators, package whole flower and roll pre rolls, and with a distribution license deliver final products directly to dispensaries throughout the state - all without relying on a third party to facilitate. In the end this would decrease costs and allow for more competitive pricing in market. The Tier 3 license is a great low asset option for those that want to partner with third parties on all products, but it also requires sharing already very tight margins with another party in the supply chain. For those with the facilities to support in house production it would be a game changer for Tier 3 white label licensees to have the same option as cultivators to process flower and pre rolls in house. Thank you for your consideration and time.
31.	Mark	Stuver	Resident at 807 Manhattan Ave. Condominui ums	Attorneys for 807 Manhattan Ave Condominui ums found that Altitude NY LLC already has active licenses for 807 Manhattan Ave, OCMRETL-2023-002012 and OCM-RETL-24-00012. I ask NYS Cannabis Control Board directly, how is this possible within the protocols that require CB1's Community input before any licenses are granted, and why two? We are still in the community feedback process, and yet OCM has granted TWO licenses to Altitude NY LLC at the address of a majority (76%) residential building. OCM's protocols and



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>comprehensive regulatory framework are not meant to prioritize cannabis businesses OVER community members' health, safety and security, but OCM has done exactly that at 807 Manhattan Avenue. As a regulatory body, I would think OCM would want to collaborate with communities and respond fully to their concerns rather than ignore them to prioritize one businesses profits over 29 families.</p> <p>Below are news stories with videos of assailants smashing rocks into the bulletproof windows of Mike Flynn's (one of the owner/operators of Altitude NY LLC) FlynnStoned Cannabis Company in Syracuse on three different occasions within 30 days:</p> <p>https://www.syracuse.com/crime/2024/08/five-boys-accused-of-break-ins-at-2-gun-stores-failed-attempt-at-syracuse-cannabis-shop.html?outputType=amp https://cnycentral.com/amp/news/local/watch-burglar-tries-breaking-into-downtown-business-as-syracuse-property-crime-rises</p> <p>In one of these stories, Mr. Flynn likens his building to a child he must protect. We at 807 Manhattan Ave. Condominiums don't have bulletproof windows. We DO have 17 small children in the building with more on the way and we have 5 glass doors direct to street where the homes these children sleep in, the common space they play in, and the hallways they walk, can be directly accessed by someone motivated enough to break through the windows. Mr. Flynn's business - with its required egress and easement to the residential section of our building - clearly presents that strong incentive to criminals. Our children cannot be bulletproofed nor repaired from violent attack; Mr. Flynn has no idea what having a child at risk for this kind of violence means if he likens it to property damage or loss.</p> <p>Mr. Flynn does have deep-pocketed investors and very able attorneys - and possibly local politicians such as Mr. Restler and Mayor Adams - who have helped him and his partners skirt OCM protocols at our expense. Over 40 million dollars has been invested in the landmark restoration of the Greenpoint Savings Bank by the New Yorkers who've made it their home. This may be a paltry sum compared to the potential profits of a Cannabis Storefront over a year. But that sum represents the individual investments of 29 owners who've worked hard in diverse industries and for diverse organizations to be able purchase a home in New York City. OCM, Altitude NY LLC, and politicians in support of the cannabis storefront</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>at 807 Manhattan are actively undermining the personal safety and financial security of those who've invested in their future here.</p> <p>At the CB1 Cannabis Committee Meeting in Brooklyn on 11/25, over 600 verified signatures of those against a Cannabis Storefront at 807 Manhattan Ave, gathered by community members from community members, were presented. Altitude NY LLC presented a negligible petition of mostly illegible names; we've seen what appeared to be paid canvassers gathering signatures for several hours on a single day over the past month. Even though Mr. Flynn KNOWS UNEQUIVOCALLY that his business presents a security risk to the families who live in the 807 Manhattan Ave Condominiums, Altitude AGAIN showed up with no security plan to the CB1 meeting. We implore OCM to acknowledge the obvious issues this location presents and respect the community's wishes by denying a license at this venue. There are ample opportunities on Greenpoint Ave for Altitude to thrive that are not in a mixed-use building and we wish them luck there.</p>
32.	Nick	McTokes		<p>The lack of nurseries is crippling the industry. The nursery license can be used for cannabis breeding. If made more accessible, the nursery license will incentive black market breeders to move their popular operations to OCM Licensed Nurseries. Moving with it, their entire genetic library, which will then be available to the farmers. I would like to request that the nursery license be made available for application year round and be changed to incentive smaller business nurseries.</p>
33.	Ricardo	Brooks		<p>Why are there proximity protection on locations that don't exist in Brooklyn for example one location is a Chinese food restaurant?</p>
34.	Tanka	Asongna-Morfaw	Common Courtesy Dispensary Inc	<p>Dear Members of the Office of Cannabis Management, I am writing to express my support for allowing New York cannabis dispensaries to offer discounts and customer loyalty programs. As an operator in this industry, I strongly believe that these tools are essential for customer retention and ensuring the long-term viability of our businesses.</p> <p>The current prohibition on discounts and loyalty programs significantly limits our ability to compete in an increasingly competitive market, particularly against unregulated operators. By providing options such as senior citizen discounts, military discounts, and loyalty rewards, we can not only attract and retain customers but also support underserved communities and those who have given so much to our country.</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>These programs are a cornerstone of consumer-focused industries, offering businesses the ability to build strong, lasting relationships with their customers while encouraging repeat patronage. Without them, licensed operators face undue challenges in surviving and thriving in New York’s cannabis market.</p> <p>Furthermore, regulated discounts and loyalty programs can be implemented responsibly and in alignment with the Office’s compliance standards. This ensures they support public safety, responsible consumption, and transparency in the industry.</p> <p>I urge the Office of Cannabis Management to approve the proposed amendments and allow licensed dispensaries to implement discounts and customer loyalty programs. This change is not only vital for business improvement but also for leveling the playing field in a highly competitive landscape.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this critical matter.</p>
35.	Madeline	Tedesco	self	<p>Dear Sir/Ms: I'm writing to express my disagreement regarding the Hallmark store being pushed out to accommodate a retail cannabis dispensary. We already have a few in the neighborhood and having another one has no positive impact on the neighborhood. In fact, quite the contrary impact due to young children and schools, the residents and the United Nations and the international community. Let's not make NYC a city of cannabis stores how boring that will be if that's all we have on every corner. Let's return NYC back to when it was exciting and safe to live here.</p>
36.	Noble I'm Manu	El:Bey		<p>Perfect example why trying to regulating Cannabis as also failed.</p> <p>‘War on drugs has failed, completely and utterly’: UN human rights chief</p> <p>https://news.un.org/en/story/2024/12/1157836</p>
37.	Vincent	Stanton	Gas Roots LLC	<p>Hello OMC,</p> <p>Vincent stanton here from Gas Roots LLC. OCMMICR-2023-000668</p> <p>I applied for the micro business. I have had brick and mortar this whole time, I’m ready to move forward.If you could please consider looking into my application I would very much appreciate it. I feel the application was confusing and I should be a (See applicant) but didn’t see that part of the application until I already submitted it.</p> <p>Thank you OMC I can’t wait to be part of the cannabis community.</p> <p>Thanks again OMC.</p> <p>Vincent Stanton</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
