



STAFF REPORT

Report To: Board of Supervisors **Meeting Date:** August 18, 2022

Staff Contact: Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

Agenda Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a request from Qualcan, LLC ("Applicant") to introduce, on first reading, a proposed ordinance revising provisions to increase the number of authorized marijuana retail stores; revising provisions governing co-location requirements for marijuana retail stores and medical marijuana dispensaries; revising provisions to remove prohibitions against drive-through services for marijuana retail stores and medical marijuana dispensaries; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. (Heather Ferris, hferris@carson.org)

Staff Summary: Currently, only two marijuana retail stores are authorized to operate in Carson City, and such stores must be co-located with an existing medical marijuana dispensary. The Applicant is proposing to amend the Carson City Municipal Code ("CCMC") to authorize another retail marijuana store to be located in Carson City, to amend the co-location requirement such that medical marijuana dispensaries must be jointly located within the same premises of a marijuana retail store and to authorize drive-through sales for both types of facilities. Pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes ("NRS") Chapter 237, a business impact statement is not required to be prepared with this ordinance. After considering this proposed ordinance, the Planning Commission recommends denying the proposed changes.

Agenda Action: Formal Action / Motion **Time Requested:** 20 minutes

Proposed Motion

I move not to introduce the ordinance.

Board's Strategic Goal

Quality of Life

Previous Action

June 29, 2022: The Planning Commission considered the proposed ordinance that would allow for a total of three marijuana retail stores in Carson City, to reverse the co-location requirement and to allow for drive-through services at marijuana retail stores and medical marijuana dispensaries. The Planning Commission continued the matter to the July 27, 2022, meeting to consider a total of 4 marijuana retail stores, consistent with the maximum allowed by state law, and to continue to prohibit drive-through services.

July 27, 2022: The Planning Commission considered a proposed ordinance that would allow for a total of four retail marijuana stores in Carson City, to reverse the co-location requirement, and to continue to prohibit drive-through uses. The Planning Commission voted 4-2, 1 absent to recommend to the Board of Supervisors ("Board") that the proposed changes to the ordinance be denied.

Background/Issues & Analysis

The Applicant has requested an amendment to the marijuana regulations in Section 1.20 of Division 1 of Title 18 Appendix (the Carson City Development Standards (“CCDS”)) of the CCMC. If adopted, the proposed amendment to CCDS 1.20 would allow for one additional retail marijuana store, reverse the co-location requirement and permit drive-through services.

In 2017, the Board adopted an ordinance to allow for recreational marijuana establishments under certain conditions. At that time, two medical marijuana dispensaries had been established in Carson City for a number of years. The Board took the approach in CCDS 1.20(1)(j) of limiting the number of medical marijuana dispensaries to two (the statutory maximum), and in CCDS 1.20(1)(k) requiring a marijuana retail store to be jointly located within the same premises as an existing medical marijuana dispensary, thereby effectively limiting marijuana retail stores to two as well. CCDS 1.20(2)(c) prohibits drive-through services.

However, NRS 678B.220(c) permits a county with a population of 55,000 or more but less than 100,000 to have a maximum of two licenses for medical marijuana dispensaries, and NRS 678B.260(c) permits a county with a population of 55,000 or more but less than 100,000 to have up to four licenses for marijuana retail stores. (Marijuana retail stores are now referred to in NRS as adult-use cannabis retail stores. This nomenclature change will be incorporated into CCMC with a global update of CCMC that is currently in progress.)

The Applicant is requesting an amendment to CCMC to allow for an additional retail store, not co-located at existing medical marijuana dispensaries, and to allow for drive-through services at retail marijuana stores and medical marijuana dispensaries in Carson City.

This matter was placed on the agenda for the Planning Commission’s consideration on June 29, 2022, concurrent with the City’s request to amend CCDS 1.20 to allow for curbside services. Under CCMC 18.02.075(5)(b), when considering a request for an amendment to the zoning code, the Planning Commission must make the following findings to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance to the Board:

- (1) That the proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with and supports the goals and policies of the master plan,
- (2) That the proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with existing adjacent land uses and will not have detrimental impacts to other properties in the vicinity, and
- (3) That the proposed amendment will not negatively impact existing or planned public services or facilities and will not adversely impact the public health, safety and welfare.

At the June 29, 2022 meeting, the Planning Commission continued the matter to the July 27, 2022, meeting to consider permitting a total of 4 retail marijuana stores, consistent with State law, and to continue to prohibit drive-through services. The Planning Commission also wanted to provide the public with additional noticing to inform the public that a total of four stores may be permitted and in hopes of receiving more public comment on the matter.

The Planning Commission considered this request again during its July 27, 2022 meeting and voted 4-2, 1 absent, to recommend to the Board no changes to existing CCMC provisions. During deliberations, many Commissioners noted that these policy decisions were more properly the province of the Board. Ultimately, the two Commissioners who voted to recommend approving the ordinance noted that it made sense to remove the number of allowable retail stores from the ordinance. They also noted that the existing facilities have not resulted in increased impacts on the Sheriff’s Office. The four Commissioners who voted to recommend denying the ordinance and keeping the current limitations in place noted that the findings could not be made because the increase would result in impacts to public services and the economic well-being of the existing facilities.

Under CCMC 18.02.075(5)(b), after consideration by the Planning Commission, the Applicant's proposed ordinance amending the zoning code is forwarded to the Board for its consideration, along with the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

Except as specifically exempted, NRS 237.080 requires a business impact statement to be prepared whenever an ordinance by the adoption of which the governing body of a local government exercises legislative powers. Under these exemptions, a business impact statement is not required to be prepared with this ordinance because the ordinance is proposed pursuant to a provision of NRS Chapter 278.

Applicable Statute, Code, Policy, Rule or Regulation

NRS Chapters 237 and 244; CCMC 18.02.075; Article 2 of the Carson City Charter

Financial Information

Is there a fiscal impact? No

If yes, account name/number:

Is it currently budgeted? No

Explanation of Fiscal Impact:

Alternatives

Introduce the ordinance on first reading, modify the proposed ordinance and/or provide alternative direction to staff.

Attachments:

[Number_of_Stores_Cannabis_Ordinance_6-2022_revised.docx](#)

[7-27-22 PC packet \(no curbside ord.\) & late material.pdf](#)

[7-27 PC- late materials- public comments.pdf](#)

Board Action Taken:

Motion: _____	1) _____	Aye/Nay
	2) _____	_____

(Vote Recorded By)

Summary: An ordinance amending various provisions relating to marijuana retail stores and medical marijuana dispensaries.

BILL NO. _____

ORDINANCE NO. 2022 - _____

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO MARIJUANA; REVISING PROVISIONS TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF AUTHORIZED MARIJUANA RETAIL STORES; REVISING PROVISIONS GOVERNING CO-LOCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR MARIJUANA RETAIL STORES AND MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES; REVISING PROVISIONS TO REMOVE PROHIBITIONS AGAINST DRIVE-THROUGH SERVICES FOR MARIJUANA RETAIL STORES AND MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES; AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

The Board of Supervisors of Carson City do ordain:

SECTION I:

That Title 18 Appendix (CARSON CITY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS), Division 1 (LAND USE AND SITE DESIGN), Section 1.20 (Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments), is hereby amended (**bold, underlined** text is added, ~~stricken~~ text is deleted) as follows:

1.20 – Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments. (NRS Title 56)

The following standards are intended to establish minimum standards and Special Use Permit review criteria for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments, in addition to other standards for commercial and industrial development.

1. The following standards apply to all Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments:

(a) Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments require the issuance of a Special Use Permit. Special Use Permits for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments are only valid at the specific location for which a person has obtained the required approval through the applicable state agency to operate as a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment. A Special Use Permit that is issued in accordance with this Division automatically expires and shall be deemed void if the Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment loses or otherwise forfeits the required state approval to operate. A Special Use Permit issued in accordance with this Division is not transferable between operators and locations within Carson City. Except as otherwise provided in this Division and notwithstanding any other provision of CCMC, a separate Special Use Permit is not required for a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment that will be established in an existing location at which a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana

Establishment in good standing already operates. The expansion of any location of a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment that will result in an increase of more than 10 percent of the space in which the Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment has been approved to operate requires the issuance of an amended Special Use Permit.

(b) The consumption of marijuana products is prohibited on the premises of any Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment.

(c) All business activities related to Medical Marijuana Establishments and any marijuana cultivation facility, marijuana testing facility, marijuana product manufacturing facility or retail marijuana store must be conducted indoors and within a permanent building. The use of an office trailer or other temporary structure is prohibited. All Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments must at all times maintain an interior and exterior appearance that is professional, orderly, dignified and consistent with the traditional style of pharmacies and medical offices.

(d) The outdoor display or sale of any Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment merchandise or product is prohibited.

(e) Accessory outside storage for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments must comply with the provisions of Title 18 Appendix (Carson City Development Standards), Division 1.12 (Outside Storage).

(f) Access to Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment must comply with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations.

(g) Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment merchandise and products must not be visible when viewed from outside the building in which the Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment is located.

(h) All signage for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana establishments must be discreet, professional and consistent with the traditional style of signage for pharmacies and medical offices. All Medical Marijuana establishments and Marijuana Establishments are limited to following signage:

(1) A maximum of 30 square feet of wall sign area.

(2) A maximum of 32 square feet of freestanding sign area.

(3) The maximum freestanding sign height for Marijuana Dispensaries and Marijuana Retail Stores shall be determined by the applicable commercial or shopping center regulations of Division 4 (Signs).

(4) The maximum freestanding sign height for all Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments other than Marijuana Dispensaries and Marijuana Retail Stores shall be 10 feet.

(5) Where a Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment are jointly located on a single property, the maximum permitted sign area applies to the property and not each type of Establishment.

(i) Off-street parking must be provided for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments in accordance with the following:

(1) For Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Marijuana Retail Stores, a minimum of one space for every 300 square feet of gross floor area.

(2) For Medical Marijuana Cultivation Facilities and Marijuana Cultivation Facilities, a minimum of one space for every 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

(3) For Medical Marijuana Product Manufacturing Facilities and Marijuana Product Manufacturing Facilities, a minimum of one space for every 500 square feet of gross floor area.

(4) For Medical Marijuana Testing and Marijuana Testing Facilities, a minimum of one space for every 400 square feet of gross floor area.

(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of CCMC, not more than 2 Medical Marijuana Dispensaries **and 3 Marijuana Retail Stores** are allowed to operate at the same time in Carson City.

(k) A **Medical Marijuana Dispensary** [~~Marijuana Retail Store~~] may only be jointly located within the same premises of **a Marijuana Retail Store** [~~an existing Medical Marijuana Dispensary~~] that is operating in good standing.

(l) A Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment is prohibited within 1,000 feet of a public or private school that provides formal education traditionally associated with preschool or kindergarten through grade 12, or within 300 feet of a facility that provides day care to children, a public park, a playground, a public swimming pool, and any other center or facility, the primary purpose of which is to provide recreational opportunities or services to children or adolescents, which already exists on the date the application for the proposed Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment is submitted to the applicable state agency for approval to operate, as measured on a straight line from the property line of the nearest school or facility to the front door or primary entrance of the Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment.

2. The following standards apply to all Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Retail Marijuana Stores:

(a) A single point of secure public entry must be provided and identified.

(b) Hours of operation are limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., daily.

(c) Drive-through service is **permitted**. [~~prohibited.~~]

(d) A Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Retail Marijuana Store is prohibited on any property, or within a shopping center with frontage, that is located on the same street on which a residentially zoned property is also located unless the dispensary or store is located more than 300 feet from the residential property, as measured on a straight line from the nearest residential property line abutting the street right-of-way to the front door of the dispensary or store.

3. In addition to the required findings for a Special Use Permit, the following standards must also be considered in the review of a request for a Special Use Permit for a Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Marijuana Retail Store to be located within the General Industrial zoning district:

(a) That the proposed Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Marijuana Retail Store is located where sufficient, convenient and safe access is provided to the public.

(b) That the proposed location has adequate lighting and street improvements for a use providing public access.

SECTION II:

That no other provisions of the Carson City Municipal Code are affected by this ordinance.

PROPOSED on _____, 2022.

PROPOSED by _____.

PASSED _____, 2022.

VOTE:

AYES: _____

NAYS: _____

ABSENT: _____

LORI BAGWELL, Mayor

ATTEST:

AUBREY ROWLATT, Clerk-Recorder

This ordinance shall be in force and effect from and after the _____ day of the month of _____ of the year 2022.



108 E. Proctor Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
(775) 887-2180
Hearing Impaired: 711

MEMORANDUM

Planning Commission Meeting of July 27, 2022

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

DATE: July 20, 2022

SUBJECT: **Agenda Item 6.C-** ZA-2022-0263 For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a request from Qualcan, LLC (“Applicant”) for a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors to amend various provisions of the Carson city Municipal Code (“CCMC”) relating to marijuana to (1) authorize an increase in the number of retail marijuana stores allowed in Carson City, and (2) authorize drive-through services at medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores.

The Applicant is proposing to amend the CCMC to increase the number of retail marijuana stores authorized in Carson City from two to three, and to authorize drive-through sales at medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores.

At its meeting of June 29, 2022, the Planning Commission considered this request along with a request from the Board of Supervisors for amendments to Division 1.20 of Title 18 Appendix of CCMC as it relates to curbside pickup. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the draft ordinance for curbside pickup but continued this item to consider a maximum total of four retail marijuana stores as allowed by NRS 678B.260 and continue to prohibit drive-through uses.

Based on the discussion at the Planning Commission meeting, staff has revised the draft ordinance to increase the number of retail marijuana stores in Carson City from two to the maximum of four as allowed under state law. Additionally, this draft makes no changes to Division 1.20.2(c) which expressly prohibits drive-through uses.

As noted in the June 29, 2022 staff report (attached), the Planning Commission, in forwarding a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for a zoning code amendment, shall make the findings of fact set forth in CCMC 18.02.075(5). Staff was able to make all findings in the affirmative.

As of the writing of this memo, staff has received written public comments from 17 members of the public concerning this proposed ordinance.

The Planning Commission makes recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Summary: An ordinance adding provisions to increase the number of allowed marijuana retail stores and permitting drive-through pickup.

BILL NO. _____

ORDINANCE NO. 2022 - _____

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO MARIJUANA; ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS GOVERNING THE NUMBER OF RETAIL MARIJUANA STORES AND PERMITTING DRIVE-THROUGH PICKUP; AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

The Board of Supervisors of Carson City do ordain:

SECTION I:

That Title 18 Appendix (CARSON CITY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS), Division 1 (LAND USE AND SITE DESIGN), Section 1.20 (Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments), is hereby amended (**bold, underlined** text is added, ~~stricken~~ text is deleted) as follows:

1.20 – Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments. (NRS Title 56)

The following standards are intended to establish minimum standards and Special Use Permit review criteria for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments, in addition to other standards for commercial and industrial development.

