

Communication from Public

Name: Liliana Guerrero

Date Submitted: 04/15/2020 07:18 PM

Council File No: 20-0446

Comments for Public Posting: Based on the proposals recommended by the DCR, the following concern should be taken into consideration for refusal of Recommendation 2b: As a participant in Round 2 of Phase 3, it would be unfair to prioritize applicants "who submitted an application during the 14-day Phase 3 Retail Round 1 Application Window and were deemed ineligible for further processing" (Recommendation 2b). Especially, if it is at the expense of applicants who didn't apply in Round 1 but planned on applying in Round 2. Had we known priority would be given to those who merely applied in Round 1, we too would have made a reckless effort to obtain a qualifying property. This recommendation would only serve to demonstrate that applicants in Round 1 who took a knowing risk, were able to force the DCR's hand. This likely was their intent all along - "if we pay rent for XX period, they have to give us a license." This recommendation would serve as nothing more than a penalty on those who heeded the DCR's multiple warnings that this process had no guarantees and those without properties could wait till Round 2. If this recommendation was approved, it would hurt applicants who appropriately followed the rules and reward those who feel their risky actions warrant approval.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 04/15/2020 09:29 PM

Council File No: 20-0446

Comments for Public Posting: Recommendation 2b states: "Allow Social Equity Individual Applicants who submitted an application during the 14-day Phase 3 Retail Round 1 Application Window and were deemed ineligible for further processing, to receive priority processing for a new application for one commercial cannabis activity not subject to Undue Concentration findings (i.e., non-volatile manufacturing, distribution, or delivery) and provide them up to one year to submit a complete annual license application." If this opportunity is granted to all applicants who applied in Round 1, the same opportunity should be awarded to individuals who were planning on applying in Round 2; it would be absolutely unfair otherwise. The DCR previously warned against undertaking leases in preparation for the application process as there were "no guarantees." Recommendation 2b would, however, mean that there were guarantees and all other applicants (that did not apply in Round 1) were misled. All social equity qualified applicants should equally be awarded this opportunity if approved.