

**Blankenship, Johni**

02016-10

**From:** Kenai Peninsula Borough <webmaster@borough.kenai.ak.us>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 19, 2016 7:59 PM  
**To:** Assembly  
**Cc:** Blankenship, Johni  
**Subject:** New Public Comment to Assembly Members

**Name:** Dollynda Phelps

**Email:** jeffndol@yahoo.com

**Subject:** ordinance 2016-10

**Message:**

I was glad to hear the withdrawal of ordinance 2016-10 this evening.

I listened to Mr. Gilman's statement about the commercialization of marijuana being bad for families, and I can't quite understand the logic. I have a family, I intend on feeding that family with my legal cultivation facility, outside of city limits. I have been a drywall contractor for 16 years, and this old body of mine won't make it much longer in that line of employment. Growing marijuana in my basement legally is a viable option for me. I have no neighbors to bother, I keep to myself. How is this business model harmful to anyone? It is most certainly beneficial to MY family...does my family not count? What about the other community members interested in this new industry who live outside of city limits? Do their families not count? And in what way is a compliant marijuana facility harming anyone?

One reason given is Marijuana cookies getting in the hands of children. You must realize that whether marijuana facilities are allowed inside city limits, outside city limits, or on the moon, it will not change the availability of marijuana edibles. People make these at home, people can buy them at a retail store inside city limits, how does preventing establishments outside city limits affect the availability of edibles? This makes no sense, no matter how I look at it. Above all, it is parenting that prevents children from obtaining marijuana cookies...and prescription pills, and alcohol, and Clorox bleach, and drain cleaner, and on and on. Again, I cannot understand the logic here.

I would appreciate some clarification about this Mr. Gilman, perhaps you can explain the connection. Are you saying edibles won't get to children if they are produced within city limits, but somehow if they are produced outside of city limits they will make it into the hands of children? How does this make sense?

I can tell you something that does make sense, and that is the prevention of allowing the commercialization of marijuana outside of city limits will do little to prevent underage use. It will however ENCOURAGE underage use, as the only competition for Black Market is the Legal Market. If you limit the Legal Market, you can thank yourself for supporting a strong black market that sells to children. Cookies and all. And don't forget about the heroin and meth black market happens to sell as well. The last thing they need is legal, regulated facilities to compete with.

I can't believe this is the logic behind an ordinance or voters initiative, it is clear folks are uneducated about cannabis and thus are afraid.

I challenge each of you, to write a list of "Benefits of banning legal, compliant marijuana facilities outside of

city limits". How will this make things better for the community? What will we see that validates banning business in 14,900sq, miles of a 15,000 sq. mile borough?

Anyway, if we need to vote again then we will prepare to do so. I will be sure to use logic when making my vote!

As always, we appreciate the time you all dedicate, regardless of whether we see eye to eye on the issues.

Have a great night, much respect,  
Dollynda Phelps

02016-10

Regarding Ordinance for Introduction 2016-10

April 18, 2016

Honorable Assembly Members,

I'm disappointed in myself for not having anticipated this ordinance or something similar coming forward. I knew on some level that it was possible of course, but didn't expect it from within what I took to be an engaged and functioning Task Force, each of us acting in good faith, and if not with a common purpose at least with a sense that we could get to a common conclusion. In fact that's what made it easy for me to put in a thousand miles of windshield time to be part of the process.

We (the Marijuana Task Force) considered and discussed an outright ban, either by ordinance or by ballot, early on and did not recommend it. We heard the concerns of task force members (including the sponsor) and the public wanting a method for local control within their neighborhoods and endorsed the Local Option Zoning re-write as the appropriate tool for that.

Again, bugs on me for not seeing this coming, but maybe also on everybody that thought we had worked within the process and that it had worked as intended. The public has weighed in, repeatedly. The Task Force offered its recommendations to the Assembly, the Assembly acted, people either responded accordingly or didn't.

If the past is any indicator, this will continue to take up as much of the Assembly's time as you let it the best way I can see to get back about the other important work before the body is to not introduce this ordinance.

I understand the urge to use any means at hand if the first outcomes(s) weren't to one's liking. But we've had a good, full and robust process over a lot of material, testimony and expertise. We're at least as good as our system. Please vote no on introduction and let's move on.

Thank you for your consideration, and for making the trip to Seward!

Ron Long, Task Force member