1. The following standards apply to all Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments:

(a) Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments require the issuance of a Special Use Permit. Special Use Permits for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments are only valid at the specific location for which a person has obtained the required approval through the applicable state agency to operate as a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment. A Special Use Permit that is issued in accordance with this Division automatically expires and shall be deemed void if the Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment loses or otherwise forfeits the required state approval to operate. A Special Use Permit issued in accordance with this Division is not transferable between operators and locations within Carson City. Except as otherwise provided in this Division and notwithstanding any other provision of CCMC, a separate Special Use Permit is not required for a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment that will be established in an existing location at which a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment in good standing already operates. The expansion of any location of a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment that will result in an increase of more than 10 percent of the space in which the Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana

Establishment has been approved to operate requires the issuance of an amended Special Use Permit.

(b) The consumption of marijuana products is prohibited on the premises of any Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment.

(c) All business activities related to Medical Marijuana Establishments and any marijuana cultivation facility, marijuana testing facility, marijuana product manufacturing facility or retail marijuana store must be conducted indoors and within a permanent building. The use of an office trailer or other temporary structure is prohibited. All Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments must at all times maintain an interior and exterior appearance that is professional, orderly, dignified and consistent with the traditional style of pharmacies and medical offices.

(d) The outdoor display or sale of any Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment merchandise or product is prohibited.

(e) Accessory outside storage for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments must comply with the provisions of Title 18 Appendix (Carson City Development Standards), Division 1.12 (Outside Storage).

(f) Access to Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment must comply with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations.

(g) Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment merchandise and products must not be visible when viewed from outside the building in which the Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment is located.

(h) All signage for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana establishments must be discreet, professional and consistent with the traditional style of signage for pharmacies and medical offices. All Medical Marijuana establishments and Marijuana Establishments are limited to following signage:

(1) A maximum of 30 square feet of wall sign area.

(2) A maximum of 32 square feet of freestanding sign area.

(3) The maximum freestanding sign height for Marijuana Dispensaries and Marijuana Retail Stores shall be determined by the applicable commercial or shopping center regulations of Division 4 (Signs).

(4) The maximum freestanding sign height for all Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments other than Marijuana Dispensaries and Marijuana Retail Stores shall be 10 feet.

(5) Where a Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment are jointly located on a single property, the maximum permitted sign area applies to the property and not each type of Establishment.

(i) Off-street parking must be provided for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments in accordance with the following:

(1) For Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Marijuana Retail Stores,] a minimum of one space for every 300 square feet of gross floor area.

(2) For Medical Marijuana Cultivation Facilities and Marijuana Cultivation Facilities,] a minimum of one space for every 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

(3) For Medical Marijuana Product Manufacturing Facilities and Marijuana Product Manufacturing Facilities, a minimum of one space for every 500 square feet of gross floor area.

(4) For Medical Marijuana Testing and Marijuana Testing Facilities, a minimum of one space for every 400 square feet of gross floor area.

(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of CCMC, not more than 2 Medical Marijuana Dispensaries **and 4 Marijuana Retail Stores** are allowed to operate at the same time in Carson City.

(k) A **Medical Marijuana Dispensary** [~~Marijuana Retail Store~~] may only be jointly located within the same premises of **a Marijuana Retail Store** [~~an existing Medical Marijuana Dispensary~~] that is operating in good standing.

(l) A Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment is prohibited within 1,000 feet of a public or private school that provides formal education traditionally associated with preschool or kindergarten through grade 12, or within 300 feet of a facility that provides day care to children, a public park, a playground, a public swimming pool, and any other center or facility, the primary purpose of which is to provide recreational opportunities or services to children or adolescents, which already exists on the date the application for the proposed Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment is submitted to the applicable state agency for approval to operate, as measured on a straight line from the property line of the nearest school or facility to the front door or primary entrance of the Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment.

2. The following standards apply to all Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Retail Marijuana Stores:

- (a) A single point of secure public entry must be provided and identified.
- (b) Hours of operation are limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., daily.
- (c) Drive-through service is prohibited.

(d) A Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Retail Marijuana Store is prohibited on any property, or within a shopping center with frontage, that is located on the same street on which a residentially zoned property is also located unless the dispensary or store is located more than 300 feet from the residential property, as measured on a straight line from the nearest residential property line abutting the street right-of-way to the front door of the dispensary or store.

3. In addition to the required findings for a Special Use Permit, the following standards must also be considered in the review of a request for a Special Use Permit for a Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Marijuana Retail Store to be located within the General Industrial zoning district:

(a) That the proposed Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Marijuana Retail Store is located where sufficient, convenient and safe access is provided to the public.

(b) That the proposed location has adequate lighting and street improvements for a use providing public access.

SECTION II:

That no other provisions of the Carson City Municipal Code are affected by this ordinance.

PROPOSED on _____, 2022.

PROPOSED by _____.

PASSED _____, 2022.

VOTE:

AYES: _____

NAYS: _____

ABSENT: _____

LORI BAGWELL, Mayor

ATTEST:

AUBREY ROWLATT, Clerk-Recorder

This ordinance shall be in force and effect from and after the 1st day of the month of September of the year 2022.

From: [Carole Terry](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Amending Municipal Code...
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 6:30:05 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Planning commission,

I urge you not to amend the municipal code limiting the number of marijuana dispensaries in Carson City. We currently have two marijuana stores and another two within a twenty minute drive. This is more than enough.

Additional dispensaries will do nothing to improve the quality of life in Carson City, in fact it will be a detriment.

Carole Terry
2651 Manhattan Dr.
Carson City, NV 89703
Phone: 775-841-0900

From: Doreen Mack
To: Planning Department
Subject: Re: Public Comment on Retail Marijuana Stores
Date: Thursday, July 7, 2022 5:57:16 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Dear Commissioners,

CBC has a purpose and is miraculous for people with severe illnesses such as Cancer and Seizures. It is not a cure, but it does help with the side effects of Nausea and Vomiting due to medication and it can stop seizures. This is something I have witnessed first-hand.

For some people with anxiety and mental Issues it can be used as a tool to help them overcome symptoms, but it does need to over seen by a physician so it is not abused.

I am concerned about the abuse and it being used for recreational use. We are a 24 hr. State and that in itself leads to substance abuse and alcoholism. I feel two stores in our town is plenty.

Thank You for listening...

P.S. Copy sent to the Board of Supervisors

God Bless,
Doreen Mack ~Lofty Expressions

President Downtown 20/20~501c3
Ph: and Fx: 775-885-2444
Web-Site: Loftyexpressions.com

From: [Mattia Healy](#)
To: [Planning Department](#); [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Re: Plans to increase number of Marijuana Dispensaries in Carson City
Date: Thursday, July 7, 2022 11:25:01 AM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Re: Plans to increase number of Marijuana Dispensaries in Carson City

Dear Planning Commission;

Dear Board of Supervisors;

This note is to register our opposition to increasing the number of marijuana dispensaries in Carson City. We already have two, which is 2 too many, and do not need more, especially ones controlled out of Las Vegas.

All you are doing is encouraging mental, psychological and long term physical problems associated with marijuana use.

We do not need any more of these businesses in our city.

Yours truly,
Thomas J .Healy
Mattia R. Healy
1822 Evergreen Dr
Carson City, NV, 89703

Healytj@hotmail.com
Tia2only@sbcglobal.net

From: Michel Hobdy
To: Planning Department
Subject: Opening of additional marijuana stores
Date: Friday, July 8, 2022 2:06:31 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

This is in regards to a statement from Teri Preston with the Planning Commission. She stated in the Nevada Appeal

Dated July 2-5, 2022, "I don't think we have a good feel for what the community feels, in regards to allowing two more marijuana retail stores in Carson City.

Our community was not in favor of the first two marijuana retail stores, but our great Planning Commission and Supervisors pushed it through regardless.

The applicant Qualcan, a cannabis company in Las Vegas, and the two Representatives Matt and Bruce Robinson have stated that "**QUALCAN**

ALREADY HAS A SITE AND A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION ALREADY IN HAND IF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND BOARD OF

SUPERVISORS ALLOW AN ADDITIONAL STORE." So why should the community waste their time when we already know how the Commission and Supervisors will vote...**ALL IN FAVOR...MAJORITY APPROVES ADDITIONAL STORE!**

-

It's time to bring Carson City back to what it once was. A clean community where adults and children had good clean living. Our kids are getting signals

every day that drugs are ok, and now we have stores selling the merchandise. One store was too many, and now we have two, with our responsible

Community leaders about to give the ok for two additional stores...WRONG!!!! I have lived here in Carson City for 60 years now, and have seen

many changes. Our family here in Carson City is now going on five generations. I use to love this town, but today it is being run by California and Las Vegas influence. Three cheers for Douglas County to not allow the sale of marijuana, there is still good morals in their Community.

Carson City needs to look at developing activities for our younger generation, good clean fun rather than more marijuana shops. Use to be a Drug store is where you would go to buy items to assist you in healthy living, and now drug stores are just that..MARIJUANA SHOPS FOR THE BIG GUYS TO MAKE BIG MONEY.

I have spoken to many people here in our town, and they don't want more Marijuana shops. They agree with me, that no matter how much the people say no, our so called leaders, people in charge, do as they damn well please. No longer can we go shopping, take a walk in the park, or to the movies, without encountering someone causing problems while high on drugs. Another marijuana store is

just what Carson City does not need.

IF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE AN ADDITIONAL MARIJUANA STORE, SHAME SHAME ON YOU!!!!

Cc: Board of Supervisor's....**charged with providing orderly government and safeguarding the general health, welfare and safety of its citizens , so do your job!**

Concerned Citizens,

Michel and Marilyn Hobby

From: [Tom Healy](#)
To: [Planning Department](#); [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Re: Plans to increase number of Marijuana Dispensaries in Carson City
Date: Thursday, July 7, 2022 11:17:35 AM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Re: Plans to increase number of Marijuana Dispensaries in Carson City

Dear Planning Commission;

Dear Board of Supervisors;


This note is to register our opposition to increasing the number of marijuana dispensaries in Carson City. We already have two, which is 2 too many, and do not need more, especially ones controlled out of Las Vegas.

All you are doing is encouraging mental, psychological and long term physical problems associated with marijuana use.

We do not need any more of these businesses in our city.

Yours truly,
Thomas J .Healy
Mattia R. Healy
1822 Evergreen Dr
Carson City, NV, 89703

Healytj@hotmail.com
Tia2only@sbcglobal.net



July 6, 2022

To: Board of Supervisors and the Carson City Planning Commission

From: Paul G. Corrado, MUP

RE: Additional Cannabis Store(s) Public Comment

Members of the Commission, please consider the following in your deliberations of your consideration of Additional Cannabis Store(s):

- In order to change the current restrictions, you, being the applicant with an analysis and review of the Planning Commission need to identify the reasons for the existing restrictions to begin with and come up with good reasons to change those restrictions, in a written point by point evaluation, discussion, justifications for change, and conclusions based on logic, consensus, as well as the perceived will and needs of the people.
- Carson City has an economic capture rate significantly greater than it current population would ever justify, hence, Costco, the vehicle dealerships, and medical care opportunities, among others. Where will the proposed new dispensary be located? What is the proximity to existing similar facilities? Will this negatively impact the existing facilities capture area? If so, to what extent? What will be the fiscal impact on the City revenues, if any?
- What are the specific justifications for Additional Cannabis stores within the City limits? Are they based on population growth? Increased per capita demand? The need for increased competition? A study of the economics of adding another seller, both pros and cons needs to be done. The requirements for additional parking? Given the time in the store, the need for increased parking spaces, with double lines between spaces, e.g., Costco? What are the positive and negative impacts of any proposed change?
- Why four marijuana establishments? Would four really drive down the price of the product? Increase competition? Would any future decision hold up in Court, since it restricts competition? How is that restriction justified? Are prices subject to any governmental review? If so, what are they? What has been done is other similarly sized governmental entities? These facilities are significant traffic generators. What is the impact of the proposed facility on adjacent facilities and permitted uses? Will this proposal increase costs and send the sales underground?

If you are going to change the availability of a controlled substance, some call a gateway drug, you better have some very good, well thought out, and clearly elucidated reasons and reasoning so that your decisions will hold up in court.

From: [Nikki Demas-Butz](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Cannabis Stores
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 10:18:39 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

To the Planning Commission:

RE: Additional Cannabis Stores

This is the opinion of my husband and myself, AND many of our friends and neighbors.

There is currently a limit of 2 cannabis stores in Carson City, NV. Please **DO NOT ALLOW** any additional stores in our town !! Additional businesses of that nature are NOT something we want in our community. We want Carson City to remain a wholesome family-oriented community. We admire Douglas County for standing up for their citizens by banning cannabis stores in their county. The two (2) stores currently in Carson City are **MORE THAN ENOUGH. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW ADDITIONAL CANNABIS STORES - NOW OR IN THE FUTURE.**

Note: There is also a store in Washoe Valley.

Thank you,

Nikki Demas-Butz and Harry F. Butz Jr.

RECEIVED

JUL 06 2022

CARSON CITY
PLANNING DIVISION

July 6, 2022

To: Board of Supervisors and the Carson City Planning Commission

From: Paul G. Corrado, MUP

RE: Additional Cannabis Store(s) Public Comment

Members of the Commission, please consider the following in your deliberations of your consideration of Additional Cannabis Store(s):

- In order to change the current restrictions, you, being the applicant with an analysis and review of the Planning Commission need to identify the reasons for the existing restrictions to begin with and come up with good reasons to change those restrictions, in a written point by point evaluation, discussion, justifications for change, and conclusions based on logic, consensus, as well as the perceived will and needs of the people.
- Carson City has an economic capture rate significantly greater than it current population would ever justify, hence, Costco, the vehicle dealerships, and medical care opportunities, among others. Where will the proposed new dispensary be located? What is the proximity to existing similar facilities? Will this negatively impact the existing facilities capture area? If so, to what extent? What will be the fiscal impact on the City revenues, if any?
- What are the specific justifications for Additional Cannabis stores within the City limits? Are they based on population growth? Increased per capita demand? The need for increased competition? A study of the economics of adding another seller, both pros and cons needs to be done. The requirements for additional parking? Given the time in the store, the need for increased parking spaces, with double lines between spaces, e.g., Costco? What are the positive and negative impacts of any proposed change?
- Why four marijuana establishments? Would four really drive down the price of the product? Increase competition? Would any future decision hold up in Court, since it restricts competition? How is that restriction justified? Are prices subject to any governmental review? If so, what are they? What has been done is other similarly sized governmental entities? These facilities are significant traffic generators. What is the impact of the proposed facility on adjacent facilities and permitted uses? Will this proposal increase costs and send the sales underground?

If you are going to change the availability of a controlled substance, some call a gateway drug, you better have some very good, well thought out, and clearly elucidated reasons and reasoning so that your decisions will hold up in court.