38.	Brooklyn	Reid	Resident of 1080 Lorimer St/807 Manhattan Ave connected buildings	<p>My name is Brooklyn Reid and my family lives in 1080 Lorimer St, the same building connected to the Greenpoint Saving Bank and proposed location for the cannabis dispensary. I not only represent the 29 units who live in the connected building, but I am a mother to two toddler girls and represent parents in the community and 17 children who live at 1080 Lorimer.</p> <p>While I understand that cannabis dispensaries are legal and can bring economic benefits to our area, I urge the NYS Cannabis Control Board to carefully consider the safety implications of opening the largest dispensary in a mixed-use building in such close proximity to families, children, and a school and daycare.</p> <p>Mike Sullivan mentioned at one of our community meetings, that legal cannabis dispensaries are coming but i think there is an opportunity and responsibility of our community members to make sure we set the proper precedent for how that will happen moving forward.</p> <p>Allowing the largest dispensary, or any size really, to open within feet of a daycare, school or in a building that shares space with residential units is a slippery slope as more and more of these legal dispensaries open. As a Greenpoint community member and a mother, I do not understand how anyone can truly say that is an appropriate location for such a large dispensary. There are many places in greenpoint if this is where you want to be that are not so close to where children are being educated, playing, cared for or living.</p> <p>The increased foot traffic, attention and clientele that are not necessarily Greenpoint residents could lead to increased risk of disturbances, altercations, and loitering around the property, which directly impacts the peace and security of the neighborhood. Residents, many of whom are families with children, could feel unsafe in their own homes (I certainly will).</p> <p>The issue of safety was discussed at the last 2 meetings however no plan was shared by altitude. Michael Sullivan commented they plan to close the egress but per fire codes, our understanding is that cannot happen. This is not the building that is best suited for this type of business. Please come see the connection for yourself before you approve this. Some suggested armed guards will be necessary for a shop this large. Armed guards do not belong in a space where schools and people live. That's not the Greenpoint community. If you need armed guards to protect Your drugs and money then it is assumed those armed guards may need to use their weapons. That</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>means around children and in the halls (by the egress) where kids live. And if they are not planning to have armed guards then how do you plan to protect the back entrance to your shop? The residents at 1080 Lorimer and the kids at the school across the street are opened up to a huge safety risk if someone tried to break in (which has happened at Mike Flynn's other locations of much smaller size). They aren't coming through the front door, they are coming in the back, less protected entrances, which is the front door to the residents homes.</p> <p>I am asking the NYS Cannabis Control Board and those with authority to block this location from turning into a dispensary. At the very least make the company resubmit their application and go through the proper channels vs transferring their license from New York city or not working with the proper channels to get this approved. As a community member and as a mother, I am asking that this be shut down. For our children's safety and for the future of greenpoint.</p> <p>Thank you Darrell & Brooklyn Reid</p>
39.	Nadine	Desfosses-Hussami		<p>We are very concerned about having the largest cannabis club in our neighborhood, at such proximity of schools and day cares. We are also concerned by the way this came about without consulting the community first, but by trying to get around us. With the amount of children and infants within the same block of the club, such a business is not at all appropriate in this location. And the lack of consulting with members of the community aggravates the trust issue with this business owners. Such a business will profoundly impact the neighborhood and its families and is not welcome.</p>
40.	Hiram	Gross	Community advocate	<p>I am trying to access Ocm forms for an order to lift sealing order once it has been established the store has abated alleged activity</p>
41.	Hiram	Gross	Public advocate	<p>I am looking on line a Ocm and cannot find the firm to lift a sealing order can someone contact me immediately @6073619416 I appreciate your courteous immediate response to this very important matter</p>
42.	Robert	Luciano	Bob Natural Cannabis Dispensary	<p>No More Adult Use Retail Cannabis Licenses Issued</p>
43.	Sarah	Gloeckler		<p>Subject: Concerns Regarding the License for Altitude NY at 807 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn Dear Board Members, I would like to express several concerns regarding the</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>cannabis dispensary license application for Altitude NY at 807 Manhattan Avenue in Brooklyn, specifically in the context of public safety, community impact, and legal compliance. Below are the key points of concern:</p> <p>Violation of Section 409(2) of the New York State Education Law 807 Manhattan Avenue is situated in a mixed-use building with an entry/exit on 1080 Lorimer Street, which is less than 200 feet from one of the entrances to P.S. 31. Additionally, the B62/B43 bus stop directly in front of 807 Manhattan Avenue is heavily used by families of P.S. 31 students. This location requires students to walk past the proposed dispensary on their way to and from school, which raises significant safety concerns. The proximity to the school violates the public policy intent of Section 409(2) of the New York State Education Law, which is designed to protect students from exposure to such establishments.</p> <p>Furthermore, a new preschool, Kuei Luck Early Childhood Center, is set to open at 171 Calyer Street, just 220 feet from 807 Manhattan Avenue and under 100 feet from its side entrance. This will increase the exposure of minors to cannabis products, further undermining the spirit of existing regulations and age restrictions intended to safeguard children.</p> <p>Size and Impact of the Location The commercial space at 807 Manhattan Avenue spans 11,200 square feet across two levels (8,720 square feet on the ground floor and 2,500 square feet on the lower level). This would make it the largest dispensary in New York City, located in the heart of a residential, family-oriented neighborhood. The size and scale of this establishment would attract significant foot traffic, exacerbating congestion in an already busy part of Greenpoint. Double parking and honking are likely to become frequent nuisances, further disrupting the community. Additionally, there are already numerous alternative dispensaries in the surrounding area, particularly in commercial sections where such establishments are better suited.</p> <p>Violation of NY Attorney General Offering Plan and Building By-Laws 807 Manhattan Avenue is a mixed-use building containing 29 residential apartments and one commercial unit. The cannabis dispensary is strictly prohibited by both the New York Attorney General's Offering Plan and the building's by-laws, which outline specific restrictions on the types of</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>businesses that may operate within the property.</p> <p>Lack of Community Engagement</p> <p>There has been no meaningful attempt by the owners of the proposed dispensary, or the operators of Altitude NY, to engage with the local community. Despite being located in the same mixed-use building, there has been no outreach to inform residents about their intentions. Although they publicly expressed a willingness to collaborate with the community during a prior meeting, we have not received any follow-up communication or attempts at engagement.</p> <p>Security Concerns</p> <p>Cannabis dispensaries are often "cash-heavy" businesses and are known targets for armed robbery. This risk is heightened by the proximity of local schools and the multiple side and residential entries to the building, which are not adequately secured. The presence of children at nearby schools, coupled with potential vulnerabilities in the building's security, could create a dangerous environment. Recent incidents involving other locations operated by the same owners in Syracuse further raise concerns about safety.</p> <p>Given these serious issues, I respectfully urge the Board to deny support for Altitude NY LLC's cannabis license application for a dispensary at 807 Manhattan Avenue. The location poses significant risks to the safety and well-being of local residents, particularly children, and violates several legal and regulatory provisions.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these concerns.</p>
