

LET OHIO GROW

Fixing a Broken Cannabis System

By Travis Vought

Copyright © 2026 by Travis Vought
All rights reserved.

For the people of Ohio—who deserve a system that actually works.

Contents

Introduction.....	5
Chapter 1: The Promise vs. Reality.....	8
Chapter 2: Anatomy of a Controlled Market.....	12
Chapter 3: Follow the Incentives.....	19
Chapter 4: The Border Problem.....	26
Chapter 5: The Michigan Comparison — Same Region, Different Rules, Different Results....	32
Chapter 6: What Actually Works	38
Chapter 7: The Ohio Cannabis Reset	45
Chapter 8: The Small Grower Pathway	52
Chapter 9: Consumer Freedom & Access	59
Chapter 10: Cannabis Culture & The Ohio Cannabis Cup.....	66
Chapter 11: Day One Actions.....	72
Chapter 12: The First 100 Days	79
Chapter 13: Cutting Through Bureaucracy	86
Chapter 14: Price Correction Strategy.....	94
Chapter 15: Law Enforcement & Transition.....	101
Chapter 16: Let Ohio Grow.....	108
About the Author.....	122

Introduction

Ohio legalized cannabis in 2023.

That decision was clear.

Voters chose to end prohibition and replace it with a legal, regulated system—one that would provide safe access, reduce reliance on the illegal market, create economic opportunity, and keep revenue inside the state.

The expectation was not complicated.

Legalization was supposed to work.

What Ohio built instead is something different.

On paper, cannabis is legal.

In practice, the system is tightly controlled, limited in scope, and constrained in ways that prevent it from functioning like a real market.

Supply is restricted. Participation is limited. Prices remain elevated. Consumers leave the state to find better options.

The result is a system that exists—but does not fully deliver on what voters approved.

This book is not about whether cannabis should be legal.

That question has already been answered.

This is about whether the system Ohio created is working—and what needs to change if it isn't.

The argument in these pages is straightforward:

Markets function when they are allowed to function.

When participation is open, supply can expand, and competition is real, outcomes follow:

- Prices stabilize
- Access improves

- Opportunity expands

When those conditions are restricted, the opposite happens.

Ohio's cannabis system is not underperforming because of bad luck or timing.

It is producing exactly what its structure allows it to produce.

That means the solution is not guesswork.

It is structural.

To fix the outcomes, you have to fix the system:

- Expand participation
- Allow supply to grow
- Reduce unnecessary barriers
- Align regulation with function instead of control

These are not radical ideas.

They are the basic conditions required for a market to work.

This book follows a simple path.

First, it defines the gap between what voters expected and what exists today.

Then, it breaks down how the system actually operates—and why it produces the outcomes it does.

From there, it compares Ohio's approach to a neighboring system that functions differently, with different results.

Finally, it lays out a practical framework for reform:

- What needs to change
 - How it can be done
 - What can be implemented immediately
-

This is not a theoretical exercise.

The effects of the current system are visible every day.

They show up in:

- The prices people pay
- The distance they travel to make purchases
- The opportunities that never materialize inside the state

The gap between policy and reality is measurable.

And it is correctable.

At its core, this is a book about alignment.

Aligning:

- Policy with voter intent
- Regulation with function
- Incentives with outcomes

Because when those elements are aligned, systems work.

When they are not, they don't.

Ohio has already taken the first step by legalizing cannabis.

The next step is making that decision work in practice.

That is the purpose of this book.

Chapter 1: The Promise vs. Reality

In November 2023, Ohio voters made a clear decision.

They chose to legalize cannabis for adult use. Not halfway. Not conditionally. Not as a pilot program. They voted to end prohibition and replace it with a legal, regulated market.

The expectation was simple.

Adults 21 and older would have safe, legal access without fear of arrest. Prices would come down as legal businesses replaced the black market. Small farmers and local entrepreneurs would have a real opportunity to participate in a new industry. Tax revenue would stay in Ohio and flow back into communities instead of disappearing into the underground economy.

That was the promise.

What Ohio built instead looks very different.

A Market in Name Only

On paper, Ohio has legalized cannabis. In practice, it has built a tightly controlled system that limits who can participate, restricts supply, and keeps prices artificially high.

This isn't a functioning market. It's a permission-based system.

As of early 2026, Ohio has just 37 active cultivators supplying the entire state—23 Level I and 14 Level II operators. On the retail side, there are roughly 204 operational dispensaries, with a hard cap of 400 written into law.

That means every product on every shelf in Ohio is coming from a small, fixed group of approved producers. No matter how high demand goes, the system does not expand to meet it.

That is not how markets work.

That is how scarcity is engineered.

When supply is capped by policy instead of allowed to respond to demand, the outcome is predictable: prices stay high, access stays limited, and consumers look elsewhere.

Sky-High Prices

Because supply is artificially restricted by policy, Ohio consumers are still paying roughly \$6.31 per gram of flower and over \$30 for the average item as of early 2026, based on state data and market reports.

But the official averages don't tell the full story.

What Consumers Actually Experience

What matters is what people actually see when they walk into a store—or when they cross the border.

In Ohio:

- Flower commonly sits around **\$10 per gram at the low end**
- Concentrates can run **\$30-\$40 per gram**

In Michigan:

- Flower routinely drops to **\$2-\$5 per gram**
- Concentrates can be found for **\$5 per gram or less**
- Pre-rolls can cost **under \$1 each in bulk packs**

That's a completely different market.

When the same consumer can pay \$35 for a gram of concentrate in Ohio—or \$5 in Michigan—the decision isn't complicated. They leave.

Markets don't ignore price gaps like this. They route around them.

At that point, this isn't a policy debate. It's a math problem.

Ohioans are literally driving to Michigan, loading up, and coming home. That is policy failure—sending Ohio dollars and Ohio jobs to another state.

Voter Intent vs. Policy Reality

Issue 2 was not ambiguous.

Voters approved legalization with the expectation that a legal market would replace the illegal one, expand access, and create opportunity.

What followed was a series of decisions that moved in the opposite direction.

Senate Bill 56, effective March 2026, tightened restrictions instead of loosening them. It banned intoxicating hemp and THCA products outside the licensed dispensary system. It added potency limits. It reinforced caps on retail expansion. It increased penalties around the edges of the system rather than opening the system itself.

In other words, after voters said “legalize,” the state responded by tightening control over who can participate and what products are available.

The result is a system that is legal in name, but restricted in function.

That disconnect matters.

Because when voters clearly approve something and the system delivers something else, the issue is no longer just policy—it’s trust.

Who Gets Left Behind

The structure of Ohio’s cannabis program doesn’t just affect prices. It determines who gets to participate.

Right now, the barriers to entry are high enough to exclude most small operators.

Licenses are limited. Application processes are complex and expensive. Compliance requirements require significant upfront capital. Approval timelines are slow and uncertain.

The result is predictable.

Large, well-capitalized operators—often from out of state—dominate the system. Small Ohio farmers, local entrepreneurs, and independent growers are effectively locked out.

Instead of opening a new industry, the system has concentrated it.

Instead of creating opportunity, it has restricted it.

This Was Predictable

None of this is surprising.

When you:

- Cap the number of producers
- Restrict entry into the market
- Increase compliance costs

- Slow down expansion

You don't get stability.

You get:

- Artificial scarcity
- Price inflation
- Limited access
- Concentrated control

Those aren't side effects. They are the direct outcomes of the design.

When supply is restricted by policy instead of expanded by demand, price inflation isn't a bug—it's the mechanism.

The Gap We Have to Close

Ohio voters did not approve a state-protected cartel.

They approved legalization with the expectation of a functioning market—one that is competitive, accessible, and responsive to demand.

Right now, there is a clear gap between what was promised and what exists.

- Access is limited
- Prices are inflated
- Participation is restricted
- Economic benefits are leaving the state

The system is legal, but it is not working.

The question now is not whether Ohio should have legalized cannabis.

The question is whether we are willing to fix the system we built—and turn it into one that actually works for the people it was supposed to serve.

Chapter 2: Anatomy of a Controlled Market

If you want to fix a system, you have to understand how it actually works.

Not what it's called. Not what it was supposed to do. What it does—mechanically, in practice, every day.

Ohio calls its cannabis program a regulated market.

It isn't.

It is a controlled system built on permission, restriction, and limited participation. And once you understand how that system is structured, the outcomes we covered in Chapter 1—high prices, limited access, and economic leakage—stop being surprising.

They become inevitable.

Permission vs. Market

A real market expands to meet demand.

If more people want a product, more businesses enter. Supply increases. Prices adjust. Competition improves quality and service.

Ohio's system does not work that way.

In Ohio, participation is not driven by demand. It is determined by permission.

The state decides:

- How many cultivators are allowed
- How many dispensaries can operate
- Who gets approved
- How fast the system expands

That means supply is not elastic. It doesn't respond to what consumers want. It responds to what regulators allow.

That is the defining feature of a controlled system.

License Caps: Artificial Scarcity by Design

Start with the most obvious constraint: license caps.

Ohio limits the number of cultivators and dispensaries that can legally operate. Even as demand increases, those numbers do not automatically expand.

That creates a fixed supply environment.

Imagine any other industry operating this way. If the state decided there could only be a limited number of grocery stores or gas stations—regardless of population growth or demand—you would expect shortages, higher prices, and reduced competition.

That is exactly what happens here.

With only a small number of approved cultivators feeding a capped number of dispensaries, the system cannot scale naturally. Supply remains tight. Prices remain elevated.

When supply is capped, scarcity isn't a risk.

It's the plan.

Barriers to Entry: Who Gets In—and Who Doesn't

Even within those caps, getting into the system is not simple.

Applicants face:

- Expensive licensing processes
- Complex application requirements
- Ongoing compliance costs
- Long, uncertain approval timelines

This creates a high barrier to entry.

In practical terms, that means:

- You need significant capital upfront
- You need legal and regulatory expertise
- You need the ability to survive long delays before generating revenue

For most small operators, that combination is a non-starter.

The result is predictable.