Christie Overlay

From: manfredo121@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 10:43 AM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Cannabis store

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Dear Sirs-

I would not be in favor of another cannabis outlet store. There are enough of them to meet the demand. I don't see any lines outside the stores either. I don't really care to have them at all, but do realize they supply a need for a small population of our citizens. Please do not authorize anymore, I don't feel the need to have one on every corner in town. Thank you for this opportunity to be heard.

Sincerely,

A. Manfredo

Sent from my iPad

Christie Overlay

From: Robin Williams <bukamom@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 1:16 PM
To: Planning Department; Robin Williams
Subject: Cannnabis Dispensary

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Please do not allow more cannabis dispensaries in the Carson City area. It effects our city, our families and our children. Younger children are using marijuana because it is legal for use by adults, so they think it is safe. Is anyone looking at the additional issues and need for additional sheriffs to police Carson City.

Please 2 are enough. Thank you!

Robin A. Williams Daytime phone: 775/885-8398 FAX: 775/885-2134

Christie Overlay

From: Nancy Campbell <campbellsdelight@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 1:05 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: online comments

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Some of us can't make the meetings but would still like to be heard.
A place for us online to be heard too would make it possible for more voting residents to comment.
Thank you,
Nancy Campbell
Carson City resident

Christie Overlay

From: Nancy Campbell <campbellsdelight@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 10:28 PM
To: Christie Overlay
Subject: Polling the community

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Poll the community before adding more cannabis stores.
I say NO!

Christie Overlay

From: Lucinda Mahoney <Lucinda@cannabellakitchen.com>
Sent: Friday, July 1, 2022 10:01 AM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Additional Dispensaries in Carson City - Please pass along this note to Planning Commission members

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Good morning Planning Department,

Will you please pass this email along to the members of the Planning Commission? Thank you

Good morning Commission members,

My name is Lucinda Mahoney and I am the owner of Cannabella Kitchen, a marijuana production facility located here in Carson City. I just became aware that you are considering adding additional dispensaries in Carson City. I am very interested in seeking one of these additional licenses.

I'd like to share the background of my current marijuana business located in Carson City. Cannabella is the producer of high quality edibles, many of which are all natural and healthy. We target customers who are seeking healthy solutions. We sell our products to dispensaries around the state. I received the first production license in Carson City in 2016 and I have been successfully operating my business since this time. I applied for a dispensary license in Carson City in 2015 with the State of Nevada and I was ranked 3rd. Additionally I applied for a license when the State reopened for dispensaries some years ago and noted Carson City as the jurisdiction, just in case Carson City opted to allow additional licenses. I wanted to be next in line.

We have been operating our business in the highest manner. We pay our taxes timely, we have passed all the inspections conducted by both the local and state inspectors. We hire Carson City locals for the production work. I also procure as many services as I can with local vendors. For example, I use Data Graphics to create all of our labels because I believe in supporting the local economy. We are a quiet neighbor off highway 50 and are respectful of our surroundings to ensure we are not in any way disruptive to the neighborhood. I have a home in Carson City.

I would appreciate the opportunity to be considered for one of the two additional licenses, should you decide to move forward on this decision. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Also, I am respectfully asking to testify at the July 27 meeting on this topic.

Kind regards,

Lucinda Mahoney
Lucinda @ Cannabellakitchen.com
907-227-6010

Christie Overlay

From: Afre1941 <afre1941@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2022 3:02 PM
To: Planning Department
Cc: Public Comment
Subject: Marijuana establishments

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

At the last Planning Commission meeting Community Director Hope Sullivan was correct when she stated, "(Residents) may not have personalized it like they would if they got notice of a physical construction site next to their house". This referenced the issue of lifting the municipal code restriction, and allowing up to two additional marijuana establishments. This was a very insightful comment inasmuch as the average citizen does not regularly read the agenda for all public meetings. We appreciate that this item was delayed until the next meeting to give concerned citizens an opportunity to provide input.

As long time residents of Carson City we enjoy living in a small neighborly community where history and recreation are valued. We were a bit dismayed when the city government originally decided to host two Marijuana stores as we feel this negatively impacted our city's image. Now that 2 additional Marijuana shops are under consideration we are concerned that Carson City will lose its image as a small, quaint, historical community and instead become known as the "**Pot Capital**" of Nevada. We urge you to please uphold the existing municipal code restriction for the benefit of our community.

Sincerely,

C. K. and Adrienne Freeman

Christie Overlay

From: Robin <robin@tristatecommercial.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 11:18 AM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Amending Municipal Code

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Carson City Planning Commission,

There is no legitimate reason to amend the municipal code to allow additional marijuana dispensaries in Carson City. There are more than enough marijuana sources in our community and 2 additional dispensaries in Mound House and Washoe within a 20 minute drive. The easy access to pot has increased the burden on law enforcement as the Sheriff's department had to pay for an additional K-9 unit to sniff out drugs in school lockers – an occurrence that has increased significantly. There is no way to keep pot out of the hands of minors and adding another dispensary sends an additional message of acceptance.

Furthermore, an additional store would not increase the revenue to the city, it would simply divide the "pie" into smaller pieces.

Douglas County doesn't allow any marijuana stores which was a smart move. The additional revenue the industry generates for the City is insignificant compared to the cost of the increased demands on law enforcement and the negative impact on the lives of our children.

Please do not amend the municipal code.

Robin Stevenson
1821 Chaise Drive
Carson City, NV 89703
775-885-2772

Christie Overlay

From: shelly@tristatecommercial.com
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 4:22 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Qualcan Application

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Dear Planning Commission Members:

I am writing to oppose the application by Qualcan, LLC to amend our municipal code to permit an additional retail marijuana store in Carson City. Given the increasing amount of evidence refuting the assertion that pot is a benign drug with few, if any, adverse impacts on the health of the consumer, I would have a difficult time, as a member of the Commission, making the finding that the proposed amendment and the resulting increase in the number of pot shops in Carson City, won't adversely impact the "public health, safety and welfare" of our citizens, especially the children in our community. When adults in authority are cavalier about the impacts of the actions they take, the children who witness this behavior are equally cavalier. According to Sheriff Furlong, the use of pot by kids in our community is "very high" and has necessitated the purchasing of a second drug sniffing dog specifically to ferret out pot in our schools. The applicant alleges that their project "will deliver much-needed development to the area ... and a sizable tax dollar infusion". The south end of Carson City is already a healthy commercial hub with a plethora of national retailers. As a property owner in the area, I reject the notion that a new retail development anchored by a marijuana business will someone strengthen the viability of an already vibrant retail community. In addition, no amount of additional tax revenue is worth placing our youth at further risk.


Respectfully,

Shelly Aldean
Eden Managements
504 W. Fifth Street
Carson City, NV 89703

MEMORANDUM

07/14/22

TO: Hope Sullivan
FROM: Paul McGrath
SUBJ: Retail Marijuana Stores



It is requested the attachments be made available to each Planning Commission member before their scheduled meeting on July 27th.

When the current Pot Shop(s) provide marijuana deliveries to the locals and to adjoining counties and then using all the frontage of the commercial property for drive thru pickups has saturated the marijuana market and declared the city to be "wide open" for drug activities.

Thanks for your assistance.

SUMMARY – THE MARIJUANA INDUSTRY IN THE NEVADA STATE CAPITAL

01/10/2020

In November, 2016, Carson and Douglas voters were among 13 Nevada counties to vote against the "legalization" of marijuana in Nevada. Question 2, the marijuana-industry written initiative, passed statewide by 100,000 votes, with the entire victory margin coming from Clark County.

Passage of Question 2 put Nevada in direct conflict with federal law. Marijuana remains a Schedule 1 "dangerous drug" under the Controlled Substances Act, most recently reaffirmed by the Obama Administration after an exhaustive Health and Human Services review completed in August, 2016.

The Nevada initiative provides that individuals over 21 can possess, consume or purchase one ounce or less of marijuana. This "legalization" has statewide application. Marijuana is now "legal" in all 17 Nevada counties.

Notwithstanding "legalization", the initiative empowered "localities"—cities, towns and counties—to determine the extent of "commercialization", if any, they want in their own communities. Localities can limit or "zone out" entirely marijuana commercial establishments—"pot shops" and "grow operations".

In April, 2017, responding to passage of Question 2, with Douglas County having voted against "legalization", a unanimous county commission adopted an ordinance to "zone out" all marijuana establishments in Douglas County—cultivation, testing, product manufacture, distribution and retail facilities.

The action of Douglas County officials mirrors the actions of the overwhelming majority of localities across the country where statewide "legalization" initiatives have been adopted. In Colorado, with statewide "legalization" passing in 2012, the vast majority (73%) of localities—cities and counties—ban commercial marijuana establishments. Since California passed its statewide "legalization" in 2016, less than 30% of cities and towns allow pot shops—with only 18 of 58 California counties allowing pot shops in unincorporated areas.

Even in affluent Marin County, where "legalization" passed overwhelmingly, all eleven municipalities and the county itself slammed the door on commercial marijuana. Likewise, Compton voters soundly rejected pot businesses in their city by a 3-1 margin. Massachusetts, another state adopting "legalization" in 2016, now has an increasing majority of 190 of 351 state jurisdictions "opting out" of commercialized marijuana.

The 3-2 vote of the Carson Board of Supervisors in July, 2017 approving commercial marijuana is therefore a remarkable anomaly. The vast majority of jurisdictions in states that have legalized marijuana statewide reject commercial pot shops and grow operations in their local communities. The Supervisors' vote clearly defied majority public opinion in Carson City, where marijuana legalization was rejected by voters.

Carson City officials' approval of commercial marijuana raises questions about whether personal, private gain outweighed the public interest. Some Carson officials have been facilitators, boosters and enablers of the commercial marijuana industry. City Manager Nick Marano left his job on June 1 to go to work for Green Thumb, Inc, a Chicago-based multi-state cannabis operator that owns the RISE marijuana dispensary on Clearview Drive and the cultivation facility on Deer Run Road in Carson. Since his hiring in May 2014, Marano was city manager when RISE was awarded medical marijuana licenses resulting from Supervisors' action in July, 2014 and recreational licenses from Board votes in July, 2017.

Similarly, Mayor Bob Crowell is identified as a partner on the Kaempfer Crowell law firm website, which promotes a nine lawyer "Cannabis Team". The law firm "assists clients with the filing of applications for dispensaries, cultivation and production establishments at the state and local level". Mayor Crowell voted in favor of licensing medical marijuana establishments in July 2014 and recreational establishments in July 2017.

Marijuana/illegal drug crises in the state's capital

From: Paul MCGRATH (pdmac_2@att.net)

To: lbagwell@carson.org; jbarrette@carson.org

Date: Wednesday, February 5, 2020, 12:46 PM PST

It has been nearly a month since a meeting with you was requested. Your response was appreciated, but prolonging a meeting won't make it go away. A tentative schedule has been developed to meet with local service clubs, women's groups, men's group, and others to get the word out of the drug crisis w/in our community and how we got there in the first place.

A number of solutions including making the effort to take our town back to where we were & using local resources. One plan is a board action for debate at a scheduled meeting using some of the information already provided. This would be taking a big step forward and would definitely cause some disruption in the community and on the board. We must remember we would not be in the current situation if certain board members had played by the rules. Information from you in resolving this issue could be discussed during the meeting.

Looking forward to hearing from you. If you want the sheriff involved (as observer)one of you needs to invite him.

Paul McGrath

On October 5, 2017 the **AB+C Cannabis Squad** was established within the Board of Supervisors with the passage of Bill No 124 & 125 (Ordinance #2017-21 & 2017-22). ("A" represents Supervisor Abowd; "B+" represents Supervisor Bonkowski colluding w/Supervisors Bagwell & Barrette; and "C" represents Mayor Crowell) to include recreational marijuana as a lawful Carson City business. The proposed Logo as indicated on the front cover depicts the names of those in their official capacity who override Carson City Voters rejection of recreational marijuana sales in the election of 2016. They violated their Oath of Office, ethical, and other federal and state statutes. This BOS will be known as **AB+C Capital City Cannabis Squad (AB+C CCCS)** on all future correspondence relating to this matter. Additional information would be forthcoming when a grand jury is impaneled to investigate license holder(s), funding sources and other matters under the jurisdiction of the State Taxation Department.

led pot program quits state job

Jenny Kane Reno Gazette Journal
USA TODAY NETWORK

Deonne Contine, the state official who charged Nevada forward into its recreational marijuana program, is resigning from her position as the director of the Department of Nevada Administration.

Contine's resignation was announced in an email to state workers sent on Thursday morning and signed by Sisolak's Chief of Staff, Michelle White, the Nevada Independent first reported. Contine will be replaced by Peter Long, the current administrator of the department's Division of Human Resource Management, as acting director.

Gov. Steve Sisolak appointed Contine as the director of the Department of Administration in February.

The Reno Gazette Journal is attempting to reach Contine for comment.

Contine served as the director of the department of taxation during the rollout of the state's recreational marijuana program, which began sales in July 2017. Contine was charged with creating the taxation, safety and security regulations that would dictate the day-in and day-out business of the fledgling industry.

Contine resigned from the position in January 2018 to pursue a career in the private sector, but she did not specify that she was pursuing work in the marijuana industry. The Reno Gazette Journal reported in July that Contine was listed as a board member for Sierra Well, which owns dispensaries in Reno and Carson City. Her name was published in both the May and August lists of some 8,900 names disclosed by Sisolak's bill to improve transparency surrounding the industry.

"I ultimately decided (actually very quickly) that the private sector just wasn't where my heart is. I was happy to have the opportunity to transition back to public service, which is really what I have a passion for," said Contine, who said at the time she has since left Sierra Well.

Contine said she was resigning from the Department of Administration because of family obligations, she told the Nevada Independent.

DRUGS IN THE CAPITAL CITY

03/01/2019

A notable quote from our new Governor on 2/13/19 in the joint hearing of the Senate and Assembly judiciary committees: "I'm here because I believe that when the citizens of our state make a decision at the ballot box, government should do all it can to carry out that decision". This statement from Nevada's chief executive should have been made over two years ago to give proper direction for the Carson City Board of Supervisors (BOS) in determining that medical and recreational should not be legalized in Carson City.

The policy statement of the Governor should apply to our local elected Board of Supervisors (BOS) who have taken the opportunity to ignore the will of the citizens of the Capital City. The BOS enacted through resolutions and ordinances, recreational marijuana cultivation, testing, wholesale and retail sales. Public records disclose that recreational marijuana was going to be authorized for use by at least three of the board members before voting to legalizing retail sales on October 5, 2017 (this information was received from the former city manager, who has now an employee of the marijuana industry. It was also disclosed that Carson City was not going to be left out of the anticipated windfall tax dollars going to Washoe County"). The other two board members relented after colluding with other board members and the promise of drug dollars the city could expect when recreational marijuana was legal.

The state announces and reports revenue projections for marijuana sales statewide that exceed expectations. The citizens of Carson City have no knowledge of the dollar amounts collected for use in the city/county unless search of revenue categories is made at city hall. The expectations of city officials of 'drug dollars' coming to city coffers is disappointing. In determining revenue projections, categories are listed separately, "gasoline, liquor, tobacco and others", but marijuana taxes can't be easily located. Estimated revenues for 2016 was Business Licenses and Permit Fees \$292,000/State Shared Revenues \$160,000; FY 2018 Business License \$454,990.70/State Allocations \$160,611.41, far below what the promoters announced to the public.