44.	Colin	Gloeckler		<p>Subject: Concerns Regarding the License for Altitude NY at 807 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn</p> <p>Dear Board Members,</p> <p>I would like to express several concerns regarding the cannabis dispensary license application for Altitude NY at 807 Manhattan Avenue in Brooklyn, specifically in the context of public safety, community impact, and legal compliance. Below are the key points of concern:</p> <p>1. Violation of Section 409(2) of the New York State Education Law</p> <p>807 Manhattan Avenue is situated in a mixed-use building with an entry/exit on 1080 Lorimer Street, which is less than 200 feet from one of the entrances to P.S. 31. Additionally, the B62/B43 bus stop directly in front of 807 Manhattan Avenue is heavily used by families of P.S. 31 students. This location requires students to walk past the proposed dispensary on their way to and from school,</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>which raises significant safety concerns. The proximity to the school violates the public policy intent of Section 409(2) of the New York State Education Law, which is designed to protect students from exposure to such establishments.</p> <p>Furthermore, a new preschool, Kuei Luck Early Childhood Center, is set to open at 171 Calyer Street, just 220 feet from 807 Manhattan Avenue and under 100 feet from its side entrance. This will increase the exposure of minors to cannabis products, further undermining the spirit of existing regulations and age restrictions intended to safeguard children.</p> <p>2. Size and Impact of the Location The commercial space at 807 Manhattan Avenue spans 11,200 square feet across two levels (8,720 square feet on the ground floor and 2,500 square feet on the lower level). This would make it the largest dispensary in New York City, located in the heart of a residential, family-oriented neighborhood. The size and scale of this establishment would attract significant foot traffic, exacerbating congestion in an already busy part of Greenpoint. Double parking and honking are likely to become frequent nuisances, further disrupting the community. Additionally, there are already numerous alternative dispensaries in the surrounding area, particularly in commercial sections where such establishments are better suited.</p> <p>3. Violation of NY Attorney General Offering Plan and Building By-Laws 807 Manhattan Avenue is a mixed-use building containing 29 residential apartments and one commercial unit. The cannabis dispensary is strictly prohibited by both the New York Attorney General's Offering Plan and the building's by-laws, which outline specific restrictions on the types of businesses that may operate within the property.</p> <p>4. Lack of Community Engagement There has been no meaningful attempt by the owners of the proposed dispensary, or the operators of Altitude NY, to engage with the local community. Despite being located in the same mixed-use building, there has been no outreach to inform residents about their intentions. Although they publicly expressed a willingness to collaborate with the community during a prior meeting, we have not received any follow-up communication or attempts at engagement.</p> <p>5. Security Concerns Cannabis dispensaries are often "cash-heavy" businesses</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>and are known targets for armed robbery. This risk is heightened by the proximity of local schools and the multiple side and residential entries to the building, which are not adequately secured. The presence of children at nearby schools, coupled with potential vulnerabilities in the building's security, could create a dangerous environment. Recent incidents involving other locations operated by the same owners in Syracuse further raise concerns about safety.</p> <p>Given these serious issues, I respectfully urge the Board to deny support for Altitude NY LLC's cannabis license application for a dispensary at 807 Manhattan Avenue. The location poses significant risks to the safety and well-being of local residents, particularly children, and violates several legal and regulatory provisions.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these concerns.</p>
45.	Diplomatic	Centre, NYC		<p>There is an application to open a FlynnStoned Cannabis store at the Diplomat Centre building at 820 Second Avenue, NYC 1 block from the United Nations and in the heart of the United Nations community.</p> <p>Permanent Mission of the Republic of Angola to the United Nations 820 Second Avenue, 12th Floor New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations 820 Second Avenue, 4th Floor. New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of Barbados to the United Nations, 820 Second Avenue, 9th Floor New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of the Republic of Croatia to the United Nations, 820 Second Avenue, 19th Floor, New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations, 820 Second Avenue, Suite 13A New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of the Republic of Madagascar to the United Nations 820 Second Avenue, Suite 800 New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania to the United Nations, 820 Second Avenue, Suite 17A New York, NY 10017</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>Permanent Mission of Nepal to the United Nations, 820 Second Avenue, Suite 17B (17th Floor), New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of Nicaragua to the United Nations, 820 Second Avenue, 8th Floor New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations 820 Second Avenue, Suite 1600 New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka to the United Nations, 820 Second Avenue, 2nd Floor New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations 820 Second Avenue, 15th Floor New York, NY 10017</p> <p>One block south of 820 Second Avenue iat 43rd Street is 800 Second Avenue which houses the following Missions to The United Nations:</p> <p>Permanent Mission of Côte d'Ivoire to the United Nations 800 Second Avenue, 5th Floor New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of Equatorial Guinea to the United Nations 800 Second Avenue, Suite 305 New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of Eritrea to the United Nations 800 Second Avenue, 18th Floor New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of Israel to the United Nations 800 Second Avenue New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Marshall Islands to the United Nations 800 Second Avenue, 18th Floor New York, NY 10017</p> <p>Please watch these videos about Flynnstoned's describing Mike FLynn's current store in Syracuse: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IY9X2ry1K6s https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EkIBzTTQrSM</p> <p>The United Nations and the above surrounding Country Missions exist in a high security neighborhood. Introducing a cannabis megastore in the midst of this neighborhood would present an increased security risk to the members of the diplomatic community and be an eyesore to the tens of thousands of domestic and</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>international visitors to the United Nations each year. During the month of September when the United Nations General Assembly is in session, the surrounding sidewalks and streets are closed and the store would likely not be permitted to operate.</p> <p>Community Board 6 reviewed the application from Mr. Flynn and his 2 partners (Mr. Flynn initially stated that he had no partners) and there were numerous statements made which were contradictory and shown to be false. The community spoke at the hearing and vehemently opposed the application for a variety of reasons including that there are schools, churches, and a homeless shelter within 2 blocks of 820 Second Avenue. Community Board 6 voted unanimously to reject Mr. Flynn's application and we request that CCB also reject the application. Thank you for considering these remarks.</p>
46.	Cheryl/Diane and Ray	Asher/Hess		<p>I am against having any more cannabis dispensaries approved in the neighborhood surrounding the United Nations, especially at 820 Second Avenue. It is across the street from a grade school where young children will be exposed to customers from other areas loitering around. There is already a dispensary at Second Avenue and 38th street and one at Second Avenue and 52nd Street. There are three more close by, The Travel Agency on Fifth Avenue and 47th Street, Polanco Brothers at 42nd Street and Madison Avenue and Etain at Second Avenue and 58th Street. As a neighbor who lives across the avenue from the potential site, I don't want to see strangers in my neighborhood at all hours of the night and day, possibly seven days week. Besides all of the above, a thriving, much patronized and needed Hallmark card shop run by a couple who live within two blocks of the store has been at this location for over 20 years. This Hallmark store would be displaced for something we do not need. I urge you, please do not approve this location. And please do not over saturate this neighborhood with more approvals for dispensaries.</p>
47.	Concerned	Citizen		<p>I am a very concerned citizen and parent of a young family at 1080 Lorimer Street, who will be directly effected by this development.</p> <p>Our growing alliance of well-funded and influential New York City residents in media, law, politics and finance will stop at no ends in taking all legal means necessary to publicly spotlight and repeal the injustice this will be if Altitude NY LLC is permitted to occupy 807 Manhattan Ave with their currently intended uses.</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
48.	willa	smiley	Wellness Options ReSources Transform Health (W.O.R.T.H.)	I educate patients, businesses, communities, and organizations on Cannabis Compliance to mitigate risks and reduce medical liabilities in the Cannabis Industry. (info@theworthcontinuum.biz) I would like to offer my services free to anyone who is interested for the next 30 days. Thank you . Willa
49.	J	T	CANY	CANY no longer represents the will or desires of a large portion of its membership, all of the members I have spoken with are hoping the the December license applications are reviewed as soon as possible. There are many people with plans (and leases) tied up in limbo, waiting on what has now been a year since applications were filed. These are the same grievances, that the active licensee's (especially those on the board of CANY) pressed so hard upon the CCB and the OCM in the past two years, to expedite their own review and licensing. Now they wish to halt the same process for others, just to capitalize on as much market share as possible.