The system favors:

- Large, well-capitalized companies
- Multi-state operators
- Groups with the resources to navigate complex regulatory processes

And it excludes:

- Small Ohio farmers
- Independent entrepreneurs
- Local startups without deep financial backing

This isn't an accident. It's how high-barrier systems behave.

Regulatory Drag: Time as a Cost

Cost is only part of the equation. Time is the other.

In Ohio's cannabis system, everything takes longer than it should:

- License approvals
- Facility buildouts
- Product approvals
- Market expansion

Every delay adds cost.

Businesses have to:

- Pay rent on facilities that aren't operational
- Retain staff while waiting for approvals
- Navigate changing or unclear requirements

Time becomes a hidden tax on the entire system.

And like any cost, it gets passed down to the consumer.

That's part of why prices remain high even after legalization.

The system doesn't just restrict supply. It slows it down.

Compliance Burden: Complexity as a Filter

Regulation is necessary. But complexity has consequences.

Ohio's system includes:

- Detailed tracking requirements
- Strict operational rules
- Layered compliance obligations

Each requirement may be defensible on its own. But collectively, they create a system that is difficult and expensive to operate within.

That complexity acts as a filter.

The more complex the system:

- The fewer people can participate
- The more advantage shifts to large operators
- The harder it is for new entrants to compete

Again, the outcome is concentration.

Not because the market demanded it—but because the system selected for it.

Vertical Concentration: Power at the Top

When you combine:

- License caps
- High barriers to entry
- Regulatory complexity

You get concentration.

A small number of operators end up controlling large portions of the supply chain.

That reduces:

- Competition
- Pricing pressure

- Consumer choice

And it increases:

- Market power for incumbents
- Resistance to change
- Incentives to maintain the status quo

From a systems perspective, this is exactly what you would expect.

When entry is restricted and complexity is high, control moves upward.

Product Restrictions: Limiting the Market Itself

The system doesn't just control who participates. It also controls what can be sold.

Policies like:

- Restrictions on hemp and THCA products
- Potency limits
- Product-specific regulations

Narrow the legal market.

That creates two problems:

1. Consumers have fewer legal options
2. Demand doesn't disappear—it shifts elsewhere

When legal options are limited, the market doesn't shrink.

It fragments.

Consumers look for alternatives:

- Out of state
- Online gray markets
- Unregulated channels

That undermines the very goal of legalization.

The System in Plain Terms

Put it all together, and the structure is clear:

- Supply is capped
- Entry is restricted
- Expansion is slow
- Costs are high
- Competition is limited

That system produces:

- High prices
- Limited access
- Concentrated control
- Cross-border leakage

None of this is random.

It is the direct result of the design.

Why This Matters

You can't fix outcomes without fixing structure.

If you leave the system as it is and try to:

- Lower prices
- Increase access
- Expand opportunity

You will fail.

Because the structure itself prevents those outcomes.

The only way to change what the system produces is to change how the system works.

That means:

- Rethinking caps

- Lowering barriers to entry
- Reducing regulatory drag
- Allowing supply to respond to demand

That's not deregulation. It's realignment.

Where This Leads

At this point, the pattern should be clear.

Ohio's cannabis system is not underperforming because of bad luck or early-stage growing pains.

It is producing exactly what it was designed to produce.

The next question is why.

Who benefits from a system that limits entry, restricts supply, and keeps prices high?

That's where we go next.

Chapter 3: Follow the Incentives

Systems don't persist by accident.

They persist because they work—for someone.

If a system produces high prices, limited access, and concentrated control, and those outcomes continue over time, it's not because no one has noticed. It's because the structure creates incentives for key players to keep it that way.

To understand why Ohio's cannabis system hasn't corrected itself, you have to follow those incentives.

Regulatory Design Shapes Outcomes

In any regulated industry, the rules don't just define what's allowed.

They define:

- Who can enter
- Who can compete
- Who can scale
- Who captures value

When those rules include:

- Caps on participation
- High barriers to entry
- Complex compliance requirements

They don't just organize a market.

They shape it.

And once that structure is in place, the people operating successfully within it have a strong incentive to maintain it.

The Incumbent Advantage

Start with the operators already inside the system.

Licensed cultivators and dispensaries benefit from:

- Limited competition
- Restricted supply
- High demand

That combination creates a protected position.

In a normal market, new competitors would enter and apply pressure:

- Prices would fall
- Margins would tighten
- Innovation would increase

In a capped system, that pressure is reduced.

Fewer competitors means:

- More predictable market share
- Higher pricing power
- Less need to compete aggressively

From the perspective of an incumbent operator, the current system is not a problem.

It's an advantage.

Barrier Economics: Who Gets Filtered Out

High barriers to entry don't just make things difficult. They filter the market.

To participate in Ohio's cannabis industry, you need:

- Significant upfront capital
- Legal and regulatory expertise
- The ability to navigate long timelines

That naturally favors:

- Large firms
- Multi-state operators

- Investors with deep resources

And filters out:

- Small farmers
- Independent entrepreneurs
- Local startups without access to capital

Over time, this leads to consolidation.

Not because consumers demanded it—but because the system selected for it.

Regulatory Capture (How It Happens)

When a small group of operators exists inside a highly regulated system, a pattern often develops.

Those operators:

- Understand the rules
- Have relationships with regulators
- Have resources to influence policy discussions

As a result, they are often the most active participants in shaping future regulations.

This doesn't require bad intent.

It's a structural dynamic.

Regulators tend to rely on:

- Industry input
- Established stakeholders
- Existing operators

That input is valuable—but it is not neutral.

Over time, policy can begin to reflect the interests of the current participants more than the broader public.

That is how systems drift toward protection instead of competition.

The Political Layer

Cannabis policy doesn't exist in a vacuum. It operates within a political system.

Policymakers balance:

- Public opinion
- Revenue considerations
- Regulatory concerns
- Stakeholder pressure

A controlled system offers something politically convenient:

- Predictable tax revenue
- A limited number of stakeholders to manage
- A perception of control

Expanding the market—removing caps, lowering barriers—introduces:

- More participants
- More complexity
- Less centralized control

Even when expansion benefits consumers and the broader economy, it can feel riskier from a political standpoint.

So the system tends to move slowly, or not at all.

Consumers: The Least Represented Stakeholder

In theory, the system is supposed to serve consumers.

In practice, consumers are the least organized and least represented group in the process.

They experience:

- Higher prices
- Limited options
- Inconvenience

But they are not:

- Coordinated
- Represented in regulatory discussions
- Positioned to influence rulemaking directly

As a result, their interests are often indirect—filtered through other stakeholders.

And when those stakeholders benefit from the current structure, consumer outcomes lag behind.

The Stability Trap

Once a system like this is established, it creates what can be called a stability trap.

Everyone inside the system adapts to it:

- Operators build business models around it
- Regulators enforce it
- Policymakers manage it

Even if the system produces suboptimal outcomes, changing it becomes difficult because:

- Incumbents risk losing advantage
- Regulators risk disruption
- Policymakers risk uncertainty

So the system persists—not because it's optimal, but because it's stable.

Why This Matters for Reform

If you treat this as a simple policy mistake, you'll underestimate the challenge.

This isn't just about writing better rules.

It's about changing incentives.

Any meaningful reform has to:

- Reduce the benefits of restriction

- Increase the benefits of competition
- Expand participation without collapsing oversight

That requires intentional design.

Because if you don't change the incentive structure, the system will revert to its previous state—even after reforms are introduced.

The Bottom Line

Ohio's cannabis system isn't failing randomly.

It's operating exactly as its incentives dictate.

- Limited entry protects incumbents
- High barriers filter competition
- Regulatory complexity reinforces concentration
- Political caution slows change

The result is a system that works for those inside it—but not for the broader public.

That's why prices stay high.

That's why access stays limited.

That's why people cross the border.

Understanding that is critical.

Because once you see the incentives clearly, the path forward becomes clearer too.

You don't just change rules.

You realign the system.

Where This Leads

We've now covered:

- What voters expected (Chapter 1)
- How the system actually works (Chapter 2)
- Why it stays that way (Chapter 3)

The next step is to look at the real-world consequence of all of it.

What happens when consumers are given a better option just across the border?

That's where we go next.

Chapter 4: The Border Problem

You don't need a complex model to see where Ohio's cannabis policy is failing.

You just need to look at the border.

Every day, Ohio residents make the same decision:
Stay and pay more—or drive north and pay less.

And every day, a growing number of them choose to leave.

A Predictable Pattern

When two neighboring states offer the same product under different conditions, consumers respond to the difference.

Michigan allows broad participation. Supply is high. Prices are low.

Ohio restricts participation. Supply is tight. Prices are high.

That creates a gap.

And when that gap becomes large enough, behavior follows.

People don't need to be experts in policy or economics to understand it. They just need to see the price difference once.

After that, the decision becomes routine.

The Drive North

For many Ohio residents, buying cannabis is no longer a local transaction.

It's a trip.

They:

- Plan around it
- Carpool for it
- Buy in bulk to make it worthwhile

They cross into Michigan, walk into a dispensary, and see:

- Lower prices
- Greater product variety
- Fewer restrictions

Then they bring it back home.

From the consumer's perspective, it's efficient.

From the state's perspective, it's a loss.

Price Gaps Create Movement

We already established the pricing differences.

In Ohio:

- Flower commonly sits around \$10 per gram at the low end
- Concentrates often run \$30–\$40 per gram

In Michigan:

- Flower routinely drops to \$2–\$5 per gram
- Concentrates can be found for \$5 per gram or less
- Pre-rolls can cost under \$1 each in bulk packs

That gap isn't marginal.

It's decisive.

When a consumer can spend \$200 in Ohio—or \$60 for a comparable amount in Michigan—the choice isn't ideological.

It's mathematical.

Markets don't ignore gaps like this. They route around them.

Exporting Demand

Ohio has done something economically backward.

It has created demand—and then made it easier to fulfill that demand somewhere else.

