

Madame Chair,

Thank you for your consideration of this incredibly important legislation, and thank you for your consideration of citizen input.

My name is Calvin Stuart, and I represent only myself. I have enjoyed the benefits of cannabis for several years, and lived in multiple states and countries with legalized cannabis. I fully support the aims of HF100. However, I see three serious issues under the current engrossment that fall under your jurisdiction, and I hope you can address these fruitfully with the committee and the author.

First, a public possession limit of two ounces, equal to the per-customer purchase limit of two ounces, is ripe for inadvertent lawbreaking. Anybody who forgets about a half-smoked joint in their bag, a pipe with residue in their backpack in their car, or a tiny fresh flower bud that their friend had just gifted them, will immediately be violating this limit as soon as they purchase two additional ounces while they're in town on a grocery run. The personal public possession limits should each be 12.5% higher than the per-transaction limit to avoid this issue, e.g. two and a quarter ounces for flower, and nine grams for concentrates.

Secondly, Section 57, Subd. 2's requirement for lower potency beverages to be packaged in childproof containers unless they contain less than 0.25 milligrams of intoxicating cannabinoids is arbitrary and wasteful. Alcohol has no such requirements, even for the strongest wines and liquors, yet we still manage well enough to keep children from consuming those products. Any brewers currently producing both beer and cannabis beverages will need entirely new supply lines and machines to add an additional layer of consumer security beyond their alcoholic beverage products' needs, new and smaller manufacturers will see a wider moat around the industry with even further increased funding needs, and all of that increased cost will carry on directly to the consumer. The additional packaging to meet childproofing standards will either make the aluminum cans more difficult to recycle, or otherwise itself be another "recyclable" product that will eventually end up in a landfill. Subsidies or incentives could be given to hemp and cannabis farmers to use their excess biomass to produce biodegradable childproof packaging, but again this will increase complexity and costs overall.

And lastly, the expungement provisions in the bill do not provide relief for those indicted under Minnesota Statute 152.092, despite the bill's removal of cannabis paraphernalia from the definitions of said statute. Without inclusion of this statute under Article 5, Section 4; the bill confusingly expunges the possession of cannabis but not of any glassware, rolling papers, herbal grinders, or anything else that may have been used to assist in the consumption of cannabis.

Thank you again for your time and effort in creating a better Minnesota.

-Calvin Stuart  
Citizen of Duluth, Minnesota