50.	Karen "KMesh"	Meshkov	The Travel Agency	It has taken so many years to reach some basic level of normal functioning as a cannabis business; please, please, please don't threaten the stability of this market with this reckless decision to overlicense this market. We already have so much competition from the grey and black markets here and we've seen what happens with massive price compression in other states. Let the business owners and licensees who have invested so much see the fruits of their labor!
51.	Megan	Elsayed	1080 Lorimer	Attorneys for 807 Manhattan Ave Condominiums found that Altitude NY LLC already has active licenses for 807 Manhattan Ave, OCMRETL-2023-002012 and OCM-RETL-24-00012. I ask NYS Cannabis Control Board directly, how is this possible within the protocols that require CB1's Community input before any licenses are granted, and why two? We are still in the community feedback process, and yet OCM has granted TWO licenses to Altitude NY LLC at the address of a majority (76%) residential building. OCM's protocols and comprehensive regulatory framework are not meant to prioritize cannabis businesses OVER community members' health, safety and security, but OCM has done exactly that at 807 Manhattan Avenue. As a regulatory body, I would think OCM would want to collaborate with communities and respond fully to their concerns rather than ignore them to prioritize one businesses profits over



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>29 families.</p> <p>Below are news stories with videos of assailants smashing rocks into the bulletproof windows of Mike Flynn’s (one of the owner/operators of Altitude NY LLC) FlynnStoned Cannabis Company in Syracuse on three different occasions within 30 days: https://www.syracuse.com/crime/2024/08/five-boys-accused-of-break-ins-at-2-gun-stores-failed-attempt-at-syracuse-cannabis-shop.html?outputType=amp https://cnycentral.com/amp/news/local/watch-burglar-tries-breaking-into-downtown-business-as-syracuse-property-crime-rises</p> <p>In one of these stories, Mr. Flynn likens his building to a child he must protect. We at 807 Manhattan Ave. Condominiums don’t have bulletproof windows. We DO have 17 small children in the building with more on the way and we have 5 glass doors direct to street where the homes these children sleep in, the common space they play in, and the hallways they walk, can be directly accessed by someone motivated enough to break through the windows. Mr. Flynn’s business - with its required egress and easement to the residential section of our building - clearly presents that strong incentive to criminals. Our children cannot be bulletproofed nor repaired from violent attack; Mr. Flynn has no idea what having a child at risk for this kind of violence means if he likens it to property damage or loss.</p> <p>Mr. Flynn does have deep-pocketed investors and very able attorneys - and possibly local politicians such as Mr. Restler and Mayor Adams - who have helped him and his partners skirt OCM protocols at our expense. Over 40 million dollars has been invested in the landmark restoration of the Greenpoint Savings Bank by the New Yorkers who've made it their home. This may be a paltry sum compared to the potential profits of a Cannabis Storefront over a year. But that sum represents the individual investments of 29 owners who've worked hard in diverse industries and for diverse organizations to be able purchase a home in New York City. OCM, Altitude NY LLC, and politicians in support of the cannabis storefront at 807 Manhattan are actively undermining the personal safety and financial security of those who've invested in their future here.</p> <p>At the CB1 Cannabis Committee Meeting in Brooklyn on 11/25, over 600 verified signatures of those against a Cannabis Storefront at 807 Manhattan Ave, gathered by community members from community members, were</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				presented. Altitude NY LLC presented a negligible petition of mostly illegible names; we've seen what appeared to be paid canvassers gathering signatures for several hours on a single day over the past month. Even though Mr. Flynn KNOWS UNEQUIVOCALLY that his business presents a security risk to the families who live in the 807 Manhattan Ave Condominiums, Altitude AGAIN showed up with no security plan to the CB1 meeting. We implore OCM to acknowledge the obvious issues this location presents and respect the community's wishes by denying a license at this venue. There are ample opportunities on Greenpoint Ave for Altitude to thrive that are not in a mixed-use building and we wish them luck there.
52.	Jeremy	Rivera	Terpbros	<p>Good morning, Chairwoman Wright, Board Members, and fellow attendees. My name is Jeremy Rivera, and I am the proud owner of Terpbros Cannabis Dispensary. I come before you today not only as a licensee under the CAURD program but as someone who has lived through the harmful consequences of cannabis prohibition and is determined to contribute to a fair and equitable industry. In 2018, I walked out of prison after serving time for non-violent cannabis-related charges. Since then, I have dedicated my life to rebuilding, working with my community to create jobs and provide assistance to others impacted by similar circumstances. In 2023, I was honored to receive a CAURD license, a moment that symbolized both a personal milestone and a chance to uplift marginalized individuals in this new industry. Like many others, I am still striving to grow my business without the backing of investors, just the support of friends and a dream to make this vision a reality.</p> <p>The proposal to issue over 5,000 additional licenses from the December licensing queue threatens to undermine this progress, not only for me but for countless others who have invested their time, resources, and hope into this program. Oversaturating the market at this early stage would have devastating consequences, as evidenced by other states like Colorado, Michigan, and Oklahoma. These markets saw a "race to the bottom," where prices plummeted, quality deteriorated, and compliance failures surged as businesses struggled to compete. Public health risks increased as cost-cutting measures compromised safety standards. Oversupply in these states also fueled diversion to illicit markets, undercutting the legitimacy of the regulated industry, a issue that so many of us have to compete with still on a day to day.</p> <p>If New York follows this path, we risk collapsing the</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>industry before it has even had a chance to stabilize. Profit margins for cultivators, processors, and dispensaries will be decimated. Compliance enforcement—already stretched thin—will be overwhelmed, jeopardizing public safety. Furthermore, this decision would devalue the investments and efforts of early licensees, many of whom have poured their personal funds into their businesses, only to face insurmountable competition from an artificially inflated market.</p> <p>The long-term consequences are clear: shuttered businesses, lost jobs, and a permanent undervaluation of New York's cannabis market. This decision would be particularly unjust to those of us who stepped forward in good faith, complied with the rigorous licensing process, and worked tirelessly to build our operations from the ground up. It would reward later entrants at the expense of those who took the initial risk and followed the rules.</p> <p>I urge the Board to take a measured, data-driven approach. Study the market demand. Look at data from other states to determine appropriate license limits. Let existing businesses gain traction before introducing thousands of new competitors. This isn't just about protecting individual businesses—it's about safeguarding the integrity and sustainability of New York's cannabis program for years to come.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.</p>
53.	Dan	Kogan		<p>My name is dany kogan I don't understand how this big company's like acreage and canopy that's going to acquired acreage and now they going to be retail dispansiry side and on The other side cultivation side which we us retail caurds and us retail cannabis dispensary and micro license who are from new york most of of our life was always told we can't be on both sides but they allowed to be on both side which is not fair. If it's a company with a new tax id number it is a new organization/new corporation new identity different owners that's why people can't sue another company if u own several company's with different tax id numbers thier is no reason why this tpi rule should get into effect and way. Plenty people own multiple organization for example Elon musk, jeff bezos, mark Zuckerberg, and so on this other side is a new businesses concept and we should have every right to aplay and get into that bussines as well since we doing it under a bussines with a new tax id number just like this company' canopy for example and thier is others. Thank you and hope this is going to change very soon</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
