

Thank you for your consideration.
Charles Ream
For Speech - My Copy

NECESSARY CHANGES TO MARIJUANA BUSINESS ORDINANCE

Change AGENDA
Home Occupations Still in There

THIS MEANS SO MUCH TO SO MANY PEOPLE, PLEASE TAKE THE TIME AND CARE TO DO IT RIGHT.

WHY?
clarified?

Chuck Ream, 734-395-0811 Jan 18, 2011

CHANGE #1 ANN ARBOR TEXT: "(2) A cultivation facility or dispensary license issued by the City under this chapter, including the name and contact information for the owner(s) and business manager(s), shall be conspicuously posted in the cultivation facility or dispensary where it is easily open to public view."

COMMENT: Yes! all dispensaries must post the name of their contact person (a person who could be called rather than calling the cops).

No! We don't need more than one person identified for contact. A list like this puts the caregivers in **great danger**. Hundreds of caregivers have been robbed and at least 15 killed while working with medical marijuana. We don't need a list of them for every passerby (and criminal) to see. **LIMIT THE CONTACT PERSON TO ONE PERSON - OR YOU UNNECESSARILY PUT GOOD PEOPLE IN DANGER!**

CHANGE #2 Section 6:417(2)d - Re: "members" **...is this a typo?** Dispensaries certainly cannot give the names of all their **members** to the city. Right? Or what is meant here?

CHANGE#3 Section 6:419.4 - regarding "delivery".

We assume that this refers to the off premises delivery of medicine to a customer. Also, didn't Council agree on Jan. 3 to remove some of those items from the label?

CHANGE#4 ANN ARBOR TEXT: "(9) A cultivation facility or dispensary shall keep records of the persons from whom they received marijuana in any form, and shall make the records available to the City for review upon request."

Caregivers

COMMENT: THIS IS CHILLING, AND ILLEGAL, and would **vastly cut the supply** of medical marijuana available to dispensaries. **Only the big guys would participate, little growers would not take the risk** of having their names on such a dangerous list, which the feds could demand at any time. PLEASE, you **"can't have it both ways"**. At the beginning of the ordinance it says "The City does **not** intend that licensing and regulation under this chapter be construed as a finding that such businesses are legal..." **Unless the ordinance provides some legal protection for caregivers it is monstrously unfair to make all caregivers who contribute medical marijuana products to a dispensary give up their confidentiality rights** and be put on a list for the city. As we speak the feds are already going after the records of patients and caregivers in Michigan. If the ordinance provided legal protection for participants then suppliers could give their names. **WE CANNOT HAVE *BOTH* A DECLARATION THAT THIS LICENCE**

DOES *NOT* PROVIDE LEGAL PROTECTION *AND* A REQUIREMENT THAT ALL CAREGIVERS WHO SUPPLY DISPENSARIES MUST GIVE UP CONFIDENTIALITY AND HAVE THEIR NAMES PUT ON A LIST!!

You can see that this concept does not pass the basic "smell test". It is just not fair. Would YOU participate in a program that involved this level of risk...even to help patients? Please drop this section!

SMALL CHANGE: SECTION 6:419(7) Do you really want to say "No person" shall fail to maintain security measures... Does this include a guy walking down the street? Shouldn't it be "No dispensary or cultivation facility shall fail to maintain..."

SMALL CHANGE: SECTION 6:420(d) It would not be appropriate to make a facility go through the whole licensing process if they wanted to make one small change. This paragraph now ends with "without applying for and being issued a new license". Please consider making it end with "without applying for and receiving written approval for any substantial change from the Ann Arbor Medical Marijuana Licensing Board." There could still be a fee for a "variance".

PLEASE, PLEASE, MAKE THESE CHANGES, ESPECIALLY THE BIG ONES.

THERE IS NO NEED TO FRIGHTEN CAREGIVERS AND CUT THE SUPPLY OF MEDICINE WHEN THE ORDINANCE CLEARLY STATES IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH THAT IT CAN'T PROVIDE PROTECTION FOR THEM. WHY WOULD THE CITY COUNCIL DEMAND TO PUT THESE PEOPLE ON A LIST THAT COULD ULTIMATELY GET THEM ARRESTED, LEGALLY ROBBED OF ALL THEIR POSSESSIONS (civil forfeiture), GET THEIR DOGS SHOT, CHILDREN TAKEN AWAY, etc.

We are close, but no cigar. Please let's do this the way our voters want us to.

Thank you very much, Chuck Ream

Az Has to Produce
The Model ooo and there is
nothing to fear here