Every Ohio resident who crosses the border is:

- Spending money in another state
- Supporting businesses outside Ohio
- Contributing to another state's tax base

This isn't just about cannabis.

It's about economic leakage.

Ohio is exporting:

- Consumer spending
- Retail activity
- Job creation
- Tax revenue

And importing nothing in return.

The Hidden Costs

The impact goes beyond lost sales.

When consumers leave the state to purchase cannabis:

1. Local Businesses Lose Out

Dispensaries in Ohio operate in a constrained environment. But they're also competing against an unconstrained one just miles away.

That's not a fair market.

It's a system competing against a real market.

2. Growth Gets Suppressed

A thriving cannabis industry doesn't just create dispensaries.

It creates:

- Cultivation jobs

- Processing and manufacturing
- Logistics and distribution
- Ancillary services (marketing, security, real estate, etc.)

When demand is fulfilled out of state, those downstream opportunities never fully develop in Ohio.

3. Tax Revenue Leaves with It

Every purchase made in Michigan instead of Ohio is:

- Tax revenue lost
- Public funding reduced
- Economic activity redirected

Ohio didn't eliminate demand when it restricted its market.

It just redirected the benefit.

The Border as a Real-Time Audit

You can think of the Ohio–Michigan border as a real-time audit of policy.

No reports required.

No projections needed.

Just watch what people do.

If a system is working, people use it.

If a system isn't working, people find alternatives.

Right now, Ohio residents are choosing alternatives at scale.

That tells you everything you need to know.

This Was Avoidable

Nothing about this outcome was unpredictable.

When you:

- Restrict supply
- Limit participation
- Allow a neighboring state to operate freely

You create an incentive to leave.

That's not a loophole.

That's a consequence.

A Competitive Reality

States don't operate in isolation.

They compete.

Not just for businesses, but for consumers.

Michigan made a decision to compete on:

- Price
- Access
- Participation

Ohio made a decision to control:

- Entry
- Supply
- Structure

Those choices produced different results.

And consumers responded accordingly.

The Bottom Line

Ohio didn't just build a restricted cannabis system.

It built one next to a fully functioning market.

That comparison is unavoidable.

And right now, it's not favorable.

We created the demand—and handed the profit to Michigan.

Chapter 5: The Michigan Comparison — Same Region, Different Rules, Different Results

If you want to understand why Ohio's cannabis system is failing, you don't need theory.

You just need to look north.

Ohio and Michigan share a border, a culture, and a similar economic history. Both states legalized adult-use cannabis through voter initiative. Both serve the same kinds of communities—working families, small towns, and regional cities with similar demand.

The only meaningful difference is policy.

Michigan chose to allow participation and competition. Ohio chose to limit both.

The results are not subtle.

A Side-by-Side Reality

As of early 2026, the structure of each market looks like this:

Retail Access

- Michigan: ~800+ active dispensaries with no statewide cap
- Ohio: ~200+ operational dispensaries, capped at 400

Cultivation

- Michigan: Hundreds of licensed cultivators across multiple tiers
- Ohio: 37 total cultivators

Pricing

- Michigan:
 - Flower commonly \$2-\$5 per gram
 - Ounces around \$60
 - Concentrates as low as \$5 per gram
- Ohio:
 - Flower commonly around \$10 per gram at the low end

- Ounces significantly higher
- Concentrates often \$30–\$40 per gram

Market Structure

- Michigan: Open licensing, competitive expansion
- Ohio: Capped, permission-based system

That gap isn't random.

It's the direct result of limiting who's allowed to grow and sell.

Supply Meets Demand

Michigan's system allows supply to expand.

If demand increases, more producers enter. More retailers open. The market adjusts.

That leads to:

- Greater product availability
- Competitive pricing
- More innovation

Ohio's system does the opposite.

Supply is fixed by policy. Even if demand increases, the number of producers and retailers does not expand in proportion.

That creates persistent pressure:

- Limited inventory
- Higher wholesale costs
- Elevated retail prices

When supply is allowed to grow, markets stabilize.

When supply is restricted, scarcity becomes permanent.

Prices Tell the Truth

Pricing is the clearest signal of how a system is functioning.

In Michigan, years of open competition have driven prices down to levels where the legal market outcompetes the illegal one.

In Ohio, restricted supply keeps prices elevated.

Consumers don't need to read policy documents to understand that.

They see it every time they compare menus.

And when the same product costs two to five times more in one state than another, that difference doesn't stay theoretical.

It changes behavior.

Who Wins Under Each Model

The structure of each system determines who benefits.

In Michigan:

- Small and mid-sized growers can enter the market
- Local entrepreneurs can open dispensaries
- Consumers benefit from lower prices and wider selection
- The legal market undercuts the illicit one

In Ohio:

- Large, well-capitalized operators dominate
- Entry is limited and expensive
- Consumers face higher prices and fewer options
- Demand spills into other states and informal markets

This isn't a matter of opinion.

It's a function of structure.

Competition vs. Control

Michigan operates on a simple principle: allow competition and let the market find equilibrium.

Ohio operates on a different principle: control participation and manage supply.

Those principles produce fundamentally different systems.

Michigan built a market.

Ohio built permission.

Resilience Through Competition

Even when Michigan has introduced new taxes or experienced market contraction, the system has remained competitive.

Why?

Because:

- Entry is still possible
- Supply can still adjust
- Businesses still compete

Competition creates resilience.

Ohio's system lacks that flexibility.

When supply is tight and participation is restricted, the system has fewer ways to adapt.

The Evidence Is Already There

Ohio doesn't need to guess what a better system looks like.

It already exists just across the border.

Consumers are experiencing it directly.

Businesses are operating within it.

Prices, access, and outcomes are visible in real time.

This isn't a theoretical model.

It's a working example.

What This Means for Ohio

The comparison leads to a simple conclusion.

Ohio's outcomes are not the result of bad luck, timing, or early-stage growing pains.

They are the result of deliberate choices:

- Limiting entry
- Restricting supply
- Controlling expansion

Different choices produce different results.

Michigan made one set of choices.

Ohio made another.

The Bottom Line

When you remove artificial caps, allow participation, and let supply respond to demand:

- Prices fall
- Access expands
- Legal markets grow

When you restrict those same factors:

- Prices stay high
- Access stays limited
- Consumers look elsewhere

Ohio didn't vote for a restricted system in 2023.

Michigan shows what happens when a state follows through on what voters actually intended.

The evidence is already there.

The question is whether Ohio is willing to follow it.

Where This Leads

At this point, the pattern is complete:

- Chapter 1 showed the gap between promise and reality
- Chapter 2 explained the structure
- Chapter 3 explained the incentives
- Chapter 4 showed the real-world consequences
- Chapter 5 proves a better model already exists

The next step is to stop diagnosing—and start fixing.

Chapter 6: What Actually Works

At this point, the pattern is clear.

Ohio's system produces high prices, limited access, and concentrated control. Michigan's system produces lower prices, broader access, and a more competitive market.

That difference isn't luck.

It comes from a small number of core principles that determine whether a cannabis market functions—or fails.

You don't need a complex theory to understand them. You just need to look at what consistently produces better outcomes.

1. Supply Has to Be Allowed to Expand

The first principle is simple.

Supply must be able to respond to demand.

In a functioning market:

- More demand leads to more production
- More production leads to more competition
- More competition leads to price normalization

That feedback loop is what stabilizes markets.

When supply is artificially restricted—through caps, delays, or barriers—that loop breaks.

Demand doesn't go away.

It builds pressure.

And that pressure shows up as:

- Higher prices
- Limited availability
- Consumers looking elsewhere

When supply is allowed to expand, the system corrects itself.

When supply is restricted, the system locks in distortion.

2. Entry Has to Be Possible

A market only works if people can enter it.

Not just large corporations. Not just a handful of approved operators.

A range of participants:

- Small growers
- Mid-sized businesses
- Local entrepreneurs

Entry doesn't have to be effortless. But it has to be achievable.

When entry is limited to those with:

- Significant capital
- Specialized legal support
- The ability to absorb long delays

The market narrows.

Fewer participants means:

- Less competition
- Less innovation
- More control at the top

When entry is possible across different scales, the market diversifies.

That's where resilience comes from.

3. Competition Has to Be Real

Competition isn't just about having multiple businesses.

It's about having enough participants that no single group can control pricing or supply.

In a competitive cannabis market:

- Businesses compete on price
- They compete on quality
- They compete on product variety
- They compete on customer experience

That pressure drives improvement.

Without it, there's no reason to change.

If supply is limited and entry is restricted, competition weakens.

Prices stay elevated because they can.

Choice stays limited because it has to.

A system with minimal competition will always underperform one with real competitive pressure.

4. Regulation Should Set Standards—Not Limit Participation

Regulation has a role.

It should ensure:

- Product safety
- Accurate labeling
- Consumer protection
- Responsible operation

What it should not do is determine how many people are allowed to participate.

There is a difference between:

- Setting rules for how to operate
- Deciding who is allowed to operate

When regulation shifts from standards to control, it stops supporting a market and starts replacing it.

The goal is not no regulation.

The goal is the right kind of regulation.

5. Time, Cost, and Risk Must Be Manageable

Every system has friction.

The question is how much.

In a functioning market:

- Time to enter is reasonable
- Costs are predictable
- Risk is manageable

In a restricted system:

- Approvals take too long
- Costs are too high
- Risk is too concentrated

That combination limits participation and slows growth.

From a systems perspective, these are not separate issues.

They are connected.

Time increases cost.

Cost increases risk.

Risk reduces participation.

When those factors compound, the system contracts.

When they are controlled, the system expands.

6. Legal Markets Must Outcompete Illegal Ones

Legalization only works if the legal market is more attractive than the alternative.

That means:

- Competitive pricing
- Easy access
- Reliable quality

- Consistent availability

If the legal market is:

- More expensive
- Less convenient
- More restrictive

Consumers will not fully transition.

They will:

- Stay in the illicit market
- Go out of state
- Use alternative channels

This isn't a moral issue.

It's a competitive one.

Legal markets don't replace illegal ones by existing.

