

ID#	Date	Type of Comment (Specific, General)	Summary of Concerns
1	11/2/2016	Specific - Accessibility	License fees are too high; should be no limit on licenses allowed; too many upfront expenses to get started without guarantee of getting a license.
2	11/2/2016	Specific - Accessibility	License fees are too high; only "big money" investors can enter the industry in Ohio; limiting the options for consumers.
3	11/2/2016	Specific - Oversight	Contact other states for information on practices; cultivation centers should be inspectable by law enforcement with 24 hours notice; create a minimum plant restriction to prevent home grow; monitor chemical or lab use to prevent accidents.
4	11/2/2016	Specific-Question	Question asking for specific state used for modeling cultivator rules.
5	11/2/2016	Specific-Question	Question asking whether initial application fee is refundable.
6	11/2/2016	Specific-Home Growing	Supports home growing large batch of plants; would like more access to what is legal/not legal.
7	11/2/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Concerned about costs, restrictions, and testing capacity (Oregon) preventing access by legitimate users.
8	11/3/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Concerns about amount of licenses, size of facilities, and possible high prices and lack of variety of medicines available due to restricted supply.
9	11/3/2016	Specific-MBE Requirement	Concerns that financial responsibility requirements exceed ability of MBE groups to apply.
10	11/3/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Concerns about a monopoly being involved; would prefer recreational access to allow greater accessibility.
11	11/4/2016	Specific-Question	Provide company or individual names of consultants.
12	11/4/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Concerns that license distribution does not provide level playing field for small businesses; suggests converting 4 Level Is to 40 Level IIs.
13	11/5/2016	Specific-Website Link	Link not working.
14	11/5/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Concerns about the number of licenses and the large difference between Level I and Level II. Suggests this appears to be monopoly influence.

15	11/6/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Concerns about sufficiency of production based on limited number of licenses, about prices; want us to look to other states; want to know about ability to home grow.
16	11/7/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Concern about the sufficiency of production based on limited number of licenses. Calculates expected population at 230,000 and 172,500 pounds necessary to produce; licensees will be 40,000 pounds short of needed quantity.
17	11/6/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Agrees with limiting grow space initially but this could lead to high prices if limited too much. Small businesses may struggle due to so many restrictions; high operating costs, tax implications, and not being able to produce enough to cover it. Wants info on territories. Concerns about familial/arms-length connections between licensees that may create covert partnerships. Suggests more frequent manual inventory counts (6mo, qtrly).
18	11/9/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Concerned about high requirement for liquid assets (\$50,000) for a Level II cultivator denying access.
19	11/10/2016	Specific-Wording	Difficult to differentiate provisional licensing from full licensing rules. Concern about need for encryption of sensitive information. Request more emergency procedures (plans, fire exits, and evacuation) of facilities. Use of term minor in employment. Advertising encroaching first amendment. Other states initiate patient cards first to establish business case for patient counts. Many specific wording suggestions to rules text.
20	11/10/2016	N/A	Test email - no comments
21	11/10/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Concerns about supply meeting demand in Ohio and about small growers being cost effective in such a constrained space. Wants Ohio 1 year residency requirement. Hearing rumors that investors trying to buy all licenses. Concerns that existing black market will thrive under restrictive environment.
22	11/11/2016	N/A	Test email - wants confirmation
23	11/11/2016	Specific-Process	Describes understanding of rules as being an employee of a business and licensing out a section to grow in. Asks for confirmation.

