

John Spencer
Acton
LD 40

After reading through LD40 I must say that the suggested adaptations are among the most reasonable to be presented thus far. The suggested changes give reasonable and logical clarity to many topics that have been of concern in previously suggested revisions to the states cannabis laws.

My main area of interest is in the handling of the violation, revocation and suspension process as well as the reciprocal appeal processes. Without a clear, nailed down list of criteria for violation it is unfair for caregivers to play the guessing game with what is or isnt allowed. Having a clearly stated list that is "limited to" rather than "but not limited to" alleviates the potential for caregivers to be surprised by a forever growing, but not communicated, list of violations. LD 40 does a good job of nailing down criteria and clearly categorizing each scenario in an appropriate tier of consequence. It leaves nothing open to a potentially inconsistent interpretation and gives caregivers and stakeholders a clear view on what they should not be doing as well as what will happen if they choose to do it.

LD 40 outlines a clear, easy to understand and reasonable yet firm guideline for the handling of these processes. Most importantly the guidance is not open to interpretation and assures that all will be evaluated and scrutinized equally and with consistency rather than it being variably based on who you dealt with for your inspection and how they interpret the previously vague verbiage.