They replace them by outperforming them.

7. Markets Require Feedback Loops

A functioning system has feedback.

- Prices signal supply and demand
- Entry responds to opportunity
- Competition corrects inefficiencies

When those feedback loops are intact, the system adjusts over time.

When they are blocked—by caps, delays, or restrictions—the system becomes rigid.

Rigid systems don't self-correct.

They persist in imbalance.

That's where Ohio is today.

The System in Simple Terms

If you reduce everything down, a working cannabis market needs:

- Open pathways for participation
- Supply that can expand
- Real competition
- Regulation focused on safety, not restriction
- Costs and timelines that don't exclude most participants

When those conditions exist, the outcomes follow:

- Lower prices
- Greater access
- Broader participation
- Stronger legal market

When those conditions are removed, the opposite happens.

Why This Matters for Ohio

Ohio doesn't need to invent a new model.

The principles are already known. The outcomes are already visible.

The issue is not a lack of information.

It's a gap between what works—and what has been implemented.

Fixing the system doesn't require guessing.

It requires alignment.

The Bottom Line

Ohio's cannabis system isn't underperforming because markets don't work.

It's underperforming because the system isn't allowing a market to function.

Once you restore:

- Entry
- Supply
- Competition

The rest follows.

Not immediately, but predictably.

Because that's how functioning systems behave.

Where This Leads

We've now established:

- What went wrong
- How the system works
- Why it stays that way
- What the real-world consequences are
- What a better model looks like
- And the principles that make it work

The next step is to apply those principles directly to Ohio.

What would a system built around these ideas actually look like?

And how do you get there from where we are today?

That's where we go next.

Chapter 7: The Ohio Cannabis Reset

Up to this point, the problem has been defined clearly.

Ohio's current system:

- Restricts supply
- Limits participation
- Keeps prices elevated
- Pushes consumers out of state

We've also seen what works:

- Open participation
- Expandable supply
- Real competition
- Regulation focused on safety, not restriction

The next step is simple in concept, but critical in execution:

Take what works—and apply it to Ohio.

The Goal

The goal is not to remove regulation.

The goal is to build a system that actually functions.

That means creating a cannabis market that is:

- Competitive
- Accessible
- Safe
- Economically beneficial to Ohio

Measured by outcomes:

- Lower prices

- Greater access
- More Ohio-based businesses
- Reduced cross-border leakage
- A legal market that replaces the illegal one

Everything in this chapter is designed to move toward that end state.

Principle 1: Expand Participation

The first change is the most important.

More people need to be allowed to participate in the system.

That means:

- Removing or significantly increasing caps on licenses
- Creating pathways for new entrants at different scales
- Allowing the number of operators to grow with demand

This does not mean chaos.

It means structured expansion.

The state can still:

- Set standards
- Enforce compliance
- Monitor operations

But it should not artificially limit how many people are allowed to compete.

Participation should be earned through meeting standards—not granted through scarcity.

Principle 2: Create Tiered Licensing

Not every operator needs to be the same size.

A functioning system allows for:

- Small growers

- Mid-sized operations
- Large-scale producers

Tiered licensing creates that flexibility.

For example:

- Micro licenses with lower costs and limited output
- Standard licenses for mid-sized businesses
- Large licenses for high-capacity operators

This lowers barriers to entry without sacrificing oversight.

It also ensures that:

- Local farmers can participate
- Entrepreneurs can start small and scale
- The system is not dominated by a single class of operator

Principle 3: Reduce Regulatory Drag

Time and complexity are major sources of cost.

To fix that, the system needs:

- Faster approval timelines
- Clear, standardized requirements
- Streamlined processes across agencies

This can include:

- Defined timelines for license decisions
- Simplified application structures
- Reduced redundancy in compliance requirements

The goal is not to remove oversight.

It is to remove unnecessary friction.

When time decreases, cost decreases.

When cost decreases, participation increases.

Principle 4: Align Product Policy with Demand

Consumers will seek the products they want.

If the legal market doesn't offer them, they will find alternatives.

To prevent that, the system must:

- Allow a broad range of product types
- Align with federal hemp standards where applicable
- Avoid unnecessary restrictions that push demand elsewhere

This includes:

- Reconsidering restrictions on hemp and THCA products
- Ensuring product availability matches consumer demand
- Maintaining safety standards without limiting variety

The goal is simple:

Make the legal market the most attractive option.

Principle 5: Let Supply Normalize Prices

Price is not something the state should control directly.

It is something the system should allow to adjust.

When supply expands and competition increases:

- Prices fall naturally
- Quality improves
- Consumers shift to legal channels

Artificial scarcity prevents that process.

Expanding supply enables it.

This is how markets correct themselves.

Principle 6: Support Ohio-Based Growth

A functioning system should benefit the state that builds it.

That means creating conditions where:

- Ohio farmers can enter the market
- Local businesses can compete
- Jobs are created within the state

This is not about excluding outside companies.

It is about ensuring that Ohio is not structurally locked out of its own industry.

Lower barriers and broader access naturally lead to more local participation.

Principle 7: Maintain Safety and Accountability

Reform does not mean abandoning standards.

The system should still enforce:

- Product testing
- Accurate labeling
- Responsible operations

What changes is the focus.

From:

- Controlling who can participate

To:

- Ensuring everyone who participates meets clear standards

This keeps consumers protected while allowing the market to function.

The Reset in Practice

Taken together, these principles produce a system that looks very different from the current one.

Instead of:

- Fixed participation
- Artificial scarcity
- High barriers
- Slow expansion

You get:

- Scalable participation
- Expanding supply
- Manageable entry
- Responsive growth

That shift changes outcomes.

Expected Results

If implemented correctly, this reset leads to:

- Lower consumer prices
- Increased product availability
- Growth in Ohio-based businesses
- Reduced out-of-state purchasing
- A stronger legal market

Not overnight.

But predictably.

Because the system is aligned with how markets function.

What This Is Not

This is not deregulation.

It is not removing oversight or eliminating standards.

It is not abandoning safety.

It is correcting a structural imbalance.

The current system restricts too much of the wrong things:

- Participation
- Supply
- Competition

And focuses too much on control instead of function.

The reset changes that balance.

The Bottom Line

Ohio doesn't need to guess how to fix its cannabis system.

The model already exists.

The principles are already clear.

The only question is whether the state is willing to apply them.

Because the difference between the current system and a functioning one is not theoretical.

It is structural.

Where This Leads

Now that the blueprint is defined, the next step is execution.

How do you move from the current system to the one described here?

What can be done immediately?

What requires legislative change?

What can be fixed through executive action?

That's where we go next.

Chapter 8: The Small Grower Pathway

If Ohio is serious about building a functional cannabis market, it cannot be built only for large operators.

It has to include small growers.

Not as an afterthought. Not as a symbolic program. As a core part of the system.

Because a market that only works for the largest players isn't a market.

It's a funnel.

Who Is Locked Out Today

Under the current structure, most small operators never get a real chance to participate.

The barriers are clear:

- High licensing costs
- Complex applications
- Long approval timelines
- Significant upfront capital requirements

For a large company, those are obstacles.

For a small grower, they are deal-breakers.

That means:

- Local farmers don't enter
- Independent growers don't scale
- New entrepreneurs never start

The system filters them out before they begin.

Why Small Growers Matter

This isn't just about fairness.

It's about function.

Small growers bring:

- Product diversity
- Local economic activity
- Competitive pressure
- Innovation

They also create something larger systems often miss:

Distributed growth.

Instead of a few centralized operations, you get:

- Activity across rural areas
- Local supply chains
- More points of entry into the industry

That spreads opportunity—and stabilizes the market.

A System Built for Scale, Not Just Size

A functioning market doesn't treat every participant the same.

It allows for different levels of operation.

That's where tiered licensing becomes critical.

A small grower should not have to meet the same requirements as a large-scale producer.

They should meet standards appropriate to their size and impact.

Tiered Licensing in Practice

A structured system could include:

Micro-Grow Licenses

- Lower application and compliance costs
- Limited canopy size
- Local or direct-to-consumer sales options where appropriate

Standard Licenses

- Mid-level production
- Broader distribution capabilities
- Scalable operations

Large-Scale Licenses

- High-capacity production
- Full distribution access
- Statewide or multi-location operations

This structure allows:

- Entry at a manageable level
- Growth over time
- Competition across multiple tiers

It creates a ladder instead of a barrier.

Lowering the Cost of Entry

For small growers, cost is the primary constraint.

Reducing that cost doesn't mean lowering standards.

It means:

- Simplifying application requirements
- Reducing unnecessary fees
- Creating predictable approval timelines

It also means recognizing that:

- Not every operation needs a large facility
- Not every grow requires the same infrastructure

When entry costs align with scale, participation increases.

Time as an Opportunity Cost

For small operators, time is just as critical as money.

A long approval process:

- Delays revenue
- Increases financial risk
- Discourages entry

Shortening timelines is one of the fastest ways to expand participation.

That requires:

- Clear review standards
- Defined decision deadlines
- Accountability within the approval process

When time becomes predictable, planning becomes possible.

Local Impact

Small growers don't just participate in the market.

They anchor it locally.

They:

- Hire locally
- Spend locally
- Build relationships within their communities

That creates a different kind of economic effect.

Instead of a centralized system where value flows upward, you get a distributed system where value circulates locally.

For rural Ohio, this matters.

Cannabis can become:

- A supplemental crop

- A new revenue stream
- A way to keep economic activity within the community

But only if the system allows participation.

Competition at Every Level

When small growers are part of the system, competition increases across the board.

- Large operators face pricing pressure
- Mid-sized businesses have to differentiate
- Consumers gain more options

That improves the entire market.

Without small participants, competition weakens.

And when competition weakens, prices rise.

Avoiding a Closed System

A system that excludes small growers tends to close over time.

Fewer participants leads to:

- Less innovation
- Less responsiveness
- Greater concentration

Reopening that system later becomes harder.

That's why access needs to be built in from the beginning.

Not added later.

