City Council
February 5, 2019

Addendum #1
Items Received 2/1 – 2/4
Dear Mayor and City Council,

I've reviewed the 700+ pages for agenda item 8D (amendments to marijuana ordinances, no 1769 series 2019) on the upcoming Feb 5th council meeting (http://www.louisvilleco.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=22344), to understand the facts of the proposed amendment and to be able to speak intelligently about past council meetings and public feedback on the matter. I have spent about 8+ hours reviewing this material, and would appreciate the council reading this brief summary of my findings and my arguments.

First, I would like to say that I support the growth and evolution of Louisville in a way that is aligned with the strategic vision for our town (family friendly, small town culture, integrated with open space). I'm grateful for the council's efforts to help our town become the very best that it can be. The understanding of who we are and what we stand for as a town is extremely important as we shape policy, as small changes now will have tremendous impact on the Louisville of tomorrow in 5/10/20 years.

As an aside, I've read the challenges surrounding the retail area in district O (http://www.louisvilleco.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=22338), and recognize that as industries change, we cannot allow small retailers in small towns to era coming to an end. But I do not believe expanding marijuana is the answer. The act O study itself recommends 3 options that are fully compatible with a family friendly, small-town Louisville. Ideas mentioned include boutique retail, restaurants, office space (realty, insurance, banks, medical/dental, outpatient/urgent), fitness, entertainment, etc. Even a smart-format hotel is potentially compatible (easy for large guest parties and business travelers to visit). I personally prefer alternative 3 in the plan.

Regarding the marijuana amendment, I will focus my comments on the proposed changes to the buffers (from 1/4 mile to 500 ft, and only around public 1-12 schools rather than around public/private schools/preschools, playgrounds, pools, outdoor education facility, alcohol/drug treatment facilities, colleges/universities, & child care facilities) – I believe this is the critical point to debate in the changes. Cultivation is also important in the debate, but less immediately practical as (per the letters from the CTCOA in the public record) the CTC has restrictive covenants that would restrict use unless >65% of their tenants vote to change covenants to allow, which appears unlikely (given many kid/family-friendly businesses + businesses with federal contracts in the CTC).

From what I can gather from the minutes of past city council meetings over the past 2 years, the city council members who support this amendment are stating on the record the motivation for the changes to the buffer restrictions is to regulate medical/retail marijuana dispensaries equivalently to liquor retailers, as a matter of either fairness or simplicity of administration. Implied but not stated directly is some increase in tax revenue (through increased sales tax, and possibly excise taxes if approved by voters). I cannot find any other material motivations stated on the record, please correct me if I'm wrong about this summary.

This line of reasoning does not make sense to me:
- Our “north star” on our policy should be about supporting the strategic vision for Louisville (family friendly, small town culture) -- more dispensaries in our town will NOT attract more families to move here nor will it contribute to a “best of America” small town vibe.
- Staying true to a vision requires saying NO even when opportunities that look “big” come along – we don’t need to align ourselves in a big way with the marijuana industry even if it’s growing rapidly because it’s not aligned with our vision of what we want to be and become as a city.
- Broadly speaking, marijuana use is against federal law, but alcohol use is not. The state has recognized that liquor and marijuana are different, and allows municipalities to make laws restricting marijuana use based on the vision/culture that residents want to have.
- Thus, we should base our policy on what local residents want to have (reference our north star)
- Just because other towns are doing it doesn’t mean that we should too, again we must be true to our north star
- I do not believe that the majority of Louisville residents would want additional liquor retail stores in the areas that would be newly allowed by the proposed amendment.
- If state law allowed us to further restrict liquor store buffer zones, then I believe Louisville residents would act to further restrict them – having more liquor retail outlets is not aligned with what we want Louisville either (how would it support our north star vision)?
- Since state law does not allow local municipalities to further restrict liquor store buffer zones, but it DOES allow us to further restrict marijuana dispensaries, then we should exercise our right to do so, and align our local laws to best support our strategic vision for the town.

