From: Kerby Coman
To: CED AMCO REGS (CED sponsored)
Subject: Enforcement Action Process Public Comment
Date: Monday, February 21, 2022 5:48:21 PM

You don't often get email from kerby@greendegree.net. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the State of Alaska mail system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Currently I believe the regulations are open for interpretation as to where NOVs get attached or tied to. I understand in the regulations or in the application process that "The Licensee" refers to both the entity itself that holds a MJ license or it refers to an individual that has financial interest in said license. I believe it was the intention to be the entity entity. With that being said when a license receives a NOV I believe that it should be tied to that specific license. Not the licensee. One of the reasons being if an entity has multiple license types I don't believe that the licensee (being an individual or an entity) should receive a 2nd violation for a similar infraction If one took place at a seperate licensed facility than 1st infraction took place at. Again NOVs should be tied to a specific license and not licensee.