What This Requires

Building a real pathway for small growers requires intentional design:

- Tiered licensing structures

- Reduced entry costs
- Faster approval timelines
- Scaled compliance requirements
- Clear growth pathways

These are not radical changes.

They are standard features of functioning markets.

The Bottom Line

If Ohio wants a cannabis system that:

- Creates jobs
- Expands opportunity
- Lowers prices
- Competes regionally

It cannot rely on a limited group of large operators.

It needs participation at every level.

Especially at the small end of the market.

Because that's where:

- New businesses start
- Innovation happens
- Local economies grow

A system that only works at the top will always leave most people out.

A system that works at every level creates real opportunity.

Where This Leads

The pathway for small growers is one part of the larger system.

The next step is to focus on the other side of the equation:

The consumer.

How do you build a system that actually serves the people buying the product?

That's where we go next.

Chapter 9: Consumer Freedom & Access

Legalization only works if it works for the consumer.

Not in theory. Not on paper. In practice—at the counter, in the price, in the availability, and in the experience.

If a system is legal but:

- Too expensive
- Too limited
- Too inconvenient

Then it isn't fully functioning.

It's just formalized.

What Consumers Expected

When Ohio voters approved legalization, the expectation was straightforward:

- Walk into a store
- Choose from a range of products
- Pay a reasonable price
- Leave without fear or friction

That's what legalization looks like in practice.

It's not complicated.

It's not abstract.

It's a basic transaction that works.

What Consumers Experience Instead

In Ohio today, that experience is inconsistent.

Consumers encounter:

- Higher prices than neighboring states

- Limited product variety
- Fewer retail locations than demand supports
- Policies that restrict what can be sold

That creates friction.

And when friction increases, behavior changes.

Price Is Access

Access is not just about legality.

It's about affordability.

If a product is legal but priced significantly higher than alternatives, it becomes functionally limited.

That's where Ohio is today.

As outlined earlier:

- Flower commonly sits around \$10 per gram at the low end
- Concentrates often run \$30-\$40 per gram

For many consumers, that pricing is a barrier.

Not absolute—but meaningful.

And when that barrier exists, people look for ways around it.

Availability Matters

Even when consumers are willing to pay, availability matters.

A functioning system provides:

- Consistent inventory
- A range of product types
- Reliable access across regions

When supply is constrained:

- Shelves are limited
- Product selection narrows
- Consumers have fewer choices

That reduces the value of legalization.

Because legality without availability doesn't solve the underlying problem.

Convenience Drives Behavior

Consumers respond to convenience.

If accessing the legal market requires:

- Long travel
- Limited hours
- Unpredictable inventory

It becomes less attractive.

This is where Michigan's system again highlights the difference.

More locations and greater competition create:

- Shorter travel distances
- More consistent supply
- Easier access overall

Convenience is not a luxury.

It is a requirement for adoption.

The Legal Market Has to Compete

Legalization does not eliminate alternatives.

It competes with them.

That includes:

- Out-of-state markets

- Informal or legacy markets
- Alternative product channels

For the legal system to succeed, it has to win that competition.

That means:

- Competitive pricing
- Broad product availability
- Ease of access

If it doesn't, consumers will continue to split their behavior.

Freedom Is Practical

Consumer freedom is not just about legality.

It is about the ability to:

- Choose products
- Access them easily
- Pay a reasonable price

When those conditions exist, the system works.

When they don't, the system falls short.

Freedom that exists only in statute but not in practice is limited.

Consistency Builds Trust

Consumers need consistency.

They need to know:

- What they can buy
- Where they can buy it
- What it will cost

Frequent changes, restrictions, or uncertainty reduce confidence in the system.

A stable, predictable market:

- Encourages participation
 - Reduces reliance on alternatives
 - Builds long-term trust
-

From Control to Service

Right now, Ohio's system is oriented around control.

It controls:

- Entry
- Supply
- Product categories

A functioning system shifts the focus.

From:

- Controlling the market

To:

- Serving the consumer

That shift changes how decisions are made.

Instead of asking:

- "How do we limit this?"

The system asks:

- "How do we make this work better for the people using it?"
-

What a Functional Consumer Experience Looks Like

When the system is aligned correctly, the consumer experience becomes simple:

- Prices are competitive
- Products are available

- Locations are accessible
- Rules are clear

That's not idealistic.

That's standard.

The Bottom Line

Consumers are the reason the system exists.

If they are:

- Overpaying
- Leaving the state
- Using alternatives

Then the system is not meeting its purpose.

Fixing the system means fixing the experience.

Because when the consumer experience works:

- The legal market grows
- Prices stabilize
- Demand stays in-state

Everything else follows from that.

Where This Leads

We've now addressed:

- Structure
- Incentives
- Economic impact
- Market function
- Participation

- Consumer experience

The final piece is culture.

Because how a state treats an industry affects how it grows.

That's where we go next.

Chapter 10: Cannabis Culture & The Ohio Cannabis Cup

Cannabis culture did not start when Ohio legalized it.

It has existed for decades—quietly, informally, and often outside the legal system.

Legalization did not create that culture.

It simply brought the opportunity to acknowledge it.

The question now is whether Ohio is willing to build around it—or continue treating it as something that exists in the background.

Culture Is an Economic Engine

Culture is not separate from economics.

It drives it.

Demand does not appear randomly. It is shaped by:

- Community
- Identity
- Shared experience

Cannabis is no different.

Where culture is recognized and supported, it creates:

- Stronger demand
- More businesses
- Increased tourism
- Broader economic activity

States that embrace cannabis culture don't just legalize a product.

They build an industry around it.

Ohio Legalized the Product—Not the Ecosystem

Right now, Ohio's system reflects a partial transition.

Cannabis is legal.

But the surrounding ecosystem is underdeveloped.

- Events are limited or unclear
- Businesses operate cautiously
- Public messaging is inconsistent
- Cultural integration is minimal

The result is a system that exists—but does not fully engage.

In practical terms:

Ohio legalized the product, but not the ecosystem around it.

Normalization Matters

For any legal market to succeed, it has to become normal.

Not controversial. Not hidden. Not treated as temporary.

Just part of the economy.

That doesn't mean ignoring regulation or safety.

It means recognizing that:

- Adults are making legal choices
- Businesses are operating within the law
- The industry is part of the state's economic structure

A system that treats cannabis as legitimate allows it to grow.

A system that treats it as an exception limits that growth.

The Ohio Cannabis Cup

If Ohio wants to signal that it is serious about building a real industry, it needs visible, structured ways to support it.

One of the most effective ways to do that is through a statewide event:

The Ohio Cannabis Cup

An annual event that:

- Brings together licensed producers and retailers
- Showcases products across categories (flower, concentrates, edibles, and more)
- Includes structured judging and awards
- Operates within the regulated system

This is not a novelty.

It is a standard feature of mature markets.

What It Does

An event like this creates immediate impact:

- It showcases Ohio-grown products
- It highlights local businesses
- It creates media attention
- It strengthens brand identity across the state

It gives the industry a focal point.

Something visible.

Something real.

Economic Impact

The effect goes beyond the cannabis industry itself.

Events like this drive:

- Hotel bookings
- Restaurant traffic

- Local vendor participation
- Regional tourism

This is economic activity that stays in Ohio.

It reinforces a broader point:

Ohio does not need to invent new industries.

It needs to stop suppressing the ones it already has.

Community and Identity

There is also a social dimension.

A structured, legal event:

- Brings people together
- Creates shared identity around a legal market
- Builds legitimacy over time

That matters.

Because industries do not grow in isolation.

They grow when they become part of the community.

From Hidden to Visible

Right now, much of Ohio's cannabis activity feels contained.

Limited.

Controlled.

A public-facing event changes that dynamic.

It signals:

This industry exists.

It is legal.

And it is part of Ohio's future.

Connecting Culture to Function

This is not separate from the rest of the system.

It reinforces it.

- Stronger culture → stronger demand
- Stronger demand → more participation
- More participation → greater competition
- Greater competition → lower prices

Everything connects.

Culture is not a side issue.

It is part of how the system grows.

The Bottom Line

Ohio cannot build a fully functioning cannabis market by keeping it quiet, limited, or disconnected.

It has to be:

- Visible
- Supported
- Integrated

Because markets don't grow in the shadows.

They grow when they are allowed to exist openly—and compete.

Where This Leads

At this point, every part of the system has been addressed:

- Structure

- Incentives
- Market function
- Participation
- Consumer experience
- Culture

The next step is execution.

What happens immediately when leadership changes?

That's where we go next.

Chapter 11: Day One Actions

Up to this point, we've defined the problem and outlined the solution.

Now comes the question that matters most:

What actually gets done—and how fast?

Because a plan that can't be executed is just another document.

The advantage of this issue is that not everything requires years of legislation or long-term reform.

Some of the most important changes can begin immediately.

On Day One.

What a Governor Can Actually Do

A governor cannot rewrite every law overnight.

But a governor does control:

- Executive agencies
- Regulatory direction
- Enforcement priorities
- Administrative processes

That means the governor sets the tone—and the speed—of the system.

The goal of Day One is not to solve everything instantly.

It is to:

- Change direction
 - Remove bottlenecks
 - Signal clearly that the system is shifting
-

Action 1: Direct Immediate Licensing Expansion

The first move is to begin expanding participation.

This includes:

- Ordering a full review of existing license caps
- Directing agencies to prepare for increased license issuance
- Prioritizing pathways for new applicants

Even where caps exist in statute, agencies control:

- Timing
- Process
- Interpretation

The message is simple:

The system will no longer be artificially constrained where flexibility exists.

Action 2: Fast-Track Pending Applications

There are already businesses waiting to enter the system.

On Day One:

- Conduct a full audit of pending applications
- Establish clear timelines for decisions
- Require agencies to resolve backlog cases quickly

Every delayed application is:

- Lost supply
- Lost competition
- Lost economic activity

Speed matters.

Action 3: Standardize and Simplify Requirements

Complexity slows everything down.

Immediately:

- Review all application requirements
- Identify redundancies
- Remove unnecessary steps

This does not mean lowering standards.