Medical Marijuana sales and use was introduced in 2013 by Ward Two Supervisor Brad Bonkowski on December 5th. The commercial property managed by Bonkowski is the location for the retail sales of medical marijuana. This same location at Clearview and south Carson Street is still in use today but expanded to allow for retail sales of recreational and medical marijuana. This commercial property is managed by NAI Alliance, and Supervisor Brad Bonkowski is a "Principal" of NAI Alliance. Supervisor Bonkowski promotes on the website: that he "owns a commercial real estate brokerage, and has extensive experience with industrial, commercial and investment properties, redevelopment and economic development transaction, as well as land development and entitlement." Bonkowski is joined by associates in developing commercial properties in Carson City.

This commentary will address Bonkowski's actions as a Board of Supervisors member in introducing and directing others (board members) to authorize medical and recreational marijuana cultivation, testing, wholesale and retail sales in Carson City. Certain sections of the NRS apply to his actions on the BOS in addressing Carson City's expanding drug problem. NRS 281A requires public officers and employees to hold public office as a public trust and avoid conflicts between public duties and private interests (NRS 281A.020). Section 281A.400(1) "Seeking or accepting any gift, services, favor, employment, engagements, emolument or economic opportunity for himself or person to whom he has a commitment in a private capacity which would tend improperly to influence a reasonable person in his position to depart from the faithful and impartial discharge of his public duties" and Section 281A.400(2) "Using his position in government to secure or grant unwarranted privileges, preferences, exemption or advantages of himself, any business entity in which he has a significant pecuniary interest, or any person to whom he has a commitment in a private capacity". NRS 281A.400(5) "Acquiring, through his public duties or relationships, and information which by law or practice is not at the time available to people generally and using the information to further the pecuniary interests of himself or any other person or business entity". NRS 281A.420(3) "Failing to abstain from acting on an official matter which is materially affected by his acceptance of a gift or loan, pecuniary interest, or commitment in a private capacity to the interest of another person".

Bonkowski's commercial real estate business has become foremost in his dealings with Carson City growth and development. As a BOS member and seated on transportation and redevelopment committees he has firsthand knowledge of Carson City growth plans. As noted in BOS meetings back to 2013, Bonkowski has put the community into situations that jeopardizes the health, security, welfare and safety of Carson City residences and their visitors. Section NRS281A.420(3) that truly identifies Bonkowski's public voting on matters that enhance his own personal interest. For the public records references, the dates that are important for this commentary are: 2013 – 12/05 & 12/19; 2014 - 01/16, 02/06, 06/19, 07/03, 10/02 & 10/16; 2017 – 01/05, 01/19, *07/06, 07/20, *09/21 & *10/05.

Other records used in developing this commentary are 2016 Campaign donations, Carson City Public Works correspondence, Carson City Finance Office, the Secretary States office and newspaper articles published in the local and Reno newspapers. The July 6th footnote (*) is important reading as it was then the BOS approved commercial marijuana on a 3-2 vote.

The September 21st and October 5th footnotes (*) are also important votes because Bonkowski decides to be absent. The most important vote(s) a Supervisor could make for the future of this community, Bonkowski is a NO-SHOW. On the October 5th meeting, Bonkowski was going to be questioned about his involvement in developing and guiding other board members to approve recreational marijuana. The purpose was to put him on record of his voting history and using his position as a board member to bring this illegal drug into the community. The Supervisors' vote clearly defied majority public opinion in Carson City where marijuana legalization was rejected by voters. Important for this commentary is the fact that majority of jurisdictions in states that have legalized marijuana statewide reject commercial pot shops and grow operations in their local communities.

Normal protocol when concerned citizens have complaints about actions taken by public officials the states' Commission on Ethics requires a complaint be filed. During August 2018 a complaint comprised of more than one hundred fifty pages was hand delivered to the commission's office. The complaint outlined the voting history of Bonkowski in guiding other board members to approve commercial marijuana sales and cultivation in Carson City/County jurisdiction. The Carson District Attorney advised the BOS in a public meeting that commercial properties near the airport, FAA Airport dollars would cause a conflict with commercial marijuana businesses. The public record would reflect the personal efforts of Bonkowski to rezone the commercial properties that NAI has listings in the north-east Carson. After six weeks waiting period required by the Commission on Ethics, e-mail correspondence was received that no action on the ethics complaint would be taken, without explanation. This rejection was questioned and additional information could be forthcoming.

The information used for this commentary reveals conflict of interest and self-dealing to bring unwanted commercial marijuana operations to the city. The Public Corruption Unit of the Department of Justice was provided a summary of the ethics complaint in December 2018. Carson City needs a Grand Jury to review actions by the BOS and City Management as it relates to commercializing marijuana in our Capital City. The Grand Jury should also question why a rush job to allow commercial sales of marijuana six month early, why after approval the city manager become a plant manager of the Carson's Clearview Drive marijuana outlet, and why after approval the state's Taxation Director is employed of the Crowell's law firm.

Information developed in the preparation of this commentary reveal collusion by public officials and city staff. The questions need to be answered with the city's wide- open drug policies, that commercialization of marijuana, will bring other businesses, including drug lounges and other expansion of the marijuana industry. It is really to bad that the Board of Supervisors did not have the foresight of the new Governor when they did not know the meaning of NO from the voters.

4718 Ponderosa Drive
Carson City, NV 89701

July 24, 2019

Honorable Aaron Ford, Esq.
Attorney General
100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701

Dear General Ford:

This correspondence is to request for an investigation by your staff into public corruption by elected city officials in Carson City. The out of control illegal drug use in the community was brought about by the mayor and certain board members who have violated their Oath of Office. They have used their positions not only to violate our civil liberties but have violated the state Ethics Laws on numerous occasions.

Criminal statutes are also being ignored that jeopardize the health and safety of our children and young adults and have brought Nevada's state capital to be known as the place to go for unrestricted public use of marijuana. On any given day, public use of marijuana can be observed. A few examples observed by the undersigned (1) "selfies" being taken by a couple in front of our Capitol building; (2) ordering from a fast food restaurant in south Carson street a different couple was so "stoned" they could not figure out how a two for one offer worked; (3) while at the doctor's office (wife's eye exam) a customer not wanting to wait, left the building, rolled a "joint" and smoked it; (4) while at the AT&T store a couple waiting stepped outside, entered their car and started smoking; and last, but not least (5) while leaving a local grocery store on Hwy 50, the couple with fifteen feet just pulled out a pipe from his jacket and begin smoking, but at least he shared it with his female grocery shopper.

The complaint was directed to the Ethic Commission who acknowledged jurisdiction but stonewalled the response/request. The ethics complaint involved using their official position to not only introduced, but to participate and then vote on the agenda item. The complaint outlined alleged collusion, corruption, fraud, and conspiracy. The Department of Public Safety was contacted because of marijuana and other illegal drug violations and recommended your office be contacted due to certain protocols.

From my prospective, civil liberties (as a voter), and those of the majority of Carson City Voters have been violated. The Board of Supervisors has violated their Oath of Office, conspiring to bring an unwanted illegal substance into the community, using their official position(s) to enhance their financial wellbeing, malfeasance, defrauding the citizens and elevated the Capital of Nevada as the place to go for cannabis and other drugs. The open door policy that exists hampers any efforts for public safety agencies to properly enforce drug and associated criminal laws.

The two plus year file is lengthy, and contains times, dates, places, and voting records that put this community in a position where the drug industry in now in control. A few examples of related correspondence and other matters are enclosed. This file is available for your review and use.

Respectfully



Paul B. McGrath

Enclosures

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

KYLE E. N. GEORGE
First Assistant Attorney General

CHRISTINE JONES BRADY
Second Assistant Attorney General



STATE OF NEVADA
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

JESSICA L. ADAIR
Chief of Staff

RACHEL J. ANDERSON
General Counsel

HEIDI PARRY STERN
Solicitor General

August 5, 2019

Via Electronic Mail

Mr. Paul B. McGrath
4718 Ponderosa Drive
Carson City, Nevada 89701
pdmac_2@att.net

Re: Carson City Board of Supervisors/Mayor Bob Crowell and Brad Bonkowski

Dear Mr. McGrath:

Thank you for contacting our office to file a complaint. It is being forwarded to the appropriate investigative unit within the Office of the Attorney General for review. As is the case with all law enforcement agencies, we can neither confirm nor deny the existence of any investigation. If any further information is needed, you will be contacted by a member of our staff.

Once again, thank you for reaching out to the Office of the Nevada Attorney General. I hope you will find the above-referenced information helpful.

Sincerely,

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

By: Diana Herrera
Constituent Services Unit



AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

KYLE E. N. GEORGE
First Assistant Attorney General

CHRISTINE JONES BRADY
Second Assistant Attorney General

JESSICA L. ADAIR
Chief of Staff

LESLIE NINO PIRO
General Counsel

HEIDI PARRY STERN
Solicitor General

STATE OF NEVADA
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

April 29, 2021

Via U.S. Mail

Paul McGrath
4718 Ponderosa Drive
Carson City, MN 89701
pdmac_2@att.net

Re: Cannabis

Dear Mr. McGrath:

Thank you for contacting our office to express your views on Cannabis in Carson City. As your Attorney General, Aaron D. Ford I look forward to learning about the issues facing each and every Nevadan. Hearing from you is one of the most effective ways our office has to protect Nevada's families.

We appreciate you taking the time to reach out to our office, and we will keep your correspondence on file.

Sincerely,

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

By: Constituent Services Unit

From: Paul MCGRATH (pdmac_2@att.net)

To: atrumble@nevadaappeal.com; ralston@thenvindy.com; gwf2138@aol.com; jhart@mynews4.com; dana@nevadacurrent.com

Date: Saturday, December 21, 2019, 03:20 PM PST

Mr. Trumble/Appeal Editor

After attempts to have a review of the op-ed which pertains to out of control drug(s) availability and use in our community, the final version of the history of how Carson City became #1 in drug related deaths due to policies of our governing board is attached. The stonewalling from responsible community leaders to keep information from the public is another story. It appears the length of this op-ed maybe a problem, and if this is a reason for not responding, a couple of suggestions are: (1) make it a news story; (2) separate and publish on different week days that home delivery service is available as a two part series; (3) make the font smaller to fit in allocated space.

With the announcement from the Governor's office of a task force looking in marijuana licensing, and the sudden departure of the former state tax director from his employ, the hiring of the former city manager in the drug industry, commercial zoning changes to accommodate the marijuana industry, and property managing by board member(s) in established recreational and medical marijuana retail sales businesses should have been enough "red flags" to alert some responsible officials that something is not proper.

As the community's major news outlet you would think some type of reporting would have been forthcoming about the drug crisis that was reported in the National News last August, and now the crisis is almost out of control with the open city policies on marijuana use by the governing board.

Thank you for your attention.
Paul McGrath, 4718 Ponderosa Dr., Carson City, NV 89701
775-882-4686/pdmac_2@att.net

January 1, 2020

Supervisor Barrette (JBarrette@carson.org) & Bagwell (LBagwell@carson.org)

HOW CARSON CITY BECAME THE DRUG CAPITAL OF NEVADA

The attached has been directed to news outlets that cover the Carson area. The city has become a magnet for those who want to use drugs openly without any fear of being challenged by public safety or other officials. It has also become a magnet for the homeless who gravitate to jurisdictions with lax enforcement policies. The harm done to the community with respect to their health and safety is attributed to the Board of Supervisors who decided to override the vote of the citizen's in the election of 2016.

This op-ed/ commentary is for information and alert to both of you, the Board of Supervisor must take action to reverse the out of control availability of drugs in the state Capital. As public records reflect, both of you opposed retail sales of recreational marijuana, but then changed your vote. In a meeting with former city manager (Supervisor Barrette present) on another matter (road taxes) and just before final voting on the resolution/ordinance that authorized retail marijuana sales, the former manager stated "were not going to let Washoe County to get all the revenue" and approval was "in the bag". The former city manager was right and now works for the industry, and the sponsor(s) (Bonkowski/Abowd/Crowell) of the ordinance and Bonkowski who had so much confidence it would be passed decided to go on a vacation before the final vote(s). With Bonkowski's known ethic problems and statute violation(s) he did not want to be associated with bring the marijuana industry permanently into the community. A real leader who couldn't find time to vote on the most important issue in the community, and who mastermind arranging for approval.

Before questionable actions by the board is brought to the attention of Carson City residences, you both are requested to use your positions on the BOS to develop a reversal plan to get the Capital City out of the drug business. A simple board agenda with information used from the attached could be the starting position in developing information for the agenda and make it an "action" item. Other issues not revealed in public records are damning and indicate the collusion among public officials should be of interest in your quest to resolve the drug problems.

Should you desire to stonewall this matter and hoping it will go away, a couple of other actions will be considered that involve a campaign to notify the community. Using the attached as a brochure and handout along with other pertinent correspondence to local civic groups and political organizations that bypass the media who may have the same inclination to not cover outrageous violations of the public trust. A citizen's petition would be directed to the federal court for a grand jury. Some local officials who have been compromised in setting the community up to accept the marijuana industry would be disclosed. It is hard to accept the community as being a "3-C" member (collusion, corruption & collaboration) because of the policies adopted by our governing board. Maybe malfeasance should be added for conduct.

Honorable Cheryl A. Lau, Commission Chair

October 15, 2018

Nevada Commission on Ethics

Complaint No. 18-048C

704 West Nye Lane

Carson City, NV 89703

Dear Ms. Lau:

The Commission's email of September 12, 2018 setting forth Amended Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation in the above referenced complaint was received on October 8th. This just caused more confusion than the original order issued on August 16, 2018, which states "—the Commission accepts jurisdiction because Subject is a public officer. However, it declines to investigate this matter and dismisses the Ethics Complaint based upon a lack of sufficient evidence to support alleged violations of the Ethics Law." My question is if the Commission declines to investigate, how can this dismissal be based on "a lack of sufficient evidence"? The amended Order provides information about Commissioner O'Neill which would be appropriate, however it should have been noted that Commissioner O'Neill has financially supported Mr. Bonkowski's reelection in 2016, according to finance reports filed with the Secretary of State. This report also reveals financial support by other current BOS members who supported/voted for the sale of recreational marijuana over the objections of this community. Marijuana is still a Class I drug that is against federal law and Bonkowski, an elected official used his position to introduce this drug into the community through his real estate business.