I’m also confused why we would enact ordinances that would directly violate the federal Controlled Substance Act, which requires a 1000 ft buffer around public/private schools, colleges, universities, and playgrounds, as well as a 100 ft buffer from youth centers, public swimming pools, and video arcades. The city requiring license holders to indemnify the city does not protect the interests of private citizens that motivated this federal law, even if it theoretically protects the city from financial damage.

Another argument made in council meetings has been that the 1500 ft separation requirement would mitigate the impact to our family friendly, small town culture. However, the changes to the buffer regulations would allow dispensaries to penetrate inner Louisville (even if they were separated by 1500 ft), rather than exist at the very edges of the city. This dramatically changes the cultural impact and presence of dispensaries in our town. Just like having open space interspersed throughout our town has a tremendous positive impact and reinforces a wonderful cultural feel for the city, allowing dispensaries to be interspersed throughout our town would also have a high impact on cultural feel, but not for the positive.

I also note that the Planning Council voted to keep the buffer requirements as they are – they recognized how impactful changing those could be. And in their meeting minutes while delivering, they considered what the buffer requirements changed criteria or had a lesser offset, and if that was the case they suggested there should be a new buffer requirement of at least 5000 put around all residential zones, to mitigate both cultural and property value concerns of Louisville residents. Without this some residents would be very unhappy surprised if the proposed amendments are passed.

Finally, I would hope that the council fully considers the community feedback. We have trusted you with our votes to represent us. The community as a whole needs to decide what Louisville should be (there is a broad group of people who are very aligned on family friendly, small town – see the parking structure debate just last week), and what family friendly, small town means. If I am in the minority see it, the community will shape itself, and I can move accordingly. To learn about public sentiment from the record, I reviewed all public feedback on the 700+ page record on the proposed amendment, and so far there appears to be a 3:1 position to reject the amendment and keep regulations as they are:

Eliminating duplicates and counting comments from couples as just 1 comment (detailed list extracted from the public record at the bottom of this email):
- 10 support the amendment (about half are shop or land owners who would directly benefit economically, and 1 from Boulder offering support)
- 35 who are not in support + 2 more not in support that are identified by first names only
- 1 who is more open to the amendment, but asking to delay until a detailed study group is completed ever more time

If a newspaper article was published about this major proposed change in our community’s culture, similar to what happened with the parking structure proposal, I'm sure the additional flood of public feedback would be aligned with the above trend. If a local article has not yet been published in similar fashion, it feels wise to do so and delay a decision until more broad public awareness and feedback can be received and evaluated. All meeting records being publicly available is very good and is commendable, but most of the public does not follow city council meeting agendas/minutes unless big items are brought to their attention through social media or a news article.

Especially concerning are studies that Patricia Ross recently sent to the City Council with substantial data over potential impacts. There are many documented concerns from reputable sources that need to be studied and well understood before making policy decisions that cannot easily be walked back. Why should Louisville become the social experiment on this point? I do not see the rush – there is no pressing public demand for more dispensaries. The existing dispensaries are meeting demand. The motivations stated on the public record by council members who are in favor are not a compelling argument to move forward right now. What if we are wrong and have very adverse consequences that are unanticipated? The risk/reward does not make sense.

I very strongly believe that we should not further expand access to marijuana within Louisville. It is not aligned with our city vision/brand. I love this city and want to see us grow but remain true to ourselves. Above all, no matter what else changes, we must not change the regulations regarding the buffer definition (it should be set back by the full 1/4 mile or at least 1000 ft and by all types of areas in the current regulation). Those who want access can already do so in < 10 minute drive, supply is already meeting demand. If we expand access, we will walk down a path our city will regret in the years to come. And I believe public sentiment strongly shares this opinion.