24	11/11/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Wants to add more cultivating licenses because concerned that supply cannot meet demand.
25	11/11/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Suggests 30 day supply, or 10 oz; 8 plants and 8 seedlings; patient registry fee of \$25 with \$10 renewal; and accept out-of-state. Wants list expanded to add auto-immune diseases. Concerned that state is more concerned with making money than helping people. Need to provide access now and not overtax which will pass along costs to patients.
26	11/11/2016	Specific-Question	Want an estimate on when applications will start to be accepted.
27	11/13/2016	Specific-Accessibility	Licensing fees too high. Illinois and NY have high fees but allow for ways to be profitable: NY allows 10 vertically integrated facilities with each allowed to operate 4 dispensaries; Illinois allows 22 facilities with 44 dispensaries. Concerns product will be too expensive, esp. with small number of licenses issued. Demand will be high. Level II won't be able to compete with Level I. Suggests third level to foster competition. Also, suggests more Level II since these will be more attainable for small businesses. Concerns that square footage constraints will force businesses to pack in plants, creating less airflow. Limits should be on canopy not square footage. Relying on Connecticut, NY, and Illinois is problematic since these states all enrolled less than .5% of their population. Ohio is going to make it hard for patients to access products. Additional concerns include ensuring women are included in 15%, not restricting escrow only using a "chartered" institution, allowing some paperwork orders online, and ensuring that sufficient Type 1 employees are overseeing the facility.

28	11/14/2016	Specific - Cultivation Rules	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cultivation square footage restriction too small. Limit does not ensure financial viability, and will not meet demand. Recommend 50,000 sq ft per cultivator</li> <li>2. Existing licensees should be given option to expand before any additional licenses are granted.</li> <li>3. Expiration dates are arbitrary and unnecessary and will drive up costs for patients.</li> <li>4. Territorial restrictions should not be applied to cultivators, and serve no public interest.</li> </ol>
29	11/14/2016	Specific - Risk / Liability	Suggest liability insurance requirements be added to rules, outlines specific suggestions in attachment to email.
30	11/14/2016	Specific - Cultivation License and square footage limits	Concerned that current square footage restrictions will not meet patient demand. Suggests increasing number of licenses to 400, limiting each to 1600 sq ft.
31	11/14/2016	Specific - Cultivation License and square footage limits	Cultivation space too small, fees unnecessarily high. Supply will not meet demand. Fees and asset requirements pose undue burden on businesses.
32	11/14/2016	General - feedback on several rules.	Specific concerns addressed on a rule-by-rule basis, with detailed explanations for each. General theme: program is too restrictive and too expensive to ensure viability and attract top-tier industry stakeholders.
33	11/15/2016	General - Cultivation license limits	Suggests Level III cultivator license for individuals/home-growers. Concerned with initial clone/seed procurement for licensed cultivators. Seeks clarity on whether dispensaries will sell flower.
34	11/15/2016	Specific - refunds of license fees	Suggests that fees be refunded for applicants who are not approved for a license, since the number of licenses is so small.
35	11/15/2016	General - Cultivator Rules	Specific concerns addressed on a rule-by-rule basis. Generally, looser restrictions on square footage, smaller number of licenses, clarification of definitions, higher application fee, lower license fee.

36	11/15/2016	Specific - licensing structure	Does not feel that Level II will be financially viable, as they will not be able to produce a volume that will allow them to compete with Level I. Suggests home-grow or to do away with the 2-tier license system in favor of a larger number of smaller operations.
37	11/15/2016	Specific - licensing structure	Suggests smaller number of Level I, larger number of Level II, giving more businesses the opportunity to compete. Also suggests increasing square footage and licensing fee for Level II.
38	11/15/2016	General - Cultivator Rules	Specific concerns addressed on a rule-by-rule basis. Generally, looser restrictions on square footage, larger number of licenses, clarification of definitions, license fee tied to revenue rather than flat rate.
39	11/15/2016	General - Cultivator Rules	Specific concerns addressed on a rule-by-rule basis. Generally, looser restrictions on square footage, 12 months from provisional to certificate, clarification of definitions, license fee tied to revenue rather than flat rate.
40	11/15/2016	Specific	Remove square footage restrictions. Remove residency requirements. Remove product registration requirements. Remove 9 month provisional-to-certified time limit.
41	11/15/2016	Specific	Suggests increasing square footage limit for Level II
42	11/15/2016	Specific	Suggests intermediate license larger than Level II, but smaller than Level I, with concordant fee structure.
43	11/15/2016	General	Extensive list of rule-by-rule suggestions. In general, fewer restrictions, lower fees.
44	11/15/2016	Specific	Suggests removing square footage restrictions, lowering fees, removing expiration date, and establishing program for veterans.
45	11/14/2016	Specific	Concerned that with current tiered license system, big business will control MMJ industry. Concerned that proposed rules are unfair and preempt average citizens and small businesses from participation.
46	11/14/2016	Specific	Inquiring about next Ohio MMJ Advisory Committee mtg date.
47	11/14/2015	General	Suggests increasing square footage limit for Level II, creating small number of "organic" licenses, permit composting of plant waste, remove "uninterrupted supply provision, clarify size restriction is for flower area.
48	11/14/2016	General	Rule-by-rule suggestions. In general, fewer restrictions, lower fees. Also, of note: "Suggest taking out any statements that allows the department any judgment or consideration. These are supposed to be the rules. Outline what the rules are, period. Allowing interpretation or judgment by the department will only provide the means for lawsuit when someone feels a judgment or an option by the department didn't go their way. I also suggest you outlining a hearing process should someone disagree with an outcome or a specific rule."
49	11/14/2016	General	Believes that proposed rules are generally unfair and favor wealthy investors.
50	11/14/2016	General	Believes that proposed rules are generally unfair and favor wealthy investors. Also questions legitimacy of an advisory committee on which none of the members are experts on cannabis or the cannabis industry.
51	11/14/2016	General	(This message is a copy/paste of comment 45)
52	11/14/2016	General	(This message is a copy/paste of comment 45)

