

July 5, 2022

RE: Retail Cannabis Business License Application

To City of Grand Junction Clerk:

I received a letter from the city indicating that my application will not be entered into the lottery due to missing documents. I am officially requesting an appeal of this decision as I feel all the documents were included in my original submission.

-The city states that my application did not include a lease reflecting the legal rights of the Applicant to possess the proposed property for no less than three years. This lease WAS included in my application. It was a requirement of the zoning verification. I submitted a complete zoning package and received the zoning approval. The lease is a standard Colorado one year lease with an amendment outlining and additional four years of lease rights with a ladder step rent increase determined at each year. This lease was notarized on June 8th 2022 and was included in my submittal. I have attached a second copy of lease in this appeal.

-The city states that my application did not include a background check of fingerprints with the city. This also was in my submittal package. The finger prints were done with copy copy and they provided the sheet that they were done. The copy copy sheet was provided to the city with my submittal and the fingerprints were taken on June 8 2022. I then received a copy of the fingerprints in the mail. I have included this in my appeal. I paid to have my fingerprints done through the online system of both Colorado Fingerprinting and Identogo. I had a receipt of payment from both companies. Unfortunately, through their system the only date they offered online was June 9 2022. However, CopyCopy was able to do the fingerprints a day earlier on the 8th which allowed me to meet the City of Grand Junction's deadline. The physical copy of fingerprints that I received in the mail shows a date of the 9th in reflection of the original order. But in fact they were completed on the 8th.

- The city states that I did not adequately show financial contributions to be made in the cannabis business. This is also not the case. In the property lease it outlined where my financial investment was coming from. The original \$25,000 personal contribution is coming from me. These funds are being paid to me by the property owner. In order to get the property more aesthetically pleasing the property owner has agreed to pay me for construction labor. The property owner is paying me a total of \$25,000 to redo the exterior wheelchair ramp, clean exterior landscaping, repair and paint frontsteps, interior repairs and paint. This is where my original \$25,000 of liquid funds contribution is coming from. In the property lease it also outlines an additional \$100,000 line of credit that the property owner is extending to me with the outlined interest costs I am paying for that loan. My contribution to this start up company is a total of \$125,000 of which \$25,000 is my income and \$100,000 is a business loan. This \$125,000 is adequate for the entire start up costs for this business. Should I discover I need additional

AUG 19 2022 PM 12:25

funding for unforeseen circumstances and additional \$100,000 small business loan is available to me from the property owner.

-The city did indicate that my package did not include the floor plan/security checklist, cannabis business license of natural persons and marijuana findings of suitability owner entity. Again, this is not correct. All of those items were indeed within my submission package. The floor plan and security checklist was a requirement of the zone approval of which I did receive.

I hope that the city can see that I have jumped through every hoop that the city has asked. I did have a complete application at time of deadline. I hope the city accepts my appeal as I do believe I deserve the chance at the lottery along with other potential applicants.

The city of Grand Junction checklist was followed, however I feel the city did not provide an even playing field with all the applicants. On step 1 of the City Submittal requirements it said that Applicants were to schedule two hours for the application submittal appointment. I was informed by the City of Grand Junction that they had accepted those in person appointments at first. However, the city had received so many applications that they were no longer scheduling that two hour meeting. By no longer allowing for the application appointment, the City of Grand Junction established a scenario that applicants were not treated with equal opportunity. The people who were not allowed to have the in person two hour appointment were disenfranchised compared to the group who received hand holding of their application and walked through the tedious city requirements. This clouds a process and therefore creating a situation that eliminates equal opportunity for all. From the date that the city stopped accepting the two hour meeting appointments it discriminated against all future applicants by not allowing for equal rights and equal opportunity.

Again, I hope that the city can see that all required documents were included. The only item that I cannot see is the code number on the fingerprints. When ordering the fingerprints I used the code that was provided on the checklist. The city indicated that on one of the forms an incorrect code was used. I do not see that code nor know why it would be there. The correct codes were typed in when ordering fingerprints. Considering the background fingerprints were indeed done before the deadline, I don't see how the code would be a factor in the city rejecting this application for a chance to be included in the lottery.

Sincerely,

Alaameen Abdool