I welcome feedback and discussion on all these points. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, a concerned citizen,
Kevin Hoffman, PhD
1176 Harper Lake Dr, Louisville

A summary of the public comments (from meeting minutes) and emails to the city council (from public records) on the proposed amendment. I tried to be objective and comprehensive while scanning through all 700 pages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date: Monday, February 4, 2019 1:49:36 AM
Meredyth Muth
City Council
To: From: Kevin Hoffman

Communication Type Date Name Position
1 1 who is more open to the amendment, but asking to delay until a detailed study group is completed ever more time
35 35 who are not in support + 2 more not in support that are identified by first names only
1 1 who is more open to the amendment, but asking to delay until a detailed study group is completed ever more time

http://www.louisvilleco.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=22344
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-05</td>
<td>Nick Broderick (Boulder resident)</td>
<td>SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Sam Tennesen</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Nick Broderick (Boulder resident)</td>
<td>SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Cyndi Thomas (CTCOA)</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Terisa Saint-Peter</td>
<td>SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Eric Fowles</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-12-04</td>
<td>Cyndi Thomas (CTCOA)</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-10-09</td>
<td>Michael Kreulsdorf</td>
<td>SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-10-30</td>
<td>Andrew Freeman</td>
<td>SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-05</td>
<td>Sherry Sommer</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-11-07</td>
<td>Peggy Simpson</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Richard Simpson</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-01-30</td>
<td>John Holland</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-06</td>
<td>Jayme Jameson</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Aidan ODonovan</td>
<td>SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Howard Peck</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Teresa Peck</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Kent Olson</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Dan Waldrip</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Sue Bolduc</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Andrew MacQueen</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Scott Robarge</td>
<td>Asking for clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Denise Choka</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Courtney Six</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Richard Mackay</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Tara Calloway</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Erica Clarke</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Marty Cooper</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Susan Goldie</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-07</td>
<td>Karen Lamb</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Eric Fowles</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Michelle Akrain</td>
<td>SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Steve Hughes</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Lisa Hughes</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Gillian Gardner</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Dan Ringle</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Jody Ringle</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Frank Harney</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Deborah Davies</td>
<td>SUPPORTS, but NOT in support of cultivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Justin J</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Bruce Kovalski</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Amber Allen</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Joel Hayes</td>
<td>SUPPORTS, but recommends 1000 ft buffers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Stu Skimming</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Leslie Aaholm</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Christopher Laird</td>
<td>SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Brian Topping</td>
<td>Delay vote until study group has detailed recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Oliva Edwards</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Laura &amp; Peter Wolton</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Stan &amp; Brenda Gordon</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-09</td>
<td>Larrie Henderson</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-08</td>
<td>Dennis &amp; Sandra Haberkern</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-01</td>
<td>Kyle Speidel, TGS Global</td>
<td>SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-29</td>
<td>Charles Kramer</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-01-31</td>
<td>Patricia Ross (grew up here, mom still lives in Louisville)</td>
<td>NOT in support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello,

My name Melinda Hoffman, and I have been a resident of Louisville for 6.5 years. I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed removal of restrictions on marijuana retail sales in Louisville. I don’t think that marijuana shops should be allowed near daycares, parks, playgrounds, ball fields, children’s recreational facilities, and schools. I also am opposed to allowing large scale marijuana growing within city limits.

We love Louisville because it is a wonderful place to raise our family. We love the small town feel and supportive community, and feel it’s a place where our kids are safe. The proposed removal of restrictions on marijuana in our community is at odds with the character and family-oriented nature of our beloved town. I urge you: please do not move forward with this change. We don’t need more marijuana in our community.

Sincerely,

Dr. Melinda Hoffman, Ph.D.

1176 Harper Lake Drive

Louisville, CO

--

Mindy Hoffman
I appreciate the commitment and sacrifice that each member of our council and their families make on behalf of our city. My father sat on our city council and his father before him. It’s generally a thankless job with a mountain of no-win situations. They spend endless hours working to resolve and overcome the city’s issues and challenges. Just as our small business owners do daily.