53	11/14/2016	General	Believes that proposed rules are generally unfair and favor wealthy investors. Suggests lottery system for license awards.
54	11/15/2016	General	Believes that proposed rules are generally unfair and favor wealthy investors.
55	11/15/2016	Specific	Suggests removing fertilizer application restrictions for hydroponic operations, as hydroponic systems require constant nutrient addition due to water being the only growth medium.
56	11/15/2016	General	Rule-by-rule suggestions. In general, fewer restrictions, lower fees, requests rule-by-rule clarifications, many of which are currently being considered.
57	11/15/2016	General	Rule-by-rule suggestions. In general, fewer restrictions, lower fees, more clarification on definitions.
58	11/15/2016	Specific	Email includes an attachment with information on laboratories and testing requirements in other states.
59	11/15/2016	Specific	Requests verification that we received his two separate emails.
60	11/15/2016	Specific	Attachment with proposal for individual growing/processing/dispensing site
61	11/15/2016	Specific	Attachment with revised/amended proposal for individual growing/processing/dispensing site
62	11/15/2016	General	In general, suggests fewer licenses, lower fees, increased square footage. Concerned that current model will not allow for pricing that will be competitive with black market.
63	11/15/2016	General	States that he has research supporting his view that demand will not be met under proposed rules. Did not include the research in his message.
64	11/15/2016	Specific - Supply/Demand	In general, concerned that restrictions on square footage under proposed rules will not allow producers to meet the demands of patients.
65	11/15/2016	Specific - Surety bond	Questions whether surety bond will be in compliance with federal law, given that cannabis is federally illegal.
66	11/15/2016	General	Wide-ranging concerns and suggestions. In general, fewer restrictions, more cultivation space, clarification of growth phases, labeling concerns, bandwidth concerns for security systems, concerns with "uninterrupted supply."
67	11/15/2016	General	Extensive list of rule-by-rule suggestions. In general, fewer restrictions, lower fees, demand will exceed supply.
68	11/15/2016	General	Email includes an attachment.
69	11/15/2016	Specific - Expiration date	Suggests removal of expiration date requirements.
70	11/15/2016	General	Rule-by-rule suggestions. In general, fewer restrictions, lower fees, lab testing suggestions. Requests rule-by-rule clarifications, many of which are currently being considered.
71	11/15/2016	General	Additional comments from Tryke's director of cultivation. In general, clarification on a rule-by-rule basis.
72	11/15/2016	Specific	Suggests removing square footage restriction, or increasing for Level II. Concerned that Level II will not be able to compete with Level I. Suggests 9 Level I, 45 Level II.
73	11/15/2016	General	Rule-by-rule suggestions. Very specific for each rule.