54.	Danny	Kogan	Cannabis nyc	<p>My name is Danny Kogan OCMRETL2023-000650 cannabis nyc, and I am seeking clarification on a situation that seems to present an inconsistency in the regulations governing the cannabis industry. Specifically, I am trying to understand how large companies like Acreage and Canopy Growth. The latter is planning to acquire Acreage, allowing it to operate on both the retail dispensary side and the cultivation side of the business.</p> <p>As smaller operators, we have always been told that this kind of dual participation is not permitted. Retail cannabis operations and cultivation businesses were said to require separation, barring entities from being involved in both. However, larger corporations appear to be granted exceptions, allowing them to effectively operate in multiple sectors simultaneously. This seems highly inequitable.</p> <p>It has been explained previously that if a company uses a new tax ID number, it is treated as a separate entity—for legal and operational purposes. Different companies with distinct tax ID numbers are treated as new organizations or corporations with unique ownership structures. This principle is widely accepted in the business world, as demonstrated by entrepreneurs like Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, and Mark Zuckerberg, who manage multiple companies using this same strategy. In these cases, the separateness of one company from another shields them from legal or regulatory overlap.</p> <p>Given this precedent, smaller businesses like mine should also have the opportunity to apply for and operate in different parts of the cannabis industry—such as cultivation and retail—under separate business entities with unique tax IDs. If this practice is acceptable for large corporations such as Canopy, it should be equally acceptable for smaller enterprises. Excluding smaller operators from this same opportunity is not only unfair but also undermines the principles of free-market competition.</p> <p>I respectfully urge regulators to reconsider these rules and ensure that all businesses, regardless of size, are treated equally under the same guidelines. If a company operates under a new tax ID number with separate ownership and management, it should be allowed to enter any area of the cannabis market, just like larger corporations are currently allowed to do. Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Respectfully, Dan Kogan Cannabis nyc Mow965@aol.com</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
55.	Patrick	Chesney	CannaLabs	What was the reasoning for the 2 different November 2023 queues? The original & "revised"? What is the difference & why revisions? Which version was filed with the courts as an official document in OCMs many lawsuits?
56.	Hsintzu	Li		Altitude NY LLC is trying to open up a mega cannabis dispensary at our building, which is only across the street from PS31. Not to mention there's a daycare center opening up next spring on the same block as where Altitude storefront is going to be. Please deny their license application and save the little ones from exposing to cannabis!
57.	Ken	Tsai	807 Manhattan Ave Condo resident	We are still in the community feedback process, and yet OCM has granted TWO licenses to Altitude NY LLC at the address of a majority (76%) residential building. OCM's protocols and comprehensive regulatory framework are not meant to prioritize cannabis businesses OVER community members' health, safety and security, but OCM has done exactly that at 807 Manhattan Avenue. As a regulatory body, I would think OCM would want to collaborate with communities and respond fully to their concerns rather than ignore them to prioritize one businesses profits over 29 families.
58.	Larrisa	H		The OCM is licensing an illegal shop OCMRETL-2023-001822 rockaway beach cafe inc. They have proof and information that this is an illegal shop and still licensed them.
59.	Debra	Wrazin		As a concerned citizen and business owner in New York, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Stiiizy's attempt to enter the New York cannabis market. It is imperative that we take immediate action to prevent this company from operating in our state due to their history of violations and criminal charges. Stiiizy, a prominent cannabis brand in California, has been embroiled in numerous allegations of illegal activities. Reports indicate that the company has been involved in running a network of unlicensed and illegal cannabis dispensaries. Additionally, Stiiizy's co-founder, Tony Huang, has been accused of leasing buildings to unlicensed retailers and funneling products through illicit channels. These actions demonstrate a blatant disregard for the law and raise serious concerns about the company's integrity and commitment to compliance. Allowing Stiiizy to operate in New York would undermine the efforts of our state to establish a regulated and compliant cannabis industry. The Marihuana Regulation and Taxation Act (MRTA) was enacted to ensure that cannabis businesses operate within a legal framework that



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>prioritizes public health, safety, and social equity. Stiiizy's track record of illegal activities is in direct conflict with these principles.</p> <p>Furthermore, Stiiizy has faced multiple lawsuits alleging fraud, negligence, and misrepresentation of their products. These legal battles highlight the company's lack of transparency and accountability, which poses a significant risk to consumers and the overall reputation of the New York cannabis market.</p> <p>In light of these serious concerns, I urge the New York Office of Cannabis Management and the Cannabis Control Board to not allow Stiiizy's to operate in our state. We must prioritize the integrity of our cannabis industry and protect our communities from companies with a history of illegal and unethical practices.</p> <p>Let us stand together to ensure that New York's cannabis market remains safe, compliant, and equitable for all.</p>
60.	Walter	Iwachiw	I4panyc llc	<p>Re: denied and vacated applications of CAURD and SEE applications based on bias and retaliation.</p> <p>There is a court case in Albany NY County Supreme Court Index number 908870-24 which is currently in talks for a resolution. I4panyc llc supports the position of the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff submitted multiple applications and won low numbers in the lottery. The Plaintiff submitted those applications under seperate Corp or LLC entities which under law are considered "persons" seperate and distinct entities. The review process was tainted by 1. Reuben McDaniels having an affinity with DASNY Vendor William Thompson Jr. As both being past School Board members in two seperate large School Districts and it turns out McDaniels violated the Ethics rules in NYS by holding a board seat on both DASNY and OCM concurrently, as I evoked in court papers in an early cannabis case.</p> <p>I believe that the outcome of the case should be to issue a License to each distinct entity that applied and won a low number in the lottery but faced a Bias by early OCM to prevent multiple licenses being issued to the same entity. Furthermore, that issuance of licenses to distinct entities should be memorialized in a resolution modifying and limiting the recent resolution limiting licenses to one per person.</p> <p>Entities that have been Victims of the Ethics violation and efforts to limit licensing to seperate entities should have the Voiding of and denial of licensing vacated and licenses issued.</p> <p>I4panyc llc was one such very early entity where it's</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>CAURD / SEE application was VOIDED in alleged Retaliation and Bias to limit the effect of the lottery method of selection. The second I4panyc llc SEE application in the November Cue was denied and a SEE Freebusntrains llc application in the November cue was also denied there after the OCM passed a resolution limiting licensing to one per "person".</p> <p>I4panyc llc and Freebusntrains llc hereby seek to join the 908870-24 as a harmed Plaintiff to reduce the States legal expenses in litigating the same fact pattern.</p> <p>I request the OCM move to vacate similar situated Voided and Denied applicants with low lottery numbers and reinstating their place in the lottery to reduce leg expenses.</p> <p>The harm which has accrued already is the coming denial of the November application for the 100,000.00 Grant application from NYC Cannabis Grant Fund.</p> <p>I make myself available to colitigate the mistake of voiding and denying applications to seperate " entities" each with different locations and DIFFERENT obstacles of SEE and CAURD TO RAISING NECESSARY CAPITAL FUNDING.</p> <p>Walter lwachiw RN SPNP SFNP (DENIED NP AND DNP CERTIFICATES BY William Thompson Jr. (CUNY Trustee) Thru CUNY Grade Fraud 2011 by Baruch and Lehman College where after the completion of the semester a new syllabus was created after passing final exams adding 2 additional papers giving the excuse to falsely claim that class work was not completed.)</p> <p>Your prompt attention to these issues shall be appreciated.</p> <p>Please advise ASAP as we are anxious to reach the 1Billion in sales tax target in 2024.</p> <p>lwachiw2001@yahoo.com Wee4justice@yahoo.com</p>
61.	Jodie Ann	Beatty		<p>I've live behind this bank my entire life, as a matter of fact my parents bought our house from The Greenpoint Savings bank. This is a family orientated neighborhood with 17 children living in the attached condo building (1080 Lorimer st)</p>
62.	Jodie Ann	Beatty		<p>I was not able to finish my comment, as I was saying the attached building has 17 children all under the age of three. This is NOT the place for a cannabis shop! They can open this shop in the industrial section of the neighborhood! Not less than 500 feet from a school and a day care! Please DO NOT APPROVE THIS application ! Thank you</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
63.	Jodie Ann	Beatty		The 807 Manhattan ave cannabis shop licensee should NOT be approved by the board since the owner is actually Mike Flynn from "Flintstoned" not by Alltitude which is an illicit operation! Please do NOT approve this licensee !!!