The 2016 election was important to this community because it has caused more illegal drugs into our homes and on the streets. In addition, the community sent a strong message to the BOS in their vote and during public testimony that recreational marijuana sales and cultivation was not wanted because of the problems associated with this illegal drug. Mr. Bonkowski's, as a member of the Carson City Board of Supervisors has placed himself on commissions and boards that allows advanced knowledge of changes in our community that have benefitted him personally and his associates. Because the Commission has failed to investigate the ethics complaint, they missed the sequence of events as outlined in the complaint, Bonkowski's voting history since 2013 on marijuana issue that is now plaguing our community. The creditability of Bonkowski as a board member has really been challenged when all his dealing with the other board members were abandoned during the critical vote to approve recreational marijuana. The most important vote of his political career, Bonkowski is a "NO SHOW".

A couple of examples personally witnessed while at the State Capitol in August, two persons were sitting on the south corner of the entrance steps enjoying a "smoke". The smell of marijuana was so strong, and when they were noticed immediately walk south away from observation. The second event just recently was at a local Fast Food place of business on the south end of Carson when a young couple trying to figure out a two for one meal coupon had them confused and took nearly five minutes just to place their order. These individuals smelled of recently smoke marijuana. These examples demonstrate the contempt for this communities' public safety laws, thanks to Bonkowski and other members of the BOS who were persuaded to change their vote, and who voted on the "windfall of dope dollars" to solve Carson City's financial shortfalls.

I would argue that Mr. Bonkowski (and others) is in violation of the Nevada Revised Statutes 281A.400 as his conduct did directly enhance his and others economic opportunity. NRS 281A.400(3) reads "A public officer or employee should not participate as an agent of government in the negotiation or execution of a contract between the government and any business entity in which the public officer or employee has a significant pecuniary interest". Mr. Bonkowski did in fact have a pecuniary interest in the property located 4385 S. Carson Street (dope headquarters for the city) in 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018. The former City Manager is now one of their employees. Talk about collusion!

Prior to the final vote on approval of recreational marijuana, a meeting with the former City Manager and newly elected Ward 4 Supervisor Barrett about road maintenance and repairs was held. During this meeting, the recreational marijuana issue and vote was discussed. The former City Manager was insistent that the resolution would pass, and Barrett advised he was changing his vote. The reason for his change was the total drug dollars the city was expecting and the concerns for road maintenance and repairs in Ward 4 would be addressed with the anticipated revenue. The supervisor's reasoning for changing his vote has been completely disregarded because sales receipts go to the state. The city is only reimbursed for expenses and administrative costs. According to the recent city treasurer's report the anticipated "windfall" failed to appear.

"No More Pot Shops in Carson" was the headline in the Appeal on September 21, 2018. "Carson City is sending a message to cannabis businesses hoping to open more pot shops here – it's not going to happen." The article continues "Supervisor Brad Bonkowski, who's a broker owner with NIA Alliance, a commercial real estate broker, said he was aware of business holding on properties in the city in anticipation of locating marijuana outlets there." It should be noted that commercial properties near the Carson Airport had a "zoning change" caused Bonkowski. The changes would have allowed marijuana businesses to exist in the north-eastern part of Carson City. With new offerings of NIA Alliance in this area, NIA Alliance must be the place to go if you want to be a cannabis wholesalers or retailers. The article continues "City ordinance allows for four marijuana outlets – two retail stores and two medical marijuana dispensaries, which must be co-located. Those outlets are already operated by Rise on Clearview Drive and Sierra Well on Highway 50 East." It looks like Bonkowski has the marijuana business under control. In the future you can be assured new businesses (smoke shops/smoking lounges, hotel bars, etc) will be petitioning the city to allow "their" business to locate in the city, like the downtown area. If Bonkowski has a commercial listing, how would he be voting?

Violations of the Ethic Laws are considered a civil matter and punishment is normally fines and to make corrections in conduct. Criminal statutes are different, and Public Corruption, Conspiracy, Fraud, and so on would require action from the Attorney General or the federal government.

Your cooperation to assure a proper "investigation" into this matter would be appreciated.

Contact information: 4718 Ponderosa Drive, Carson City, NV 89701; Telephone No. 775-882-4686; Email pdmac_2@att.net.

Respectfully,

Paul B. McGrath

CANNABIS IN NEVADA'S CAPITAL - HOW THIS HAPPENED

Carson City is one of those Nevada jurisdictions where "Big Marijuana" has found a home. Recreational marijuana should not be allowed in Carson City because voters rejected retail sales of recreational marijuana in the 2016 general election.

The Board of Supervisors who had already decided to allow both medical and recreational marijuana to be in our homes and with reduced enforcement on our streets ignored the vote of our citizens. This put our community on a course to become in two short years the number one community in drug related deaths (News 4-Fox11 Digital 8/4/19 study by 24/6 Wall St/USA Today). What a position to be in, out doing both Clark and Washoe counties for the most drug related deaths in Nevada as reflected in the survey. It should be noted that marijuana is a "gateway drug" and classified as a Class I drug under the Federal Controlled Substance Act.

In 2013, a proposal was introduced by a commercial real estate broker and Carson City Board of Supervisors member to allow retail sales of marijuana for medical use. This public official engaged in marketing of the property and business location, then introduced the agenda item, acted in discussions and voted for approval of the resolution and ordinance. There are Ethics Statutes that govern elected and public officials and prohibit this type of personal involvement. Public records from 2013 to 2017 show this board member directed and expanded other cannabis/marijuana businesses in Carson City. Zoning changes in certain locations, marketing certain properties, licensing marijuana type businesses and other actions that involved three of the board members in pursuing marijuana businesses would be part of the economic growth that was projected for the community.

The time has come to reverse the damage the former Board of Supervisors caused this city by their unethical conduct which has brought the city to be #1 in drug deaths.

Two board members are needed to introduce a resolution and bill to restrict sales of recreational marijuana. This action would open debate in the community and expose collusion, collaboration and malfeasance by public officials who have violated their oath(s) of office.

Complaints in writing to the Ethics Commission is the normal procedure when naming public officials that use their government position(s) to enhance their own personal interest. Certain officials are excluded from scrutiny. The Ethics Commission takes no responsibility to investigate certain complaints of misconduct by Carson City officials who violate ethic statutes. Other community members have experienced the same rejection by the commission when filling complaints against the same Carson City official(s).

Examples of collusion among elected officials, ethics commission, and city staff include, the former city manager leaving to work in the drug industry, the state tax director who rushed early start marijuana licensing then left his position to associate with the former law firm of the mayor. Another example of an ethic commission member who donated campaign dollars to the supervisor who originated, introduced, and acted upon medical and recreation marijuana sales and markets commercial property for the industry. These are violation of the state's Ethics Statutes and have exasperated the existing opioid crisis in Carson City.

City business records are not available for public review for the cannabis industry. Residents who use marijuana in their homes may influence their young children (students) who could become users and dependent on marijuana as well as experiment with other drugs. Past news articles involving juveniles as young as 13 using a gun to obtain marijuana, selling marijuana at the high school, or packing marijuana on their person to be used at lunch break or other school activities are just a few examples of how far the community is out of control.

The FBI has declared the marijuana industry "to be a public corruption threat" and "Nevada's regulatory structure is at best inept and at worst corrupt."

10/31/21

School Board Meeting

From: Paul MCGRATH (pdmac_2@att.net)

To: rvarner@carson.k12.nv.us

Date: Tuesday, March 15, 2022, 01:55 PM PDT

Rich - It has been a long time since we have talked. I'm requesting a meeting w/school board members on the out-of-control use and availability of drugs, especially marijuana, the (gate way drug). Service clubs, political organization, religious groups, and others have been provided with the information or being scheduled for the 10--15-minute presentation w/handouts. It addresses how Carson City became involved in the cannabis industry and BOS ignoring ethics laws and using their positions to enhance themselves. Carson City during the last five years has become #1 in drug related deaths (outing LV & RNO).

The pandemic has shut down communications with the community. Since 2017 the BOS overrode the voters and allowed recreational marijuana to be part of the business community, so starting from scratch. The push back from our current BOS is very noticeable.

If you could schedule a short presentation at your next meeting it would be appreciated. Please let me know. 775-882-4686/cell 775-742-6300 or email pdmac_2@att.net

Paul McGrath - 4718 Ponderosa Dr., CCNV

Information on Carson's Drug Problems

From: Paul MCGRATH (pdmac_2@att.net)

To: carsoncitylions@gmail.com

Date: Monday, March 28, 2022, 11:46 AM PDT

This is a request to make a presentation to your membership at a schedule meeting during April. The presentation w/handout(s) will take about 10-15 minutes.

At the March 3rd BOS a handout was given to the board to be included as a public record during "public comment(s)". The handout relates to how and why Carson City has become the state's Drug Capital because of policies established from the previous BOS in 2018. This presentation will challenge the current BOS to address the issue and makes recommendations to reduce the available of "illegal" drugs in the Capitol.

After the March 3rd board meeting, a number of local service organizations in March have contacted. The VFW, Democratic organization for a virtual presentation, and Kiwanis. The Republican Central Committee is scheduled for April 28th @ 6:30 pm.

If additional information is needed, please advise.

Thanks,
Paul McGrath
4718 Ponderosa Dr
Carson City, NV 89701 - 775-882-4686/Cell 775-742-6300

COMMENTARY

Enough is enough



Shelly Aldean

The Carson City Planning Commission has delayed action on a request by Qualcan, a cannabis company based in Las Vegas, to open an additional retail marijuana outlet in Carson City. To the commission's credit, the matter was tabled in anticipation that a delay might encourage additional public input. The matter will be reconsidered at the commission's July 27 meeting.

For those of us who fought vigorously against the licensing of any recreational marijuana outlets, the very fact that this matter is back before the commission is disheartening.

In 2017, after some rather contentious hearings, the Board of Supervisors amended the municipal code to require that any retail pot establishment be co-located with the two existing medical marijuana dispensaries and confined to certain zoning districts as a way of restricting the retail growth of the industry in our city.

For those of us concerned about the impacts of the increased availability of

teens on youth substance abuse, mental health and suicide prevention, it was determined, not surprisingly, that more young people are using pot and experiencing greater mental health issues in states with permissive marijuana laws. In parts of the country where recreational marijuana is fully legalized, monthly consumption is 47% higher among adolescents and 81% higher among young adults than in states where pot is illegal. The increased use of pot correlates closely with the rise in self-reported cases of major depressive episodes, mental illness, and suicidal thoughts.

Ironically, one of the objectives of the Initiative to Regulate and Tax Marijuana in the state of Nevada included "Requirements to prevent the ... diversion of marijuana and marijuana products to persons under 21 years of age."

with any luck, the city could avoid many of the adverse impacts that the unbridled growth of the industry has had on other parts of the country. This is why the current action pending before the commission is such a disappointment.

While, as a businessperson I appreciate the importance of free enterprise, as a former elected official, I also understand the importance of honoring commitments to the people you serve and respecting the wisdom of your predecessors. It is bad public policy to amend a municipal ordinance simply to accommodate one applicant who wishes to change the rules.

In a recent nationwide study commissioned by the Drug Free America Foundation and Johnny's

Ambassadors, an organization offering education for


ferreting out pot in our local schools. According to Sheriff Furlong, the use of pot by kids in our community is "very high."

While I suspect that not all of the marijuana being provided to our local youth, by careless or irresponsible third parties, is purchased at existing pot shops, the very fact that we are even considering the licensing of another retail outlet to further saturate the market and increase the risk to our children astonishes me.

As a city we have always prided ourselves on our quality of life. Let's not sacrifice the welfare of our kids and the safety of our community simply because of an unwillingness to say "enough is enough."

Shelly Aldean in a Carson City resident.

CAPITAL CITY CANNABIS



**ILLEGAL DRUGS ARE IN
CARSON CITY**

**AB+C/CCCS
Supervisors
Abowd, Bonkowski, Barrett,
Bagwell, & Mayor Crowell
are....Carson City's
Cannabis Squad**

Carson City is one of the Nevada jurisdictions where “Big Marijuana” has found a home. Recreational and medical marijuana can be purchased openly at any of the city’s approved retail businesses within Carson City and one of them provides deliveries and curb side retail. This means the location is a major distribution center for illegal marijuana as defined in the United States Code.

The former US Attorney for Nevada proclaimed the marijuana industry “to be a public corruption threat” and “Nevada’s regulatory structure is at best inept and at worst corrupt.” This proclamation has now been realized with a full-service cannabis industry in Carson City.

In 2013 a proposal was introduced by commercial real estate broker and Carson City Board of Supervisors member to allow retail sales of marijuana for medical use. This public official engaged in marketing of the property and business location, introduced the agenda item, acted in discussion, and voted for approval of both the resolution and ordinance in violation of state ethic laws.

Throughout 2017 and 2018 certain Squad member(s) repeatedly considered various issues regarding the marijuana industry in Carson City. Public records indicate three Squad members did habitually with purposeful intent conceal their business associations from the public, commercial property owners, and others owning parcels in new zoning areas within Carson City.

Carson City Public records are not available for review by the public of ownerships, financing, and responsible party(s) for the cannabis industry and citing limited access for disclosure as defined in legislation of 2018. The licensing information has the State Taxation Dept. responsible for cannabis licensing, with business licensing the responsibility of the individual counties.

Residents who use marijuana (*gateway drug*) in their homes influence children and visitors who could become users and dependent on marijuana as well as experimenting with other dangerous drugs. Past news articles report juveniles as

young as 13 using a gun to obtain marijuana, selling marijuana near the high school or packing marijuana on their person to be used at lunch breaks or other school activities, are just a few examples of how far the community is out of control. Concerns of jurisdictional enforcement of violations are confusing at best to both state and local officials.

The policy of declaring retail cannabis businesses as “*essential business*” during the COVID-19 crisis is another example of the hold the cannabis industry has over local and state officials.

Carson City has been reported to have the worst drug problem in Nevada. A study showed Carson to be #1 in drug deaths in the state (8/4/19-News 4 Fox11) and (12/4/21 NV Appeal) that over the past five years Carson City has steadily ranked among the least healthy of Nevada’s Counties. One must wonder what has been the effect of cannabis on our health ranking with wide open sales and use in Carson City during the study period.

Information provided is recommended to reduce drug availability and usage to let the community heal from the shenanigans of Carson’s Cannabis Squad. Carson City must come together to reverse the damage caused by the Squad’s conduct while in elected office.

● **Frequent reporting of activities where “drugs” are involved in situations where public safety officials, first responders, or health care providers are summoned. CCMC should be revised to reflect changes for enforcement use and public health services.**

● **Revoke licenses of retail cannabis businesses in Carson City. These licenses should have never been issued as the voters rejected retail recreational marijuana. Collaboration by the Squad and abuse of their positions to cater to the Cannabis industry has caused Nevada’s Capital City to be a distribution center of illegal drugs in Northern Nevada.**

● **Because of local, state, and federal statutes and violations by the Squad, the current Board of Supervisors should consider requesting impaneling of a Grand Jury. Some local and state officials appear to have been compromised.**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
CONTACT
PAUL McGRATH
www.CCCSABC.com

STAFF REPORT FOR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 29, 2022

FILE NO: ZA-2022-0263 & ZA-2022-0292

AGENDA ITEM: 14.G & 14.H

STAFF CONTACT: Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

AGENDA TITLE:

ZA-2022-0263 For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a request from Qualcan, LLC (“Applicant”) for a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors to amend Division 1.20 of Title 18, Appendix of the Carson City Municipal Code (“CCMC”) to amend various provisions relating to marijuana governing the number of retail marijuana stores allowed in Carson City and the availability of drive-through services at medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores.