It means making the process:

- Clear
- Consistent
- Predictable

A system people can understand is a system people can enter.

Action 4: Set Clear Approval Timelines

Uncertainty is one of the biggest barriers in the system.

On Day One:

- Establish defined timelines for license decisions
- Require agencies to adhere to them
- Create accountability for delays

Time is cost.

Reducing uncertainty reduces risk—and increases participation.

Action 5: Align Enforcement with Reality

Enforcement should support the legal market—not undermine it.

That means:

- Prioritizing serious violations over technical issues
- Avoiding unnecessary penalties that discourage participation
- Shifting focus toward compliance and correction

The goal is a system that people can operate within—not one that pushes them out.

Action 6: Initiate Product Policy Review

Consumer demand is already clear.

On Day One:

- Launch a full review of product restrictions
- Evaluate alignment with federal standards where applicable
- Identify areas where legal supply is being unnecessarily limited

The objective is not to remove safeguards.

It is to ensure that legal options match real demand.

Action 7: Establish a Public Transparency Dashboard

If the system is going to improve, people need to see it.

Within the first phase of the administration:

- Publish data on licenses, approvals, and timelines
- Track progress publicly
- Make system performance visible

Transparency does two things:

- Builds trust
 - Forces accountability
-

Action 8: Engage Directly with Stakeholders

The system affects:

- Consumers
- Small growers
- Existing operators
- Local communities

On Day One, begin structured engagement with all of them.

Not just large stakeholders.

Not just those already inside the system.

Everyone.

Because reform only works if it reflects the full picture.

Action 9: Coordinate Across Agencies

Cannabis policy doesn't sit in one place.

It overlaps with:

- Agriculture
- Commerce
- Public safety
- Local governments

On Day One:

- Establish coordination across agencies
- Align objectives
- Remove conflicting requirements

Fragmentation slows progress.

Coordination accelerates it.

Action 10: Set the Direction Clearly

More than any single action, Day One is about direction.

The system needs a clear signal:

- Participation will expand
- Bottlenecks will be removed
- The market will be allowed to function

Without that signal, nothing changes.

With it, everything begins to move.

What Day One Does—and Doesn't Do

Day One does not:

- Instantly lower prices
- Instantly fix supply
- Instantly rebuild the system

What it does is:

- Start the process
- Remove immediate barriers
- Establish momentum

And momentum matters.

Because once the system begins to move in the right direction, outcomes follow.

The Bottom Line

Reform doesn't begin with legislation.

It begins with execution.

A governor who understands the system can:

- Accelerate change
- Remove friction
- Realign incentives

Starting immediately.

The difference between a system that improves and one that stays stuck is not time.

It's action.

Where This Leads

Day One sets the direction.

The next step is sustaining that direction.

What happens in the first 100 days determines whether reform takes hold—or stalls.

That's where we go next.

Chapter 12: The First 100 Days

Day One sets direction.

The first 100 days determine whether that direction becomes real.

This is where intent turns into structure. Where early actions are reinforced, expanded, and translated into measurable change.

The goal of the first 100 days is not to complete the transformation.

It is to make it irreversible.

From Signal to System

In the first days of an administration, agencies respond to direction.

In the first 100 days, that direction becomes process.

What begins as:

- Orders
- Reviews
- Audits

Must turn into:

- Policies
- Timelines
- Systems that operate consistently

Without that transition, early momentum fades.

Priority 1: Formalize Licensing Expansion

Initial direction must become formal policy.

Within the first 100 days:

- Expand license availability where legally possible
- Publish updated criteria for new applicants

- Establish ongoing issuance schedules

The goal is to move from:

- Limited, irregular access

To:

- Predictable, continuous entry

A system that people can plan around is a system people will enter.

Priority 2: Launch Tiered Licensing Structure

Day One sets the intention.

The first 100 days implement the framework.

This includes:

- Defining license tiers (micro, standard, large)
- Setting appropriate requirements for each
- Establishing cost structures aligned with scale

This creates a pathway for:

- Small growers to enter
- Mid-sized businesses to expand
- Larger operators to continue operating

Without forcing every participant into the same model.

Priority 3: Eliminate Application Backlogs

Any existing backlog must be resolved.

Within the first 100 days:

- Process all pending applications
- Provide clear approvals or denials
- Remove indefinite waiting periods

A backlog is not just an administrative issue.

It is delayed supply.

Clearing it increases:

- Market participation
 - Competitive pressure
 - Economic activity
-

Priority 4: Standardize and Publish Clear Rules

Uncertainty slows participation.

Within the first 100 days:

- Finalize simplified application requirements
- Publish clear compliance standards
- Ensure consistency across agencies

Participants should know:

- What is required
- How long it will take
- What the process looks like

Clarity reduces risk.

Reduced risk increases entry.

Priority 5: Align Product Policy with Market Demand

Initial review leads to action.

Within the first 100 days:

- Update product policies where possible
- Expand legal offerings to match demand
- Remove unnecessary restrictions that push consumers elsewhere

The legal market must reflect what consumers actually want.

If it doesn't, demand will continue to fragment.

Priority 6: Build the Transparency System

Accountability requires visibility.

Within the first 100 days:

- Launch a public dashboard tracking:
 - License applications
 - Approval timelines
 - Market growth metrics
- Provide regular updates on progress

Transparency does not slow the system.

It strengthens it.

Priority 7: Strengthen Interagency Coordination

Fragmentation creates delays.

Within the first 100 days:

- Establish a coordinated framework across agencies
- Align requirements and timelines
- Remove conflicting rules

A unified system:

- Moves faster
 - Reduces confusion
 - Improves outcomes
-

Priority 8: Engage the Full Market

Reform requires input from all sides.

Within the first 100 days:

- Conduct structured engagement with:
 - Small growers
 - Existing operators
 - Consumers
 - Local communities

Not as a formality.

As a feedback mechanism.

A system that listens adapts faster.

Priority 9: Support Local Entry

The pathway for small growers must move from concept to reality.

Within the first 100 days:

- Open initial application windows for smaller operators
- Provide guidance on entry requirements
- Ensure access is practical, not theoretical

This is where opportunity begins to expand.

Priority 10: Track Early Results

Progress must be measured.

Within the first 100 days:

- Track changes in:
 - Participation
 - Supply
 - Pricing trends

- Identify what is working and what needs adjustment

Reform is not static.

It is iterative.

What the First 100 Days Should Produce

By the end of this period, the system should show:

- Increased participation
- Reduced barriers to entry
- Faster approval timelines
- Expanded product availability
- Early signs of competitive pressure

Not final outcomes.

Clear direction.

Maintaining Momentum

The risk after the first 100 days is stagnation.

To avoid it:

- Processes must continue operating
- Expansion must remain consistent
- Oversight must stay aligned with goals

Momentum is not automatic.

It is maintained through continued execution.

The Bottom Line

The first 100 days are where reform becomes real.

They determine whether:

- A system changes

Or

- A system absorbs change and returns to its original state

Success is not measured by announcements.

It is measured by:

- Participation
- Supply
- Access
- Movement in the right direction

Because once the system starts functioning differently, outcomes follow.

Where This Leads

Day One sets the direction.

The first 100 days establish the system.

The next phase is removing the deeper structural barriers that require sustained effort.

That's where we go next.

Chapter 13: Cutting Through Bureaucracy

By this point, the direction is clear.

- Participation is expanding
- Processes are being standardized
- The system is beginning to move

But there is still one major obstacle that can slow or reverse progress if it isn't addressed directly:

Bureaucracy.

Not in the abstract sense. In the practical, day-to-day way that systems become slow, complex, and difficult to navigate.

If you don't fix that, everything else stalls.

What Bureaucracy Actually Is

Bureaucracy is not inherently negative.

At its best, it provides:

- Structure
- Consistency
- Accountability

The problem is what happens over time.

Rules accumulate. Processes expand. Requirements layer on top of each other.

Eventually, the system becomes harder to operate within than it needs to be.

That's where Ohio's cannabis system has been.

The Cost of Complexity

Complexity creates friction.

Friction creates cost.

And cost limits participation.

In practical terms, complexity shows up as:

- Redundant forms
- Conflicting requirements
- Unclear approval paths
- Multiple agencies requiring the same information

Each individual requirement may seem minor.

Together, they create a system that is:

- Slower
- More expensive
- Harder to navigate

That affects:

- New applicants trying to enter
- Existing operators trying to expand
- Agencies trying to process decisions

No one benefits from unnecessary complexity.

Time Is the Hidden Barrier

Most people focus on fees and capital.

But time is often the bigger barrier.

When approvals take:

- Months instead of weeks
- Years instead of months

It creates:

- Financial strain
- Uncertainty

- Lost opportunity

For small operators, that can be the difference between entering the market and walking away.

Reducing time is one of the most effective ways to improve the system.

Where the System Breaks Down

In Ohio's current structure, bureaucracy creates several key problems:

1. Redundancy

The same information is requested multiple times across different stages or agencies.

2. Lack of Standardization

Requirements vary depending on interpretation or agency interaction.

3. Unclear Accountability

When delays happen, it is often unclear:

- Where the delay occurred
- Who is responsible
- When it will be resolved

4. Process Over Outcome

The system focuses on completing steps instead of achieving results.

These issues compound.

And when they do, the system slows down dramatically.

What Fixing It Looks Like

Cutting through bureaucracy does not mean eliminating structure.

It means improving it.

The focus should be on:

Clarity

Every requirement should be:

- Defined
- Documented
- Consistent

Participants should know exactly what is expected.

Simplicity

Processes should include:

- Only what is necessary
- No duplication
- No unnecessary steps

If a requirement does not improve safety or accountability, it should be reconsidered.

Speed

Timelines should be:

- Defined
- Enforced
- Measured

Approvals should move at a pace that supports a functioning market.

Accountability

Every process should have:

- A clear owner
- A defined timeline
- A visible outcome

When delays occur, they should be:

- Identified
 - Explained
 - Corrected
-

From Process to Performance

A functioning system measures outcomes, not just activity.