64.	John	Rozmus		I oppose this license application for public safety concerns and because there is a school one block away.
65.	Christina J	Zill		<p>The Greenpoint savings bank is a landmarked building that deserves respect as an historic building . The Greenpoint residents,local leaders & politicians ,& our community at large is TOTALLY against having a cannabis operation at this location!!</p> <p>We have so few historically designated landmarked buildings & streets ... this would be a BLACK mark on the neighborhood , in generalyes ..a disgrace !! "come one ..come all ..visit Greenpoint .. the place with the biggest pot store"...."& hey they even allowed it in a historic building "!!</p> <p>.. Directly across the street,on Calyer st., a preschool of 1-5 yr old children , is planned ..they will be immersed in mandarin language ...& we are going to allow them to inhale pot smoke !!</p> <p>We were just successful in closing the multiple cannabis stores on Manhattan Ave,that were totally illegal & allowed to operate for a significant period of time ..</p> <p>I think the world is upside down it will definitely be an attraction to my beloved neighborhood that will have me feel ashamed to say I live here . I am so so sad that this is even considered .</p>
66.	Jane	Pedota	St Cecilia and Hausman St block assoc	Please do not put a cannabis shop in the old Greenpoint Savings Bank at 807 Manhattan Ave and Calyer Street. Our neighborhood has suffered by many recent changes to it. This would just be another affront to it. There is no need to grant a license for a cannabis shop at this historic site. People liked the neighborhood and moved here and
67.	Matt	MacLean		Is there no better use for this building? Right next to the YMCA and an elementary school, it's a terrible location for a cannabis dispensary. There are surely empty commercial properties in other parts of Greenpoint where this can be located. If you want to drive families out of the neighborhood, this is the way to do it. Please REFUSE this license for this location.
68.	Elizabeth	Lajca		We have enough weed shops in this neighborhood. Every other week one pops up and within 2 days they are closed for illegal activity. Kids get off the bus right in front of this bank to go to school right around the corner. People will come, buy and start smoking it right around the school. It's



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				enough we have guys from the YMCA smoking and drinks up at the corner or the bank, we don't need a monstrosity weed shop as well.
69.	Helen	Mena	Long time Greenpoint resident and school crossing guard for this community	Please we have enough of these shops in Greenpoint .we really don't need this here and sure not around the corner from an Elementary school Please find another place ,,,,make something for the children in the community , do you have children ,if you do I'm sure you wouldn't them smelling this and the traffic it's gonna bring .the riff raft Please I'm begging you DONT DO THIS TO OUR COMMUNITY
70.	Michele	Chesnicka		I am against these types of stores, because I feel they draw in the wrong element for the neighborhood.
71.	Sharon	Cobb		Legal yes. I sure wish it wasn't. A drug is a drug is a drug.
72.	Virginia	Charles		The presence of this type of shop compromises all of the residents and affects even the smallest member of our community creating an unsafe environment.
73.	NYS	Resident		Within the last 30 days, OCM has only approved a total of less than 70 licenses. In addition, over 6 of those entries (approx 10%) of the approved applications are CURRENT license holders. There is an application queue of over 5,000 people. That is 5,000 individuals that are depending on you to do your job, instead of cater to companies that are already in existence. At this rate, it will be roughly 5 years in the future before your office completes the INITIAL open applications for licensing. There is absolutely no reason why other agencies cannot be used to approve applications from ORIGINAL entities, instead of REapproving existing businesses.
74.	Carl	Anderson	MADCity Canna	It would appear that someone received proximity protection, over my proposed location, however, the landlord is also the landlord of the location with noted protection. The landlord has signed a sworn affidavit noting that they have no business relationship with any additional cannabis businesses and that you are the only cannabis business it has signed a lease with. The landlord has also submitted a letter detailing the business with proximity protection is false. I am asking that the OCM and the CCB take a serious look into this matter and reconcile their proximity protection mapping. As I should have been granted proximity protection with my final application. I have a copy of the documents with me and can provide a copy to all interested parties now.
75.	Application #	Application #		Please continue to review the applications submitted for licenses last year, and do not adhere to any requests from



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
	OCMMICR-2023-001172	OCMMICR-2023-001172		current licensees to pause or end the review process. Those of us in the December queue are still waiting for review, primarily because we did not control real estate that would have allowed us to be placed in the November queue. For a program that purports to support small, minority-owned businesses, it is unconscionable to fail to review applications from the applicant pool with the least access to mainstream capital sources. We have waited patiently for a year, watching other applicants receive licenses and open businesses with no more or less qualifications or experience operating a cannabis business than applicants in the December queue, but having the good fortune of having access to real estate. There is no legitimate reason to cease review of the applicants currently in the queues; please do not take away our opportunity simply because current licensees would like to close the door behind them.
