

Trevor Shuster  
Mexico  
LD 40

Hello VLA,

My name is Trevor Shuster and I would like to support LD 40. As an Inventory Manager at a cannabis store in Oxford County, I would like to throw my support behind LD 40 because of the following:

From a scientific standpoint, the yearly fingerprinting requirement in our cannabis regulations seems kind of pointless. Science tells us that fingerprints don't really change much over short periods, so asking for them every year is a bit of a waste. This rule not only makes things more expensive and inconvenient for people in the industry but also makes you wonder if it actually makes us safer. Unlike jobs where things can change and need checking regularly, the cannabis industry's insistence on annual fingerprinting feels a bit overboard and out of touch. This rule not only uses up resources but also takes attention away from things that could actually make a difference in safety. It's time to rethink this rule and focus on smarter ways to keep things safe.

Ensuring the absence of vague or ambiguous language in legal statutes is imperative for the maintenance of a just, transparent, and effective legal system. Ambiguities in legal texts engender confusion, hinder equitable interpretation, and compromise the foundational principles of justice. By advocating for the meticulous refinement of language within legislation, we underscore a commitment to legal clarity that serves as the linchpin for uniform application and judicious governance. This concerted effort not only enhances the accessibility of laws for all stakeholders but also fortifies the integrity of the legal framework. In essence, the pursuit of precision in language epitomizes a commitment to the principles of fairness and justice within the legal realm.

A comprehensive review of the current statutes reveals a prevailing sentiment that the existing regulations cast the cannabis industry as inherently criminal, perpetuating an unjust stigma that has its roots in the remnants of the prohibition era. Despite Maine's forward-looking embrace of legalization, these laws seem to linger in the shadows of a bygone era, reflecting an outdated perspective that fails to acknowledge the industry's evolution. It is crucial that our legal framework aligns with the progressive step of legalization, dispelling unjust stereotypes and treating the cannabis sector on par with other lawful industries. By addressing this unfair treatment, we pave the way for a more enlightened and equitable approach, allowing the cannabis industry to thrive without the burden of unjust historical perceptions.

The requirement for cannabis businesses to prove compliance with laws beyond the purview of the Office of Cannabis Policy (OCP) seems both impractical and unnecessary. OCP's jurisdiction should logically be limited to matters directly related to cannabis regulation, and compelling businesses to demonstrate adherence to unrelated laws introduces an undue burden. Simplifying the regulatory process by aligning OCP's oversight with its designated scope would contribute to a more efficient and industry-friendly framework, without having any impact on public safety because those laws are already enforceable.

The insistence on individual identification cards for cannabis employees continues to appear illogical and unwarranted. This requirement stands as an anomaly in comparison to norms in other industries, where employees typically do not carry such specialized identification. The practical utility of these individual cards remains dubious, as they do not enhance security measures or streamline operational processes. Instead, this practice perpetuates an unnecessary bureaucratic burden on both employees and businesses. As we strive for a more sensible and equitable regulatory environment, the reassessment of such requirements is essential to align the cannabis industry with established workplace practices across various sectors.

Thank you for your time and please support LD 40.

Regards,  
Trevor Shuster