Staff Summary: The Applicant is proposing to amend the CCMC to increase the number of retail marijuana stores authorized in Carson City from two to three and to provide for drive-through sales at medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores. Section 678B.260 of the Nevada Revised Statutes (“NRS”) permits up to four retail marijuana stores in Carson City.

ZA-2022-0292 For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a request from the Carson City Board of Supervisors (“Board” or “Applicant”) for a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Board to amend Division 1.20 of Title 18, Appendix of the Carson City Municipal Code (“CCMC”) to establish various provisions relating to marijuana governing curbside pickup at medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores.

Staff Summary: On August 5, 2021, the Board considered an ordinance banning curbside pickup at medical marijuana dispensaries and at retail marijuana stores. The Board rejected the proposed ordinance and requested that an ordinance establishing curbside pickup provisions be brought back before the Board. This ordinance proposes to amend the CCMC to allow curbside pickup under certain conditions at medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores.

PROPOSED MOTIONS:

“I move to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of an ordinance amending Division 1.20 of Title 18, Appendix of the Carson City Municipal Code to amend various provisions relating to marijuana governing the number of retail marijuana stores allowed in Carson City and the availability of drive-through services at medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores.”

“I move to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of an ordinance amending Division 1.20 of Title 18, Appendix of the Carson City Municipal Code to establish various provision to marijuana governing curbside pickup under certain conditions at medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores.”

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS: CCMC 18.02.050 (Review); CCMC 18.02.075 (Zoning map amendments and zoning code amendments); and NRS 278.260.

KEY ISSUES: Is the request to increase the allowable number of marijuana retail stores and add the ability for drive-thru and curbside service appropriate?

DISCUSSION:

ZA-2022-0263:

The Applicant, Qualcan, LLC, has requested an amendment to the marijuana regulations in Division 1.20 of Title 18, Appendix of the CCMC (Title 18 Appendix is also known as the Carson

City Development Standards (“CCDS”)) to increase the number of retail marijuana stores allowed in Carson City and to include drive-through services.

Number of Retail Marijuana Stores: In 2016, Nevada voters passed The Regulation and Taxation of Marijuana Act (codified as NRS Chapter 453D and later amended and recodified as NRS Title 56), legalizing recreational marijuana in Nevada. In 2017, the Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance to allow for recreational marijuana establishments under certain conditions. Currently, CCDS 1.20.1(j) limits the number of medical marijuana dispensaries to two and CCDS 1.20.1(k) allows for a marijuana retail store to be jointly located within the same premises as an existing medical marijuana dispensary, thereby limiting marijuana retail stores to two as well.

However, NRS 678B.220(c) permits a county with a population of 55,000 or more but less than 100,000 to have a maximum of two licenses for medical marijuana dispensaries, and NRS 678B.260(c) permits a county with a population of 55,000 or more but less than 100,000 to have up to four licenses for adult-use cannabis retail stores (adult-use cannabis retail stores are stated in the proposed ordinance as marijuana retail stores).

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the CCMC to allow for a total of three retail marijuana stores in Carson City. As noted above, per NRS and based on the population of Carson City, an additional two more retail marijuana stores could potentially be allowed in Carson City, if permitted by the City’s regulations.

As noted, however, CCDS 1.20.1(k) effectively prohibits more than two marijuana retail stores in Carson City because those stores must be co-located with a medical marijuana dispensary. (As a caveat, it is theoretically possible, although practically unlikely, that two marijuana retail stores could be co-located on the premises of one medical marijuana dispensary. However, as applied here, such a requirement would effectively prohibit the proposed, stand-alone marijuana retail store.) To alleviate this concern, the proposed ordinance reverses the co-location requirement, requiring medical marijuana dispensaries to be located within a marijuana retail store. This would permit additional retail stores in Carson City, but limit the total number of points of sale of marijuana.

Staff has consulted the Carson City Sheriff’s Office (“CCSO”) on this matter. The CCSO has no objections to an additional retail marijuana store and notes that they have not experienced any marked challenges with the existing operations in Carson City. Based on the input from the CCSO, staff recommends increasing the number of allowed marijuana retail stores.

Drive-through services: Currently, CCDS 1.20.2(c) expressly prohibits drive-through services at medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores. The applicant has requested a text amendment to allow for drive-through services. As presented to the Planning Commission, the text amendment simply changes “prohibited” to “permitted” to allow for drive-through services at a marijuana retail store.

Staff has consulted with the CCSO on this matter as well. The CCSO has requested that this option be scrutinized to ensure that there are adequate safety and security measures for monitoring to prevent access to juveniles. The CCSO indicated that providing cameras at the drive-through with full access at the CCSO could help to alleviate these concerns.

Based on the input from the CCSO staff recommends allowing for drive-through service at marijuana retail stores only if adequate safety/security cameras are provided with access given to the CCSO for real time monitoring of the drive-through.

ZA-2022-0292:

The Applicant, the Carson City Board of Supervisors, has requested an amendment to the marijuana regulations in CCDS 1.20 to establish curbside pickup provisions for marijuana retail stores and medical marijuana dispensaries.

On August 5, 2021, the Board of Supervisors considered an ordinance banning curbside pick-up at medical marijuana dispensaries and at retail marijuana stores. The Board rejected the proposed ordinance and requested that an ordinance establishing curbside pick-up provisions be brought back before the Board. The proposed ordinance was initially delayed and the provisions were to be added in conjunction with the comprehensive revisions to CCMC Title 18. However, since another application requesting an amendment to the marijuana regulations has been received, the ordinance addressing curbside pickup is being brought forward at the same time.

Consistent with the prior discussion at the Board of Supervisors, staff recommends permitting curbside pickup of marijuana.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

As of the writing of this staff report, no public comments were received. Any comments that are received after this report is complete will be submitted prior to or at the Planning Commission meeting, depending on their submittal date to the Planning Division of the Carson City Community Development Department.

OTHER CITY DEPARTMENTS OR OUTSIDE AGENCY COMMENTS:

The application was routed to commenting agencies and the following comments were received:

Development Engineering:

Carson City Public Works Department Engineering Division (“Development Engineering”) has no preference or objection to the amendment requested. Development Engineering has analyzed how a third retail marijuana establishment would affect city infrastructure. In general, retail marijuana establishments have minor to moderate impacts on City infrastructure, and City infrastructure can support the imposed demand, but specific projects will be required to be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

Sheriff’s Office:

The CCSO has no objections to an additional retail marijuana store. The CCSO has not experienced any marked challenges with the existing regulations or existing operations in Carson City. The CCSO cautions, however, that the option to have drive-through service be scrutinized to ensure that there are adequate safety and security measures for monitoring to prevent access to juveniles. Providing cameras at the drive-through with full access at the CCSO could help to alleviate these concerns.

FINDINGS:

The Planning Commission, in forwarding a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for approval of a zoning code amendment, shall make the findings of fact found in CCMC 18.02.075(5). The following findings are recommended by staff:

- 1. That the proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with and supports the goals and policies of the Master Plan.**

The proposed text amendments to allow for additional retail marijuana stores and drive-through and curbside services do not conflict with any goals or policies of the Master Plan. Goal 2.3 of the Master Plan encourages the City to provide opportunities for a range of retail services; and Guiding Principle 5: *A Strong Diversified Economic Base* encourages the City to maintain and enhance the base of primary jobs and provide a broader range of

retail services to serve residents of Carson City as well as those in surrounding counties. The state has authorized Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments as a legal use in Nevada. In order to implement those uses in Carson City, the City must provide for any applicable regulations.

2. That the proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with existing adjacent land uses and will not have detrimental impacts to other properties in the vicinity.

The proposed text amendments will not change the type of land use permitted per the zoning ordinance; therefore, it will not create incompatible land uses. Allowing for additional retail marijuana stores and expanding services to curbside and drive-through would be consistent with other similar uses in the same zoning districts.

3. That the proposed amendment will not negatively impact existing or planned public services or facilities and will not adversely impact the public health, safety and welfare.

The requests include increasing the number of retail marijuana stores allowed in Carson City and expanding services to include drive-through and curbside. The proposed amendment would not result in increased impacts on public services or public health, safety and welfare. Each new retail marijuana store will be required to obtain a special use permit, at which time the project will be evaluated for project specific impacts. Additionally, any existing medical marijuana dispensary or retail marijuana store that wishes to expand its services to include drive-through and/or curb-side services will require an amendment to their special use permit, at which time the project will be evaluated for project specific impacts. The CCSO has reviewed the requested text amendment and has no objections to an additional retail marijuana store. The CCSO has noted concern with the possibility of drive-through service but also notes that cameras at the drive-through with full access at the CCSO could help to alleviate these concerns.

Attachments:

- 1) Draft ordinance for ZA-2022-0263
- 2) Draft ordinance for ZA-2022-0292
- 3) ZA-2022-0263 application packet

Summary: An ordinance adding provisions to increase the number of allowed marijuana retail stores and permitting drive-through pickup.

BILL NO. _____

ORDINANCE NO. 2022 - _____

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO MARIJUANA; ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS GOVERNING THE NUMBER OF RETAIL MARIJUANA STORES AND PERMITTING DRIVE-THROUGH PICKUP; AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

The Board of Supervisors of Carson City do ordain:

SECTION I:

That Title 18 Appendix (CARSON CITY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS), Division 1 (LAND USE AND SITE DESIGN), Section 1.20 (Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments), is hereby amended (**bold, underlined** text is added, ~~stricken~~ text is deleted) as follows:

1.20 – Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments. (NRS Title 56)

The following standards are intended to establish minimum standards and Special Use Permit review criteria for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments, in addition to other standards for commercial and industrial development.

1. The following standards apply to all Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments:

(a) Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments require the issuance of a Special Use Permit. Special Use Permits for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments are only valid at the specific location for which a person has obtained the required approval through the applicable state agency to operate as a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment. A Special Use Permit that is issued in accordance with this Division automatically expires and shall be deemed void if the Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment loses or otherwise forfeits the required state approval to operate. A Special Use Permit issued in accordance with this Division is not transferable between operators and locations within Carson City. Except as otherwise provided in this Division and notwithstanding any other provision of CCMC, a separate Special Use Permit is not required for a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment that will be established in an existing location at which a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment in good standing already operates. The expansion of any location of a Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment that will result in an increase of more than 10 percent of the space in which the Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana

Establishment has been approved to operate requires the issuance of an amended Special Use Permit.

(b) The consumption of marijuana products is prohibited on the premises of any Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment.

(c) All business activities related to Medical Marijuana Establishments and any marijuana cultivation facility, marijuana testing facility, marijuana product manufacturing facility or retail marijuana store must be conducted indoors and within a permanent building. The use of an office trailer or other temporary structure is prohibited. All Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments must at all times maintain an interior and exterior appearance that is professional, orderly, dignified and consistent with the traditional style of pharmacies and medical offices.

(d) The outdoor display or sale of any Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment merchandise or product is prohibited.

(e) Accessory outside storage for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments must comply with the provisions of Title 18 Appendix (Carson City Development Standards), Division 1.12 (Outside Storage).

(f) Access to Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment must comply with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations.

(g) Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment merchandise and products must not be visible when viewed from outside the building in which the Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment is located.

(h) All signage for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana establishments must be discreet, professional and consistent with the traditional style of signage for pharmacies and medical offices. All Medical Marijuana establishments and Marijuana Establishments are limited to following signage:

(1) A maximum of 30 square feet of wall sign area.

(2) A maximum of 32 square feet of freestanding sign area.

(3) The maximum freestanding sign height for Marijuana Dispensaries and Marijuana Retail Stores shall be determined by the applicable commercial or shopping center regulations of Division 4 (Signs).

(4) The maximum freestanding sign height for all Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments other than Marijuana Dispensaries and Marijuana Retail Stores shall be 10 feet.

(5) Where a Medical Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Establishment are jointly located on a single property, the maximum permitted sign area applies to the property and not each type of Establishment.

(i) Off-street parking must be provided for Medical Marijuana Establishments and Marijuana Establishments in accordance with the following:

(1) For Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Marijuana Retail Stores,] a minimum of one space for every 300 square feet of gross floor area.

(2) For Medical Marijuana Cultivation Facilities and Marijuana Cultivation Facilities,] a minimum of one space for every 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

(3) For Medical Marijuana Product Manufacturing Facilities and Marijuana Product Manufacturing Facilities, a minimum of one space for every 500 square feet of gross floor area.

(4) For Medical Marijuana Testing and Marijuana Testing Facilities, a minimum of one space for every 400 square feet of gross floor area.

(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of CCMC, not more than 2 Medical Marijuana Dispensaries **and 3 Marijuana Retail Stores** are allowed to operate at the same time in Carson City.

(k) A **Medical Marijuana Dispensary** [~~Marijuana Retail Store~~] may only be jointly located within the same premises of **a Marijuana Retail Store** [~~an existing Medical Marijuana Dispensary~~] that is operating in good standing.

(l) A Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment is prohibited within 1,000 feet of a public or private school that provides formal education traditionally associated with preschool or kindergarten through grade 12, or within 300 feet of a facility that provides day care to children, a public park, a playground, a public swimming pool, and any other center or facility, the primary purpose of which is to provide recreational opportunities or services to children or adolescents, which already exists on the date the application for the proposed Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment is submitted to the applicable state agency for approval to operate, as measured on a straight line from the property line of the nearest school or facility to the front door or primary entrance of the Medical Marijuana Establishment or Marijuana Establishment.

2. The following standards apply to all Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Retail Marijuana Stores:

(a) A single point of secure public entry must be provided and identified.

(b) Hours of operation are limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., daily.

(c) Drive-through service is **permitted**. [~~prohibited.~~]

(d) A Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Retail Marijuana Store is prohibited on any property, or within a shopping center with frontage, that is located on the same street on which a residentially zoned property is also located unless the dispensary or store is located more than 300 feet from the residential property, as measured on a straight line from the nearest residential property line abutting the street right-of-way to the front door of the dispensary or store.

3. In addition to the required findings for a Special Use Permit, the following standards must also be considered in the review of a request for a Special Use Permit for a Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Marijuana Retail Store to be located within the General Industrial zoning district:

(a) That the proposed Medical Marijuana Dispensary or Marijuana Retail Store is located where sufficient, convenient and safe access is provided to the public.

(b) That the proposed location has adequate lighting and street improvements for a use providing public access.

SECTION II:

That no other provisions of the Carson City Municipal Code are affected by this ordinance.

PROPOSED on _____, 2022.

PROPOSED by _____.

PASSED _____, 2022.

VOTE:

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

LORI BAGWELL, Mayor

ATTEST:

AUBREY ROWLATT, Clerk-Recorder

This ordinance shall be in force and effect from and after the 1st day of the month of September of the year 2022.