Instead of asking:

- “Was the process followed?”

The system should ask:

- “Did the process produce a timely, accurate result?”

That shift changes behavior.

Agencies begin to focus on:

- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Results

Instead of simply completing steps.

Using Transparency as a Tool

Transparency reinforces performance.

When data is visible:

- Delays become obvious
- Bottlenecks can be identified
- Progress can be tracked

A public dashboard showing:

- Application timelines
- Approval rates

- Processing times

Creates pressure for improvement.

And it builds trust.

Coordination Over Fragmentation

One of the biggest sources of inefficiency is fragmentation.

When multiple agencies operate independently:

- Requirements conflict
- Timelines diverge
- Communication breaks down

Coordination solves this.

By aligning agencies around:

- Shared goals
- Shared timelines
- Shared standards

The system becomes:

- Faster
 - More predictable
 - Easier to navigate
-

What This Changes

When bureaucracy is reduced to what is necessary:

- Entry becomes more feasible
- Expansion becomes faster
- Costs decrease
- Participation increases

That strengthens the entire market.

Because when friction decreases, activity increases.

The Balance

There is always a balance between:

- Oversight
- Efficiency

The goal is not to eliminate oversight.

It is to ensure that oversight:

- Protects the public
- Does not unnecessarily restrict participation

When that balance is achieved, the system functions.

The Bottom Line

Bureaucracy becomes a problem when it stops serving the system and starts slowing it down.

Ohio's cannabis system has accumulated enough complexity to limit its own effectiveness.

Fixing that is not optional.

It is necessary.

Because without reducing friction, no other reform will reach its full impact.

Where This Leads

With bureaucracy addressed, the system becomes capable of functioning at scale.

The next step is to focus on one of the most important outcomes of a functioning market:

Price.

How do you move from inflated pricing to a competitive, stable market?

That's where we go next.

Chapter 14: Price Correction Strategy

At the center of this entire issue is one question:

Why are prices so high?

And more importantly:

How do they come down?

Because for most consumers, price is the system.

It determines:

- Whether they participate
- How often they purchase
- Where they buy

If the legal market is not competitive on price, it will never fully replace alternatives.

Price Is an Outcome, Not a Setting

One of the most common mistakes in policy is treating price as something that can be controlled directly.

It can't.

Price is not a lever.

It is a result.

It reflects:

- Supply
- Demand
- Competition
- Cost structure

If those factors are misaligned, prices will be high.

If they are aligned, prices will normalize.

That's the foundation of this strategy.

What Drives High Prices in Ohio

Ohio's pricing is not random.

It is the direct result of the system we've outlined.

- Limited supply
- Restricted participation
- High compliance costs
- Slow expansion

Each of these adds pressure.

Together, they create a system where:

- Wholesale prices remain elevated
- Retail prices follow
- Consumers absorb the cost

This is not a temporary phase.

It is a structural condition.

The Only Sustainable Solution: Expand Supply

There is only one reliable way to reduce prices over time:

Increase supply.

Not through mandates.

Not through price controls.

Through participation.

When more producers enter the market:

- Total output increases
- Competition increases
- Pricing pressure builds

That process is already visible in Michigan.

It is not theoretical.

Competition Applies Pressure

As supply increases, competition becomes real.

Businesses begin to compete on:

- Price
- Quality
- Product variety
- Customer experience

That competition:

- Reduces margins
- Encourages efficiency
- Rewards better operators

The result is a market that corrects itself.

Without competition, that correction never happens.

Cost Structure Matters

Price is also influenced by cost.

When businesses face:

- High compliance costs
- Long delays
- Complex requirements

Those costs are passed down.

Reducing unnecessary friction lowers operating costs.

Lower operating costs allow:

- Lower pricing
- Greater flexibility
- More competitive behavior

This is why reducing regulatory drag is part of price correction.

Time as a Price Factor

Delays increase cost.

Cost increases price.

If a business spends:

- Months waiting for approval
- Extended time without revenue

That cost must be recovered.

Faster timelines reduce:

- Financial strain
- Risk
- Required pricing levels

Time is not separate from price.

It is built into it.

Legal vs. Alternative Markets

Price determines which market wins.

If the legal system is:

- More expensive
- Less convenient

Consumers will:

- Buy out of state

- Use informal channels

If the legal system is:

- Competitive
- Accessible

Consumers shift toward it.

This is not about preference.

It is about incentives.

What Price Correction Looks Like

As reforms take effect, price correction will not happen instantly.

It follows a pattern:

Phase 1: Increased Entry

- More producers begin operating
- Supply starts to expand

Phase 2: Competitive Pressure

- Businesses begin adjusting pricing
- Promotions and discounts increase

Phase 3: Stabilization

- Prices settle at competitive levels
- Market becomes predictable

This process is gradual.

But it is consistent.

Avoiding the Wrong Approach

There is a temptation to try to control prices directly.

That does not work.

Price controls:

- Distort markets
- Reduce supply
- Create new imbalances

The correct approach is indirect.

Fix the structure, and price follows.

What Success Looks Like

A functioning system produces:

- Prices that are competitive with neighboring states
- A legal market that outperforms alternatives
- Consumers who no longer feel the need to leave

Not necessarily the lowest price at all times.

But a stable, competitive range.

Why This Matters

Price is not just an economic issue.

It is the mechanism that determines whether legalization succeeds.

If prices remain high:

- The legal market stays limited
- Demand continues to leak
- The system underperforms

If prices normalize:

- Participation increases
- Demand stays in-state
- The market grows

Everything connects back to this.

The Bottom Line

You don't fix price by targeting price.

You fix price by fixing:

- Supply
- Participation
- Competition
- Cost

When those factors align, price corrects.

Not because it was forced.

Because the system finally works.

Where This Leads

At this point, the system has been:

- Diagnosed
- Compared
- Broken down
- Rebuilt in principle
- Executed in phases
- Optimized for performance

The final step is completing the transition.

What happens to enforcement?

How does the system move from restriction to compliance?

That's where we go next.

Chapter 15: Law Enforcement & Transition

Legalization is not just a policy change.

It is a shift in how the law is applied.

For decades, cannabis was treated primarily as a criminal issue. Enforcement focused on prohibition—preventing production, distribution, and use.

Legalization changes that framework.

But if enforcement doesn't change with it, the system never fully transitions.

From Prohibition to Compliance

Under prohibition, the goal was simple:

Stop the activity.

Under legalization, the goal is different:

Regulate the activity.

That requires a shift in focus.

From:

- Criminal enforcement

To:

- Regulatory compliance

This is not a reduction in responsibility.

It is a change in mission.

What Enforcement Looks Like Today

In a restricted system, enforcement often includes:

- Strict penalties for technical violations
- Broad oversight of limited participants
- Continued focus on activities outside the legal framework

This can create tension.

Because when the legal system is:

- Expensive
- Limited
- Hard to access

More people operate outside of it.

And enforcement ends up managing the consequences of the system's limitations.

The Goal of Transition

A functioning legal system should reduce the need for enforcement—not increase it.

That happens when:

- Legal participation is accessible
- Prices are competitive
- Products are available

As the legal market improves:

- Fewer people operate outside it
- Compliance becomes the norm
- Enforcement can focus on true violations

This is how the system stabilizes.

Refocusing Enforcement Priorities

During the transition, enforcement should prioritize:

1. Public Safety

- Preventing unsafe products
- Addressing large-scale illegal operations
- Protecting consumers

2. Clear Violations

- Activities that intentionally avoid regulation
- Actions that create risk to the public

3. Supporting Compliance

- Helping operators meet requirements
- Correcting issues before escalating penalties

The focus should not be on:

- Minor technical violations
- Creating barriers for compliant operators

Because that slows the system down.

Reducing Friction Between Operators and Enforcement

In a compliance-based system, operators and regulators are not adversaries.

They are part of the same system.

When the system is clear and accessible:

- Operators are more likely to comply
- Enforcement becomes more targeted
- Interactions become more predictable

That improves outcomes on both sides.

Transitioning Away from Legacy Enforcement Models

A system built for prohibition often carries forward its structure.

That includes:

- Processes designed to restrict activity
- Policies designed to deter participation

Those models don't align with legalization.

Transition requires:

- Reviewing existing enforcement practices
 - Updating policies to match current law
 - Removing approaches that no longer serve the system
-

The Role of Discretion

Enforcement always involves discretion.

During transition, that discretion should be used to:

- Encourage compliance
- Allow for correction
- Avoid unnecessary escalation

This does not mean ignoring violations.

It means responding proportionally.

Reducing the Incentive to Operate Outside the System

The most effective way to reduce illegal activity is not through increased enforcement.

It is through better alternatives.

When the legal system is:

- Affordable
- Accessible
- Functional

Participation shifts naturally.

This reduces:

- Enforcement burden
 - Resource strain
 - Conflict between operators and regulators
-

Coordination Matters

Enforcement does not operate in isolation.

It intersects with:

- Regulatory agencies
- Local governments
- Licensing authorities

Effective transition requires coordination across all of them.

That ensures:

- Consistent standards
- Clear expectations
- Aligned priorities

Without coordination, confusion increases.

What This Changes

When enforcement aligns with a functioning system:

- Compliance increases
- Conflict decreases
- Resources are used more effectively

Law enforcement can focus on:

- Serious violations
- Public safety concerns

Instead of managing the consequences of a restrictive system.

The Balance

There is always a balance between:

- Enforcement
- Access

The goal is not to eliminate enforcement.

It is to ensure that enforcement:

- Supports the system
- Does not restrict it unnecessarily

When that balance is achieved, the system works.

The Bottom Line

Legalization is not complete when laws change.

It is complete when the system operates as intended.

That includes enforcement.

When enforcement shifts from:

- Restricting activity

To:

- Supporting compliance

The system becomes:

- More stable
 - More effective
 - More aligned with its purpose
-

Where This Leads

At this point, every major part of the system has been addressed:

- Structure
- Incentives
- Supply
- Pricing
- Participation
- Consumer experience
- Enforcement

The final step is bringing it all together.