76.	Chase	Schuyler		As we are well surpass the one year mark since application is submitted, I am literally as broke as I've been my adult life because of my rent that I have to pay while waiting for this license. As we enter the holiday season, I am struggling to buy gifts for my two kids that rely on me. As some people on the November queue have been in the market for almost a year, I sit here and wait as I see processor type three being approved when they only applied a month ago. Their application required no lease, so while I pay my lease and wait, you are catering to a license type that is for OUT OF STATE brands that have not invested their entire life into this. When review first started at the beginning of the year, you were averaging 200 a month which was too slow. Now since July there have been just over 300 reviewed in that entire time frame. In the October meeting it was stated that a new review process was started immediately with 32 additional employees to review, yet only 100 were reviewed. We were also told that everyone in the November queue would be reviewed by the end of the year. At the current place, it will go into next summer and approach the 2 year mark from application submittal. Please Dr Gilbert Jenkins, see my pain and suffering. I know you want the right thing done. My family is struggle because of the actions of New York State. We moved back to our home state of New York from Oregon over two years ago specifically for this license. While licenses are being awards to people that don't have the funds or ability to put the business together, we are fully built out with an indoor cultivation facility.



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				Ready to go, ready to plant ready to grow yet we wait and struggle.
77.	Jenny	Hall		807 Manhattan Avenue (proposed site for cannabis dispensary Altitude NY LLC) is a corner building with entrances/exits on 3 sides; Manhattan Ave, Calyer Street and Lorimer Street. The closest Public School, PS 31 at 75 Meserole Ave, is also a big corner building with multiple entrances/exits including one on Lorimer Street that is utilized by the kindergarteners and first graders. The closest point of connection between the two buildings are their two Lorimer street egresses which are 118 feet apart. The second closest point of connection is the Lorimer school entrance and the 807 Manhattan Ave ADA entrance which is 360 feet apart. These buildings are too close for this location to legally open as a cannabis dispensary. Please deny this license.
78.	Maria	Kolaitis		<p>To: New York State Cannabis Control Board RE: Altitude NY LLC License Application: OCMRETL-2023-002012 and OCMRETL-24-00012</p> <p>I am writing regarding the location of the proposed cannabis license at 807 Manhattan Ave in Brooklyn, NY 11222. An egress to 807 Manhattan Avenue is only 118 feet from an entrance of a nearby school, PS31, thereby it does not meet the Municipality Rulemaking regulations (9 NYCRR § 119) which requires: A minimum straight-line measurement of 500 feet between any cannabis dispensary and a building exclusively used as a school (the two entities must be located on the same street for the 500-foot requirement to be applicable). Both 807 Manhattan Ave and PS 31 (75 Meserole Ave) are corner buildings with multiple entrances/exits which must be considered when determining proximity. Both buildings have entrances on the same block of Lorimer Street between Calyer Street and Meserole Avenue. Neither of these additional entrances are listed on the OCM's Full-featured Legal Online Cannabis Activities Locator.</p> <p>807 Manhattan Ave This address is a mixed-use condominium complex composed of 29 residential units and 1 commercial unit, the former Greenpoint Savings Bank/ 807 Manhattan Avenue. It is a single structure made up of two combined historic buildings that share a single tax lot. The commercial and residential uses are interconnected. For example, the ADA entrance to the commercial unit is in the residential side of the building on Calyer Street. There are four residential units and the gym which reside in the</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>commercial side of the building. And there is a permanent easement for an internal passageway, which grants 24/7 access for the commercial owner/tenants to the residential side to access their mechanicals and for use as an emergency exit. The main entrance to the residential side is at 1080 Lorimer Street, and this is legally an egress/emergency exit for the commercial unit. Additionally, since the commercial unit is part of the condominium structure it is subject to the rules and regulations of the condo association and the New York State Attorney General Offering Plan. The 807 Manhattan Ave offering plan explicitly states that no business which sells federally controlled substances can rent in the commercial space. A cease-and-desist letter has been sent to the owner of 807 Manhattan Ave but the owners have not responded.</p> <p>Public School 31 Samuel Dupont (PS 31) PS 31 has a main entrance at 75 Meserole Avenue but there is an additional entrance on Lorimer Street accessed through the playground at the school's double doors. This is the entrance used daily by Kindergartners and 1st Graders to come and go from their school.</p> <p>The distance from the entrance to the school on Lorimer Street to the additional egress for 807 Manhattan on Lorimer Street is approximately 118 feet. This falls well below the threshold of the 500 ft requirement set forth by Cannabis Control Board. New York City buildings have a number of entrances that are not yet displayed on the OCM's Full-featured Legal Online Cannabis Activities Locator.</p> <p>We are requesting that this additional information be taken into consideration when assessing the legality of this license application and we ask that the license be denied due to proximity to a public school.</p>
79.	John	Nguyen		<p>Regarding 870 Manhattan Ave cannabis license, the potential licensees have done almost no outreach to the community to address our safety concerns about needing armed guards around the building. I think they set up a table unannounced one weekend handing out t-shirts and gathering signatures for about an hour. By the time I heard about it and got there, they were already gone. Can we at least verify that those signatures even live nearby?</p>
80.	N	Keller		<p>One of the most noted landmarks in Greenpoint is the revered Greenpoint Savings Bank. It would be a travesty to open this to a 'pot shop'. As the old beautiful bank building set the stage for us years ago, we are now to go</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				backwards?! A cannabis shop does NOT belong in this building!
81.	Darrell	Reid	Greenpoint community member	Please do not approve this until this until you see the egress. This building is directly connected to a residential building. This should not be approved until that part is figured out. The understanding is that it cannot be closed and if it cannot be closed than the weed dispensary has direct access (& opportunity for crime) to a residential area with 17 children playing in the common space by egress. Go to a Greenpoint warehouse, not a residential area. It is not safe and this business has had multiple break in attempts st their other NY facility. Please do the right thing by the community, not for money but for families.
82.	Dolores	Keller		Please do NOT grant license for a cannabis shop to open at 807 Manhattan Ave. in Greenpoint Brooklyn. This is a community landmark building & a cannabis shop is not wanted nor needed here in the presence of many concerned residents & our children, especially in this building.
83.	Francoise	Olivas	PS31 PTA and Administration	The Cannabis Shop trying to open at 807 Manhattan Ave is within 500 feet of our school. We are a Title One school that was just awarded number one school in the country. Please think about our children and working families. This license was given without community input or due processes. We ask that the licences for 807 Manhattan Ave are immediately revoked. Thank you.
84.	Denise	M	Cb 1 resident	A cannibus business is not the appropriate use for this space - it is right near a school and will not better the community.
85.	M	b		I'm opposed to a cannabis shop in the old Greenpoint savings Bank building. We have too many cannabis shops in the neighborhood already.
86.	Jadzia	Dax		Please include comments from the municipalities when answering negative opinions so we can see exactly what the issues are. It says attached but its not.