Carson City Planning Division
108 E. Proctor Street Carson City NV 89701
Phone: (775) 887-2180 • E-mail: planning@carson.org

For Office Use Only:

ZONING CODE AMENDMENT

FILE # ZCA - 18 - 2A-2022-0263

FEE: \$3,250.00 + noticing fee

APPLICANT

QUALCAN, LLC

- Application Form, Written Project Description and Supporting Documentation
- 6 Completed Application Packets (1 Original + 5 Copies)

MAILING ADDRESS, CITY STATE, ZIP

4145 WAGON TRAIL AVE, LAS VEGAS, NV 89118

Application Reviewed and Received By:

PHONE #

(702) 960-7778 / (702) 283-2033 *

FAX #

Submittal deadline: see attached PC application submittal schedule.

Note: Submittals must be of sufficient clarity and detail such that all departments are able to determine if they can support the request. Additional Information may be required.

EMAIL ADDRESS

mcristalli@qualcan.com

Requested Amendment to Development Standards: _____ or Title 18 1.20(1)(j)

SEE ATTACHMENT


Required Findings: Title 18 of the Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC) requires that the applicant must present evidence justifying the revision to the Code, that the proposed addition/deletion will be consistent with the objectives of the Master Plan and will not be detrimental to the surrounding properties. A statement relative to findings from Page 2 **MUST** be included herewith, or on an attached sheet.

Please remember that the requested code revision will affect **all** of Carson City and not only your parcel of land. Present your **statement with that in mind**. In addition to the brief description of your project and proposed use, provide additional page(s) to show more detailed summary of your project and proposal.

SEE ATTACHMENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF APPLICANT:

I certify that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.



Applicant's signature *Matt Robinson signing on behalf of Michael Cristalli, I am his designated representative.*

5/19/2022
Date



May 19, 2022

Nancy Paulson
City Manager, Carson City
201 N. Carson Street, Suite 2
Carson City, NV 89701

Dear Ms. Paulson,

On behalf of Qualcan and Mystic LLC, we would like to submit the following text amendment for review and consideration. A special use permit application has been submitted for the corresponding project, to be named "Jade Carson City."

"1.20(1)(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of CCMC, not more than ~~two (2)~~ **three (3)** Medical Marijuana Dispensaries **or Marijuana Establishments** are allowed to operate at the same time in Carson City."

Justification for Text Amendment

- (1) That the proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with and supports the goals and policies of the master plan
 - The proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with and supports the goals and policies of the master plan. We believe this project will deliver much-needed development to the area, improvements to shared infrastructure, and a sizable tax dollar infusion to the city.
- (2) That the proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with existing adjacent land uses and will not have detrimental impacts to other properties in the vicinity
 - The proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with existing adjacent land uses and will not have detrimental impacts to other properties in the vicinity. Qualcan, through our representatives, will continue working with surrounding landowners to ensure this.
- (3) That the proposed amendment will not negatively impact existing or planned public services or facilities and will not adversely impact the public health, safety, and welfare.
 - The proposed amendment will not negatively impact existing or planned public services or facilities and will not adversely impact the public health, safety, and welfare. Through talks with law enforcement and other stakeholders we are confident this amendment and project will be in alignment with the health and welfare interests of the public, as well as surrounding businesses and property owners.



We look forward to the opportunity to continue to work with and in Carson City and are always available to answer any questions and address any concerns. Thank you.

Regards,

Michael Cristalli, CEO
Qualcan
mcristalli@qualcan.com

Carson City Planning Commissioners:

Sierra Well wishes to express its concern with the proposed expansion of Carson City's cannabis dispensary market. Specifically, Sierra Well is concerned whether or not this community is able to support another cannabis dispensary and what the addition of another cannabis sales outlet would do in a market that has yet to express any concern for being inadequately supplied with cannabis.

COVID and its impacts on our economy were felt statewide and the cannabis industry felt those impacts too, but that never stopped Sierra Well. Sierra Well adapted to a curbside model and met the cannabis community where it was at: to continue servicing the medical patients and recreational customers who needed us the most.

2022 may be the most challenging year to date when it comes to cannabis operations in Carson City. COVID and its impacts, the forced adaptations required of the cannabis industry, inflationary constraints, general labor force challenges, rising prices for the cost of goods and supplies, and increased industrywide regulatory expenses create a compounding, complex, and challenging environment for a cannabis licensee to operate in. Additionally, the opening of a competing cannabis operation in Mound House just 5 miles away has already caused a much more strained Carson City cannabis market that raises the question: what benefit is it to Carson City to allow another cannabis operator to open? As Sierra Well sees no demonstrated need for another cannabis dispensary in Carson City and with the inelastic nature of demand for cannabis, an additional cannabis dispensary is unlikely to increase local revenue generated by the sale of cannabis products. As a point in fact, the opposite is likely to occur if Carson City's cannabis market does reach a level of sales saturation. This has been seen in Clark County and other highly competitive cannabis markets across Nevada, where the addition of recreational dispensary licensees has not increased total sales.

Sierra Well is proud of its Carson City store and thinks of it as the heart and flagship of its Nevada operations, but it has been a long journey to get to this moment. From medical sales and concerns over patient rights, to communication with our local Sheriff's office, followed by an industry-lead education campaign that hired Marine McNamara to help our employees achieve that higher level of security our community had asked for, Sierra Well and Carson City have done it together. In this way, Sierra Well would ask Carson City to do it with us together, again. If there is a question of updating some of Carson City's cannabis regulations, Sierra Well would like to have a seat at that table and advocate for changes to the code such as the addition of cannabis drive throughs or bigger store signs.

At this time, Sierra Well would ask that the Carson City Planning Commission dismiss the petition from Qualcan LLC as it appears to be insufficiently thought out and detrimental to the interests of Carson City as a whole. Conversely, Sierra Wellness would welcome a finalizing of the language around Carson City's curbside delivery policy as well as any discussion around drive through sales and larger signs for facilities.

Thank You,

Michael Livak
Chief Executive Officer
Sierra Wellness

Members of the Carson City Planning Commission,

It is with mild interest and general dissatisfaction that Green Thumbs Industries (GTI, dba Rise Carson City) learned of the proposal before the Carson City Planning Commission to amend the ordinance regarding cannabis retail store licensure in Carson City. This proposal would allow for the addition of one recreational-only cannabis retail store, in opposition to Carson City's previously stated position that it would only be allowing the operations of its medical and recreational cannabis stores, not the recreational-only licenses issued in 2018. Carson City stated this in ordinance, issued prior to the close of the licensing rounds of 2018, that clarified its intent to not allow the perfecting of any new recreational-only licenses. That ordinance announcement has been attached for clarification.

This is of interest to GTI because GTI is also the owner of Essence Henderson LLC, the winner of the third license, the first of the recreational-only license awarded in the 2018 state licensing round. Again, as one of the two owners of a recreational-only cannabis store certificate in Carson City, it is thought of as improper that we have had no opportunity to perfect that license, scope out properties, or allowed to follow through with our own due diligence when it comes to the development of our Carson City recreational license and did not seek to do so in respect for what our understanding of Carson City's wishes were: medical and recreational licenses only; no recreational-only license.

As there is no difference in the status of the license the applicants are asking to open compared to the license GTI also possesses, it is our opinion at this time the only determination, as seen in other jurisdiction in Nevada, is to refer back to the state licensing round of 2018 and the scores issued in that process to determine who is to be the "third" or "fourth" retail cannabis store within Carson City. As such, GTI is unaware why the applicant has asked for the activating of our "third" license in Carson City but at this time it is the opinion of GTI that we would much rather stick with the current status of cannabis in Carson City, "No recreational-only cannabis stores withing Carson City."

GTI has been the proud owner and operator of Rise Carson City since 2016 as Carson City's first medical marijuana dispensary. Since that day, we have grown with this community and have become welcome within it. As this is more than just a retail outlet but part of GTI's origin story, they have always felt a special connection to this community. Rise has always operated with Carson City in mind and have tried to give back in any way they have asked that starts with food banking and goes to participated as top tear contributor to the Carson City Boys and Girls Luau every year. So, we ask

this Commission to recognize this for what it is: planting a competitor a block away from our back door.

We previously asked and were told by members of the Board of Supervisors and by staff that at no time Carson City was considering cannabis expansion. If that has changed, we'd also ask for an expansion of zoning areas that allow for cannabis as we were previously limited to a selection of corridors where "medical marijuana sales" would previously be allowed. If there is to be an opening of Carson City's zoning code to allow for additional recreational-only cannabis operations we ask that it be a more informed and inclusive conversation.

Thank you,

Aaron Walden
Commercial General Manager
GTI, dba Rise Carson City



CARSON CITY, NEVADA

CONSOLIDATED MUNICIPALITY AND STATE CAPITAL

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES SEEKING TO LICENSE A NEW FACILITY FOR RETAIL SALES OF MARIJUANA IN CARSON CITY

To All Interested Parties:

Please be advised that the consolidated municipality of Carson City has recently adopted an ordinance which governs the local licensing of marijuana retail stores in Carson City. That ordinance, Bill No. 124 (Ordinance No. 2017-21) was effective on October 8, 2017 and can be viewed by using the following link:

https://library.municode.com/nv/carson_city/ordinances/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=856070

The ordinance requires a marijuana retail store to be jointly located with an existing medical marijuana dispensary in Carson City that is operating in good standing. Because Nevada law currently limits the number of registration certificates that may be issued for medical marijuana dispensaries within each county under NRS 453A.324 and Carson City already has met the statutory cap pursuant to this statutory limitation, the effect of Ordinance No. 2017-21 is that **no additional marijuana retail stores may be licensed in Carson City.** This ordinance was prepared with significant public input and adopted in accordance with state law and with Carson City's commitment to ensuring the proper balance between the community's concerns and the medical and retail marijuana industries.

Accordingly, please be aware that even if you obtain a state-issued license, Carson City staff are currently unable to process or issue any special use permit or business license to operate a marijuana retail store in Carson City.

For more information, please contact:

Nancy Paulson, Interim City Manager at:

npaulson@carson.org or by phone at 775-887-2100

Adriana Fralick, Interim Deputy City Manager at:

afralick@carson.org or by phone at 775-887-2100

Lee Plemel, Community Development Director at:

lplemel@carson.org or by phone at 775-887-2180

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE • 201 N. Carson Street, Suite 2 • 89701 • (775) 887-2100
Fax: (775) 887-2286 • E-mail: cceo@carson.org



2018 Retail Marijuana Store Application Scores and Rankings

Revised 4 pm 5/14/2019

CARSON CITY				
Rank	Business Name	DBA/LOGO	Score	Conditional License Yes / No
1	ESSENCE HENDERSON, LLC	ESSENCE	223.37	Yes
2	NEVADA ORGANIC REMEDIES, LLC	THE SOURCE	222.66	Yes
3	LONE MOUNTAIN PARTNERS, LLC	ZENLEAF	214.50	No
4	TRNV098, LLC	GRASSROOTS	196.49	No
5	CLARK NATURAL MEDICINAL SOLUTIONS, LLC	NUVEDA (THE GREEN SOLUTION)	191.67	No
6	NYE NATURAL MEDICINAL SOLUTIONS, LLC	NUVEDA (THE GREEN SOLUTION)	191.67	No
7	BIONEVA INNOVATIONS OF CARSON CITY, LLC	BIONEVA INNOVATIONS	188.00	No
8	CLARK NMSD, LLC	NUVEDA (THE GREEN SOLUTION)	178.84	No
9	D.LUX, LLC	D LUX	150.49	No
10	CN LICENSECO I, INC	CANA NEVADA	139.01	No
11	CARSON CITY AGENCY SOLUTIONS, LLC	CARSON CITY AGENCY SOLUTIONS	128.67	No

CHURCHILL COUNTY				
Rank	Business Name	DBA/LOGO	Score	Conditional License Yes / No
NO APPLICATIONS RECEIVED				

CLARK COUNTY- HENDERSON				
Rank	Business Name	DBA/LOGO	Score	Conditional License Yes / No
1	ESSENCE TROPICANA, LLC	ESSENCE	227.94	Yes
2	NEVADA ORGANIC REMEDIES, LLC	THE SOURCE	222.99	Yes
3	DEEP ROOTS MEDICAL, LLC	DEEP ROOTS HARVEST	222.49	Yes
4	CHEYENNE MEDICAL, LLC	THRIVE	216.50	Yes
5	GREENMART OF NEVADA NV, LLC	HEALTH FOR LIFE	213.33	Yes
6	CLEAR RIVER, LLC	KABUNKY	210.16	Yes
7	QUALCAN, LLC	QUALCAN	209.66	No
8	CIRCLE S FARMS, LLC	CIRCLE S	208.00	No
9	WSSC, INC	SIERRA WELL	201.50	No
10	VEGAS VALLEY GROWERS	KIFF PREMIUM CANNABIS	197.83	No
11	TRNV098, LLC	GRASSROOTS	196.49	No
12	HARVEST OF NEVADA, LLC	HARVEST	195.01	No
13	RED EARTH, LLC	RED EARTH	194.67	No
14	GRAVITAS NEVADA, LTD	THE APOTHECARIUM	194.66	No
15	CLARK NATURAL MEDICINAL SOLUTIONS, LLC	NUVEDA (THE GREEN SOLUTION)	191.67	No
16	NYE NATURAL MEDICINAL SOLUTIONS, LLC	NUVEDA (THE GREEN SOLUTION)	191.67	No
17	FRANKLIN BIO SCIENCE NV, LLC	BEYONDHELLO	190.66	No
18	GREEN THERAPEUTICS, LLC	PROVISIONS	188.34	No
19	NV 3480 PARTNERS, LLC	EVERGREEN ORGANIX	188.00	No
20	SERENITY WELLNESS CENTER, LLC	OASIS CANNABIS	180.17	No
21	GIBS NEVADA PARTNERS, LLC	SHOW GROW	180.17	No
22	CLARK NMSD, LLC	NUVEDA (THE GREEN SOLUTION)	178.84	No
23	ROMBOUGH REAL ESTATE, INC	MOTHER HERB	178.83	No
24	NEVADA GROUP WELLNESS, LLC	PRIME	178.18	No
25	WELLNESS & CAREGIVERS OF NEVADA NV, LLC	MMD	172.16	No
26	GOOD CHEMISTRY NEVADA, LLC	GOOD CHEMISTRY	167.17	No
27	TWELVE TWELVE, LLC	12/12 DISPENSARY	166.67	No
28	GLOBAL HARMONY, LLC	TOP NOTCH	165.34	No
29	JUST QUALITY, LLC	PANACA CANNABIS (HUSID)	163.83	No
30	FTW MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC	GASSERS	158.17	No
31	GREEN LEAF FARMS, LLC	PLAYERS NETWORK	148.51	No
32	LIBRA WELLNESS CENTER, LLC	LIBRA WELLNESS	134.17	No
33	NYE FARM TECH, LTD	URBN LEAF	133.34	No
34	GREENLEAF WELLNESS, INC	GREENLEAF WELLNESS	114.83	No
35	GREENWAY HEALTH COMMUNITY, LLC	GREENWAY HEALTH COMMUNITY	87.33	No