What does this system look like when it works?

And what does it require from the people of Ohio to make it happen?

That's where we go next.

Chapter 16: Let Ohio Grow

By now, the facts are clear.

Ohio legalized cannabis—but built a system that restricts it.

- Supply is limited
- Participation is constrained
- Prices remain high
- Consumers leave the state

This is not a temporary problem.

It is the direct result of how the system was designed.

And that means it can be fixed.

What We Know

We've walked through every part of this system.

- What voters expected
- What was actually built
- How the structure works
- Why it stays that way
- What the real-world consequences are
- What a functioning system looks like
- How to implement it

This is not guesswork.

It is not theory.

It is a clear comparison between two models—and the outcomes they produce.

The Choice

At this point, the issue comes down to a choice.

Ohio can continue with:

- A controlled system
- Limited participation
- High prices
- Ongoing economic leakage

Or it can move toward:

- A competitive market
- Broader access
- Lower prices
- Growth within the state

Both paths are available.

Only one of them works.

What Fixing It Requires

Fixing the system does not require starting over.

It requires changing direction.

- Expanding participation
- Allowing supply to grow
- Reducing unnecessary barriers
- Aligning regulation with function
- Focusing on outcomes instead of control

These are not radical steps.

They are practical ones.

And they are achievable.

What Happens If Nothing Changes

If the system remains as it is:

- Prices stay elevated
- Consumers continue to leave
- Small operators remain locked out
- Growth stays limited

The legal market will exist.

But it will underperform.

And the gap between what was promised and what was delivered will remain.

What Happens If It Does

If the system is realigned:

- Prices begin to normalize
- Participation increases
- Supply expands
- Demand stays in-state
- The legal market grows

Not overnight.

But consistently.

Because the system begins to function the way it was intended.

This Is Not Just About Cannabis

This is about how systems are built.

Whether they:

- Serve the public
- Or restrict it

Cannabis is one example.

But the principle is broader.

When systems are designed around:

- Control instead of function
- Limitation instead of participation

They produce predictable results.

Fixing them requires understanding that.

And acting on it.

What This Requires From Ohio

Change does not happen automatically.

It requires:

- Attention
- Pressure
- Participation

From voters.

From consumers.

From businesses.

If you have:

- Paid higher prices
- Driven out of state
- Seen the gap between what was promised and what exists

Then you already understand the problem.

The next step is making it clear that the system needs to change.

Keep It Simple

This issue is not complicated.

- If supply is restricted, prices stay high
- If participation is limited, competition stays weak
- If better options exist elsewhere, people leave

Fixing it means reversing those conditions.

That's it.

A System That Works

A functioning cannabis system in Ohio should be:

- Competitive
- Accessible
- Predictable
- Safe

It should:

- Support local businesses
- Keep economic activity in-state
- Provide real options to consumers

And it should reflect what voters actually approved.

The Opportunity

Ohio has everything it needs to build this system.

- Demand already exists
- Businesses are ready to participate
- Consumers are engaged
- The model has already been proven

The only missing piece is alignment.

The Bottom Line

Ohio didn't vote for a restricted system.

It voted to move forward.

The gap between where we are and where we should be is clear.

Closing that gap is not a question of possibility.

It is a question of willingness.

Let Ohio Grow

If you've ever:

- Driven across the border to buy what should be available here
- Paid more than you should have
- Seen opportunity blocked by unnecessary barriers

Then this matters.

Not as a policy issue.

As a practical one.

Because systems should work for the people they serve.

Right now, this one doesn't.

It can.

But only if we decide to fix it.

Appendix A: Price Comparison (Ohio vs. Michigan)

Real-World Consumer Pricing (as of April 2026)

Product Type	Ohio (Typical Low-End)	Michigan (Typical Range)
Flower (per gram)	~\$10	\$2 - \$5
Flower (per ounce)	\$200+	~\$60
Concentrates (per gram)	\$30 - \$40	~\$5
Pre-rolls	\$5 - \$10 each	<\$1 each (bulk packs)

Reported Market Averages

Metric	Ohio	Michigan
Avg. Flower Price (per gram)	~\$6.31	~\$2.96
Avg. Retail Item Price	\$30+	Significantly lower (varies widely)

Key Takeaways

- Ohio prices remain **2x-5x higher** than Michigan in real-world purchases
 - Bulk purchasing in Michigan dramatically increases savings
 - The price gap is large enough to **change consumer behavior at scale**
-

System Interpretation

This pricing difference is not accidental.

It reflects:

- Restricted supply (Ohio)
- Open competition (Michigan)

Consumers are responding rationally to these conditions.

Appendix B: Market Structure Comparison

System Design (as of April 2026)

Category	Ohio	Michigan
Retail Dispensaries	~200+ (cap: 400)	800+ (no cap)
Cultivators	37 total	Hundreds
Licensing Model	Capped, controlled	Open, scalable
Market Entry	Restricted	Accessible
Expansion Speed	Slow	Responsive

Structural Differences

Ohio

- Fixed number of operators
- High barriers to entry
- Slow approval timelines
- Limited competition

Michigan

- Open licensing framework
 - Continuous market entry
 - Faster expansion
 - High competition
-

Outcome Comparison

Outcome	Ohio	Michigan
Price Levels	High	Low
Product Availability	Limited	Broad
Consumer Behavior	Cross-border	In-state
Economic Retention	Weak	Strong

Conclusion

Different rules produce different outcomes.

Michigan built a market.

Ohio built a system of controlled participation.

Appendix C: Tiered Licensing Model (Proposed)

Purpose

To create a scalable, accessible system that allows participation at multiple levels while maintaining safety and oversight.

License Tiers

1. Micro-Grow License

Designed for: Small farmers, local entrepreneurs

- Limited canopy size
- Lower application fees
- Simplified compliance requirements
- Potential for local or direct sales (where permitted)

Impact:

- Expands entry
 - Supports rural economies
 - Increases product diversity
-

2. Standard License

Designed for: Mid-sized operators

- Moderate production capacity
- Full participation in distribution channels
- Scalable growth potential

Impact:

- Strengthens market competition
 - Enables business expansion
-

3. Large-Scale License

Designed for: High-capacity producers

- Large canopy and production limits
- Full distribution and retail access
- Multi-location operations

Impact:

- Supports large supply needs
 - Drives statewide distribution
-

Core Design Principles

- Entry should match scale
 - Costs should be proportional to operation size
 - Growth pathways should be clear
 - Compliance should scale with impact
-

Expected Outcomes

- Increased participation across all levels
 - Reduced market concentration
 - Greater supply diversity
 - Stronger competition
-

Appendix D: Sample Executive Actions (Day One Framework)

Executive Action 1: Licensing Acceleration Directive

Purpose: Increase market participation

- Direct agencies to expand license issuance where legally permissible
 - Initiate review of existing caps and constraints
 - Prioritize new applicant pathways
-

Executive Action 2: Application Backlog Resolution Order

Purpose: Eliminate delays

- Audit all pending applications
 - Establish mandatory decision timelines
 - Require resolution of backlog within defined period
-

Executive Action 3: Regulatory Simplification Initiative

Purpose: Reduce unnecessary complexity

- Identify redundant requirements
 - Standardize application processes
 - Remove non-essential steps
-

Executive Action 4: Timeline Enforcement Policy

Purpose: Improve system predictability

- Establish clear approval deadlines
 - Assign accountability for delays
 - Track and report performance publicly
-

Executive Action 5: Product Policy Review Order

Purpose: Align legal market with demand

- Review current product restrictions
 - Evaluate alignment with federal standards
 - Identify areas limiting legal supply unnecessarily
-

Executive Action 6: Public Transparency Dashboard Launch

Purpose: Increase accountability

- Publish real-time data on:
 - Applications
 - Approvals
 - Processing timelines
 - Provide regular updates
-

Executive Action 7: Interagency Coordination Directive

Purpose: Eliminate fragmentation

- Align agencies under unified framework
 - Standardize requirements and timelines
 - Reduce conflicting rules
-

Executive Action 8: Stakeholder Engagement Initiative

Purpose: Ensure system alignment

- Engage:
 - Small growers
 - Operators
 - Consumers

- Local communities
 - Use feedback to refine implementation
-

Executive Action 9: Small Grower Entry Program

Purpose: Expand participation

- Open application pathways for micro-grow licenses
 - Provide clear entry guidance
 - Ensure accessibility
-

Executive Action 10: Market Performance Monitoring

Purpose: Track progress

- Measure:
 - Participation
 - Supply
 - Pricing trends
- Adjust strategy based on results

About the Author

Travis Vought is a U.S. Marine Corps veteran and a financial crimes and regulatory compliance professional with over a decade of experience in risk management, anti-money laundering (AML), and policy development.

During his military service, he worked in Human Intelligence (HUMINT), focusing on threat analysis, risk assessment, and operational strategy. After his service, he spent more than ten years in the financial sector, including roles at J.P. Morgan Asset Management, where he operated at the Vice President level and helped develop and maintain global policies and procedures related to compliance, sanctions, and risk mitigation.

Across both military and civilian roles, his work has centered on understanding how systems function—how they are built, how they fail, and how they can be improved.

He is the founder of Veteran Home Guardians, an Ohio-based nonprofit that provides practical, day-to-day support for disabled, elderly, and homebound veterans. The organization focuses on direct service—helping with basic needs, improving quality of life, and creating opportunities for veterans to continue serving their communities.

This work reflects a core belief: systems should exist to serve people in real, tangible ways.

A resident of Marengo, Ohio, Travis has spent years working at the intersection of policy, operations, and real-world outcomes. His approach is grounded in practical experience, not theory—focused on identifying inefficiencies, reducing unnecessary complexity, and aligning systems with the people they are meant to serve.

He is running for Governor of Ohio on a platform centered on fixing broken systems, expanding opportunity, and restoring alignment between policy decisions and real-world results.

This book reflects that approach.

It is not just a position on cannabis policy.

It is an example of how systems can be analyzed, corrected, and made to function as intended.