87.	Sean	McKenzie	NYSEE	Good morning, members of the Cannabis Control Board, My name is Sean McKenzie of Five Borough Farms, a CAURD-licensed cannabis dispensary at 150 Atlantic Avenue in Brooklyn. I am here because I believe in the promise of this industry—a promise rooted in fairness, equity, and opportunity for communities historically excluded or harmed by past policies. That promise is now under threat—not just for me, but for all retail licensees who depend on the protections



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>established by this board and the Office of Cannabis Management.</p> <p>At 137 Court Street, less than 1,000 feet from my location, another adult-use dispensary is in the process of securing approval and is already shown on the proximity map. This proximity blatantly violates regulations designed to prevent market saturation and ensure new licensees have a fair chance to succeed, especially during these critical early stages.</p> <p>The impact has been immediate and devastating. My initial investor withdrew during the buildout stage, citing concerns about the proximity issue, leaving me with \$50,000 in sunk costs for design work. While I secured a new investor, they too are now reconsidering for the same reasons, placing my business at risk before we've even opened our doors.</p> <p>This is more than a financial setback—it is an issue of fairness and accountability. As a CAURD licensee, I entered this process with the understanding that the regulatory framework would protect my ability to operate competitively. When proximity rules are disregarded, it undermines not only my business but the very equity principles this industry was built upon.</p> <p>If this issue is not resolved promptly, I will have no choice but to hold the Office of Cannabis Management accountable for the harm caused—financial losses, operational sabotage, and the erosion of trust in the systems designed to protect businesses like mine. This is not a decision I take lightly, but I must advocate for myself and all licensees facing similar challenges.</p> <p>I urge you to take immediate action to address this violation and enforce the rules as they were intended. This is about more than my business—it is about protecting the integrity of this industry and ensuring the promise of equity becomes a reality for all.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and your commitment to fairness and equity in New York's cannabis industry. I remain hopeful we can work together to resolve this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sean McKenzie Five Borough Farms</p>
88.	CJ	Segal-Isaacson	Growing Renaissance LLC	<p>Like many others, I am concerned about the number of licenses to be granted. An additional 5000 licensees is not supportable by the New York Market.</p> <p>However there are several caveats:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OCM promised all AUCCs that if they were law-abiding, they would receive their next license. They also promised



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>that AUCCs would be reviewed separately from the general population and before the general population. OCM has not honored that commitment. OCM must make good on that commitment. There are AUCC applicants who have still not received their next license. They need to receive their license as quickly as possible.</p> <p>2. SEE applicants need to given top priority from the general population, especially CCTM graduates.</p> <p>3. The application fees plus an appropriate percentage of interest will need to be returned to any applicants who's applications are not reviewed. NYS has had use of their \$1000 for more than a year!</p>
89.	Thomas	Ballistrea	Cannabaceae LLC	<p>(Comment 1 of 2 due to character limits)</p> <p>My name is Thomas Ballistrea Jr., I'm the founder and CEO of Cannabaceae LLC, a graduate of the CCTM program and I'm also proud to be a microbusiness licensee and grateful to have the privilege of being a part of the solution. The following comments are in reference to the CCB meeting held on 12-10-2024.</p> <p>In reference to Dr. Jennifer Gilbert Jenkins comments during the board meeting on 12-10-24 regarding the CCTM program and ensuring continued support for the mentees that have graduated the CCTM program. The support from the SEE team at the OCM for the mentees of the CCTM program to help individuals overcome knowledge gaps has been invaluable and a large part of our ability to succeed in entering the AU market in NY, I would personally like to extend my gratitude to all the individuals whom labor tirelessly to provide this support, your efforts and sacrifices for our community are appreciated.</p> <p>With that said, the greatest barrier to entry for the mentees of the CCTM program (and all individuals in the AU Cannabis industry in NY) remains the lack access to working capital, please consider instituting unsecured, unsubsidized, revolving, low and zero interest loans, grants, tax incentives and other programs for those whom have graduated the CCTM program to allow us a path to succeed in our endeavors, please help us.</p> <p>In regards to resolution 2024-119 and as the board continues to award additional AU Cannabis licenses, as per NYSCR S. 854--A § 87 (4.) and; S. 854--A § 99-ii. New York state cannabis revenue fund. as we are all well aware, traditional sources of revenue are not available for Cannabis related businesses, I would humbly ask the board, the Office and the CAB to please consider instituting programs that provide capital by way of</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>unsecured, unsubsidized, revolving, low and zero interest loans, grants, and tax incentives directly to all licensees to; increase accessibility for all individuals in the Adult Use Cannabis market in New York state, provide financial relief for all licensees and allow for all licensees to meet the compliance standards set forth in the NYSCRR S. 854--A.</p> <p>These programs should echo the statutory goals set in the NYSCRR S. 854--A for equity by setting goals to award 50% of the assistance programs to SEE licensees as defined in the NYSCRR S. 854--A § (3) (50) and take into account the economic status of aal of the licensees when setting the terms of the unsecured, unsubsidized, revolving low and zero interest loans and assistance programs, including but not limited to, the interest rates and/or repayment methods for unsecured low and zero interest loans and eligibility for loans, grants and other assistance programs.</p> <p>These assistance programs and incentives should provide working capital and resources that can be used to maintain compliance and establish infrastructure in a manner that is compliant as well as ensures that the development of these businesses has a minimal negative impact on our environment while establishing a safe working environment for individuals.</p> <p>Assistance via unsecured, unsubsidized, revolving, low and zero interest loans, grants, tax incentives and other programs for all Cannabis related businesses must be offered by New York state to allow small business and economically challenged individuals to proliferate in a well-regulated industry as per the NYSCRR S. 854--A and such as those that have been instituted in other Cannabis markets for example; Colorado established the Cannabis Resource Optimization Program and California established; the Qualified Cultivator funding opportunity, the Cleanup, remediation and watershed Enhancement program; and the Cannabis research and innovation funding opportunity, to name just a few.</p> <p>(Continued in comment due to character limits 2)</p>
90.	Thomas	Ballistrea	Cannabaceae LLC	<p>(continued from Comment 1 due to character limits)</p> <p>My name is Thomas Ballistrea Jr., I'm the founder and CEO of Cannabaceae LLC, a graduate of the CCTM program and I'm also proud to be a microbusiness licensee and grateful to have the privilege of being a part of the solution. The following comments are in reference to the CCB meeting held on 12-10-2024.</p> <p>The time to enact these incentive programs is now, small businesses are failing due to a lack of working</p>



Office of Cannabis Management

	First Name	Last Name	Organization (If Applicable)	Public Comment
				<p>capital and individuals are being subject to predatory practices due to the lack of adequate funding for Cannabis businesses and/or are unable to operate due to the financial barriers to entry that a well-regulated industry presents.</p> <p>As The board continues to award licenses to individuals to operate in the adult use Cannabis industry in New York reiterating my prior comments, please consider amending Article 4 section 120.3 paragraph (c) subdivision 1 to include a combination option for indoor and outdoor cultivation as well as increasing the canopy size limits to allow microbusinesses to compete in the adult use Cannabis market.</p> <p>Additionally, please consider amending Article 4 section 123.12 paragraph (a) subdivisions 7&8 as well as all corresponding reference to allow Microbusinesses to sell Cannabis products other than their own cannabis products and perhaps limit those sales to other microbusinesses products to elevate the craft industry in New York State.</p> <p>The current regulations limit the ability of microbusiness licensees to be successful and in some cases make the structure of the microbusiness not economically viable given the ability of established licensees to produce Cannabis grown in a controlled environment and at a large scale as well as the ability for retail licensees to carry multiple SKUs.</p> <p>In closing, I would like to extend my gratitude to all the individuals that labor to create a post Cannabis prohibition reality for our community and for allowing us a pathway towards community healing from the atrocities carried out by the enforcement of Cannabis prohibition. As we enter a new year, I hope these comments find each of you and your loved ones well and I look forward to continuing to write the next chapter of post Cannabis prohibition together with all of you.</p> <p>(Comment 2of 2 due to character limits)</p>