CLARK COUNTY- LAS VEGAS				
Rank	Business Name	DBA/LOGO	Score	Conditional License Yes / No
1	ESSENCE TROPICANA, LLC	ESSENCE	237.84	Yes
2	NEVADA ORGANIC REMEDIES, LLC	THE SOURCE	222.66	Yes
3	DEEP ROOTS MEDICAL, LLC	DEEP ROOTS HARVEST	222.49	Yes
4	HELPING HANDS WELLNESS CENTER, INC	HELPING HANDS WELLNESS CENTER	218.50	Yes
5	CHEYENNE MEDICAL, LLC	THRIVE	216.50	Yes
6	LONE MOUNTAIN PARTNERS, LLC	ZENLEAF	214.50	Yes
7	GREENMART OF NEVADA NV, LLC	HEALTH FOR LIFE	213.33	Yes
8	CLEAR RIVER, LLC	KABUNKY	210.16	Yes
9	WELLNESS CONNECTION OF NEVADA, LLC	CULTIVATE	209.67	Yes
10	CIRCLE S FARMS, LLC	CIRCLE S	208.00	Yes
11	QUALCAN, LLC	QUALCAN	207.33	No
12	MM DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, INC	PLANET 13 / MEDIZIN	204.01	No
13	JAP, INC	NATURE'S CHEMISTRY	202.83	No
14	WSSC, INC	SIERRA WELL	200.83	No
15	ACRES MEDICAL, LLC	ACRES DISPENSARY	199.84	No
16	LAS VEGAS WELLNESS & COMPASSION CENTER	PUGASUS NV	199.83	No
17	VEGAS VALLEY GROWERS	KIFF PREMIUM CANNABIS	197.83	No
18	NATURAL MEDICINE, LLC	NATURAL MEDICINE	197.17	No
19	TGIG, LLC	THE GROVE	196.67	No
20	TRNV098, LLC	GRASSROOTS	196.49	No
21	TRNV098, LLC	GRASSROOTS	196.49	No
22	GRAVITAS HENDERSON, LLC	BETTER BUDS	196.01	No
23	D.H. FLAMINGO, INC	THE APOTHECARY SHOPPE	196.00	No
24	HARVEST OF NEVADA, LLC	HARVEST	195.01	No
25	RED EARTH, LLC	RED EARTH	194.67	No
26	STRIVE WELLNESS OF NEVADA, LLC	STRIVE	194.00	No
27	CLARK NATURAL MEDICINAL SOLUTIONS, LLC	NUVEDA (THE GREEN SOLUTION)	191.67	No
28	NYE NATURAL MEDICINAL SOLUTIONS, LLC	NUVEDA (THE GREEN SOLUTION)	191.67	No
29	FRANKLIN BIO SCIENCE NV, LLC	BEYONDHELLO	190.66	No
30	LIVFERRE WELLNESS, LLC	THE DISPENSARY	190.17	No
31	INYO FINE CANNABIS DISPENSARY, LLC	INYO	189.68	No
32	TRYKE COMPANIES SO NV, LLC	REEF	189.33	No
33	NV 3480 PARTNERS, LLC	EVERGREEN ORGANIX	188.00	No
34	AGUA STREET, LLC	CURLEAF	188.00	No
35	GREEN THERAPEUTICS, LLC	PROVISIONS	187.67	No
36	POLARIS WELLNESS CENTER, LLC	POLARIS MMD	184.84	No
37	HIGH SIERRA HOLISTIC, LLC	HSH	184.83	No

Christie Overlay

From: Joel <joel9728@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 24, 2022 5:41 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Marajuana Dispensaries, NO!

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

My name is Joel Flamenbaum, I live on the Northside off of Arrowhead Drive.

An important prior commitment prevents my presence at this this weeks board meeting. I would like the following comments to be read into the public meeting records:

A few weeks ago Guy Farmer wrote a brief excellent comment as why the Carson Planning Commission should NOT vote in favor of changing the Municipal Code to allow a 4th marihuana dispensary entitled "Enough is Enough" I usually am not in agreement with most of Farmers comments but with this one, I am.
The areas encompassing Douglas, Carson and Washoe supplies enough Dispensaries within a short drive. I can see only one positive derived from allowing a 4th dispensary and that is a potential increase in tax revenues. But in my opinion that is a very small benefit with a lot of negative ones. While Marihuana has been made legal in most places around our nation I firmly believe out combined area has enough dispensaries to accommodate those that imbibe.
I ask strongly that the Planning Commission vote a unanimous NO on this proposal.

Respectfully,

Joel Flamenbaum

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

Christie Overlay

From: Ann James <anndomingosonntag@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 23, 2022 2:46 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: 7/27/22 agenda item 6.C ZA-2022-0263

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

yes! we need more cbd stores, as many as possible. since they are so heavily regulated and taxed, it's great revenue for carson city. much better than car washes and slaughterhouses.

ann james, author
"Bienvenidos a Calzoncillos"

Christie Overlay

From: bepsy strasburg <strasburgbpsy@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 1:38 PM
To: Planning Department; Heather Ferris; Hope Sullivan
Subject: Public Comments for July 27th on Marijuana retail and drive thru
Attachments: Did Carson City residents say that we need another Cannabis retail outlet.docx

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Hello Heather and Hope,

I will make some comments at the meeting but wanted to send you in advance due to the 3-minute limit.

Thank you,
Bepsy

Public Comment at Planning Commission, July 27th regarding increased # of cannabis retail stores in Carson City

Betsy Strasburg and Richard Nagel

Did Carson City residents say that we need another Cannabis retail outlet?

Who is Qualcan? Qualcan is a Las Vegas cannabis company – has anyone asked how many outlets they have in Las Vegas compared with the population size of Las Vegas? <https://investqualcan.com/>

“The Las Vegas Market is exploding. Nevada’s first year recreational retail sales of \$425M **drastically outpaced that of Oregon, Washington and Colorado.** Marijuana is already generating more tax revenue than alcohol. If it continues at this pace it should pass the estimated forecast revenue of \$814M by 2025.”

Is this what we want in our rural community where we value the quality of life of current and future generations? **We are not Las Vegas or Reno.**

What is the worth of City Commission approvals? In 2017, after some rather contentious hearings, the Board of Supervisors amended the municipal code to require that any retail pot establishment be co-located with the two existing medical marijuana dispensaries and confined to certain zoning districts as **a way of restricting the retail growth of the industry in our city.**

A subsequent Commission should not override public policy simply because a single applicant wants a change in the City rules. Do you believe in the Book of Rules or do you change them based on convenience?

Today, Marijuana, has become three to four times more potent than it was only a few years ago and has, according to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, led to psychosis **at a rate five times greater than among those who do not smoke pot** - not to mention a reported link between marijuana use and schizophrenia, paranoia, and other psychotic disorders.

With increased access, consumption is significantly higher among adolescents and young adults which correlates closely with the rise in self-reported cases of major depressive episodes, mental illness, and suicidal thoughts. Isolation during Covid has increased mental illness so do we now need to invent another way to harm our community?

Anyone remember the “Just Say No” programs? If you read the sheriff’s arrest records in the NevadaAppeal, every single incident have associated possession charges.

One study of pot products seized by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) found the potency has increased from about 4% THC in 1995 to about 12% in 2014. Newer products called marijuana concentrates can have levels of THC as high as 85% to 90%. Do you know **the consequences of this very high content of THC?**

Who is the beneficiary other than the applicant with increased profits? Sales tax revenue to the City? San Francisco just eliminated the sales tax on marijuana sales to compete with illegal sales just like underground cigarette sale. If you approve the change in City Ordinance, it is the same as Defund the Police – unforeseen consequences of a decision. Will Carson City need to build drug addiction treatment centers just like Las Vegas? Or should we leave the addicts live in tent cities on the sidewalks as in San Francisco?

Alexia Benshoof of the Nevada Division of Child and Family Services said nearly 20 percent of expectant mothers reported using pot. She said the **percentage of pregnant women** using illegal drugs and those using prescription drugs has remained stable over the past decade but that pot use is up **212 percent** since recreational use was legalized. The testimony came during the Interim Joint Committee on Health and Human Services. 15-28 percent of women in their child-bearing years now admit to using pot so access will cause addiction from birth and mental disorders.

This Commission should require a due diligence study of the adverse long term effect of increased access before tossing a deliberate action of a prior Board of Supervisors. This is so much more worse than a slaughter house outside the town.

Christie Overlay

From: Lisa Partee <dlpartee@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 2:04 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Marijuana dispensary

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Hello,

My name is Lisa Partee and I'm a resident of Carson City (my hometown).

I am against changing the laws and rules by allowing yet another Marijuana dispensary here. A recent article in the paper recently surmised that the current rules in place shouldn't be changed to accommodate one business who is asking for us to change the rules. I couldn't agree more! Because then there would be exceptions for EVERY applicant going forward to the point of oversaturation.

I'm sure those that wish the rules to be changed to allow it are just looking at the tax revenue the city will receive.
It's always about the money.

If I recall, the whole reason for allowing these dispensaries in the first place was because they were mainly to be used for medicinal purposes? Of course we've completely gone WAY past that by now. It's mostly recreational use now and that was the goal all along.

Next thing you'll be allowing pot lounges and smoking in public??

Just Say No, Please.

Lisa Partee
775-841-6452
1100 Fremont St
Carson City NV 89701

Christie Overlay

From: Madeline Nichols <mcnichols7@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 6:59 AM
To: Planning Department

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

To Whom this Concerns,

Concerns for this development are huge...making this availability sounds like it's must be very profitable for you rather than the concerns that marijuana opens the door to other more addicting drugs...the research is very clear and very defined.....you must reconsider with different opposition.

Respectfully,

Madeline Nichols

Christie Overlay

From: Mary DeFelice <Marenang@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 6:12 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Pot stores

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

No more pot stores!

40 year Carson City resident!

Sent from my iPhone

From: JACK ELDRIDGE
To: Planning Department
Subject: I think that each person should be able to make their own decisions on cannabis use. I am 91 years old and I don't use any form of cannabis, but I think it is up to each person to make their own decision as to make cannabis part of their life.
Date: Monday, July 25, 2022 6:47:41 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Sent from my iPad

Christie Overlay

From: Donald Asp <d.asp@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 7:11 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: No more marijuana stores in Carson City

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Hopefully you will not approve additional marijuana stores in Carson City. The number of stores currently in existence is more than sufficient.

Donald Asp
Carson City, Nevada

Christie Overlay

From: Mark Paloolian <m.paloolian@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 7:42 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Additional "pot" stores in CC....

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

I want to add my comments to the proposed additional pot stores within the city. I am opposed to doubling the available stores. I see no benefit for the city. We have enough dysfunctional humans within our city limits. There is no benefit to more impaired people walking our streets. Although you rarely turn down any development, this is one opportunity you have to do the right thing for the quality of life within the community.
Mark.....

Sent from my iPhone

From: Shellie
To: Planning Department
Subject: Marijuana dispensary
Date: Monday, July 25, 2022 6:04:42 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

As a native Carsonite, I am asking the board to reject changing the law or ordinance to allow yet another dispensary.

Do we need to start investigating kickbacks? Why is it the rules always change when a big company wants to come in? Do we need to start investigating the bank accounts of, or gifts to the supervisors? This is getting ridiculous.

Thank you,

Shellie Shannon
Carson City

Sent from my iPhone

Christie Overlay

From: Mary Bryan <meadowmary@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 4:46 AM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Marijuana

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

No need for more. Certainly no need for drive through.

Sent from my iPhone

Christie Overlay

From: CHERYL PAWLUK <cheryljp@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 10:38 AM
To: Planning Department
Subject: New pot stores

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

My spouse has used medical marijuanas fir years and relies on it for his glaucoma. He says we do not need more pot stores in Carson. Please vote no on this measure.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Christie Overlay

From: Derrick Miles <derrickxmiles@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:10 AM
To: Public Comment
Cc: Planning Department
Subject: Public Comment LU-2022-0262 (Qualcan proposal)

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

I am a cannabis industry professional and retail cannabis guest consultant in Carson City speaking on behalf of myself.

Since the initial request and discussion to increase the number of retail cannabis dispensaries to either 3 or the approved amount of 4 set by the state, I have read and heard a few arguments against that have been primarily fear based and quite disheartening.

I hope eventually we can move past the notions that cannabis is equally or more dangerous than the widely accessible and acceptable use of alcohol and tobacco. In reality, the barriers in place for those incredibly harmful substances pale in comparison to cannabis.

Unsurprisingly cannabis industry professionals and consumers alike are still reversing decades of miseducation and downright propaganda used to scare people about cannabis.

I'm not going to dissuade anyone of their fears of cannabis right now. Instead I ask the Commission to focus on two issues that I find vastly more important.

The first is with whom and where exactly Carson City's massive amounts of cannabis profits (not taxes) end up. Personally, I'd much rather see a local minority owned retail cannabis business that will proudly stand with, invest in and support our community in more ways than just selling cannabis.

I would ask the Commission to look into whatever avenues are available and within their control to seek only cannabis license candidates that will contribute to a locally based cannabis culture and directly give back to our community; to stray away from a complete corporate takeover of the industry in Carson City by multi-state operators.

All that being said, the Vegas headquartered Qualcan does operate several Jade dispensaries in the state, and would hopefully be a step up from having 3-4 Chicago based entities with large presences elsewhere pulling Carson's profits to Illinois.

The second focus is on the current zoning limitations that likely restrict where the few dispensaries allocated to our community can even exist. The freedom to choose from 3-4 different dispensaries is hampered when the ability to access them isn't equitable. Again compared to alcohol and tobacco access the particular discrimination in our cannabis policy is apparent.

This proposal places the third dispensary mere blocks from another off HWY 395. The other current dispensary is approximately 5 miles away on Lincoln HWY. I'm unsure how this increases the equity in accessing products for those living in various areas of the municipality, putting additional risks on the consumer that is well within their right to purchase retail cannabis. Many of whom are using cannabis products for severe medical issues.

With large gaps in accessibility, favoring proposals filling these "dry" spaces would significantly increase the equitability of access in our community.

I'd like to thank you all for your time and your consideration in seeking the community's input on this important proposal.

With Respect,

Derrick Miles
Carson City

Christie Overlay

From: D M Aunkst <agctry.a6@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 12:58 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting 7/27/22

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

I would oppose any further cannabis outlets in Carson City. We have two too many now. The consensus of the voters several years ago was against any recreational cannabis outlets in the City. (Only medical outlets were generally approved.)

And we do not need any drive-up or delivery cannabis services. The verification of customers would be compromised.

I think, the reason you are not getting more feed-back from the public is a lack of confidence in the decision making. People figure what's the use of input, they are going to approve it anyway.

David Aunkst
Carson City
775-410-7266