If there is one thing our city hall is good at, it’s dotting the i’s and crossing the t’s on its legal process and notification of meetings. For me, this has never stood in question. What I do ponder, is why our city council would not bring such a broad reaching issue to a comprehensive outreach. As I recall, we did this with the rec center, Highway 42, South Boulder Road Plan, The Sam’s Club Site, and neighborhood speed control just to mention a few. Has the cart been put before the horse? Perhaps our council simply underestimated the far reaching and long-lasting impact it will have on all of our residents and businesses in our community.

I claim to know nearly half of the members of this council and consider them long time personal friends. Our council shoulders the burden of knowing the gravity of our declining sales tax revenue projections. I suggest they ask the question, if not for the anticipated financial pickle, would we even be entertaining this change in the marijuana ordinance?

Colorado Public Radio reported on October 22, 2018, “Despite the fervor, marijuana isn’t the big green budget bandage that many envisioned. That’s not to say that the state isn’t making money on the deal, but, like many taxes, it’s not a cure-all that balances the checkbook.” How much sales tax revenue do we believed is projected to be gained? Has that number been calculated? At whose expense will it come?

The Louisville City Council has done a great job of preserving the architecture of our Old Town area. The charm and character and attraction of Louisville truly comes from the deep-rooted family values which have been established and passed on for generations. Why should we not protect that?

One has to wonder why on January 07, our mayor wrote in response to a citizen query (that is on public record), “I personally don’t support these changes”, yet on November 05, he voted in favor. Then, on January 08, he actually made the motion to approve and again voted in favor to pass this ordinance forward?

I recommend that all council members watch the December 13th planning commission meeting. I find it representative of the marijuana issue as it applies to our population. We all can agree that our commissions are hand selected by council to represent a cross section of its Louisville constituency.

I’ve participated in and have watched hundreds of city council and planning commission meetings over the last 20 years. It’s been customary when a request or ordinance is served up by council that it usually flows through the planning commission smoothly and is a foregone conclusion to get a yes vote with some recommendations.

This ordinance is unique in that raised many more questions than staff had answers. It quickly became evident that this issue and decision will impact nearly every resident, business, church, school and daycare in our community. This has such far reaching consequences, shouldn’t it warrant a formal outreach to allow for comprehensive public input?

Typically, when council serves up an ordinance and or amendment it conveys its motivation and objective of what the ordinance should achieve. When commissioners asked this question, staff stated that council’s desire is for their marijuana ordinance to be more in line with alcohol. The reality is that it cannot and should not. Marijuana is a class one controlled substance by federal law of the United States of America.

Commissioner Howe highlighted the negative socioeconomic impacts which were provided in the
packet by staff. He also brought to light that folks who currently operate businesses will be concerned about being located next to a pot shop, only to be ignored and dismissed by the chairman. I can say it’s a huge issue to me and know several Louisville business owners who would echo Commissioner Howe’s concerns.

On December 13, the opinions voiced by planning commissioners were clearly divided and the 6-1 vote did not reflect their overall support. There were three commissioners who clearly voiced, for the record, their preference was to keep our existing ordinance of four retail recreation outlets.

The planning commission asked that staff quantify the potential number of retail shops the new ordinance would accommodate. Fifteen, 5,000 square foot stores are what staff stated is possible. I’d like to believe this is not our council’s desire, but this is what the ordinance will allow.

Marijuana is a rapid growing multi-billion-dollar industry in Colorado with a war-chest of investment behind it. The rush is on for retail operations to establish market share and position themselves for acquisition. These operators will do whatever it takes to establish new retail locations.

Only about half of the cities and counties of Colorado allow marijuana sales, thus true market factors will not limit the number. This ordinance will allow this as a “use by right”. They will max out the pot shop allowance and ask for more. Just as the residential developers have at North End. If the ordinance allows them to move in, our city hall and council will not be able to deny them.

The owner’s association representative of CTC clearly stated that they will not allow marijuana cultivation or processing. This, to protect the companies’ who conduct business on a national and international stage and with federal government entities. Why would our council not do the same? Would our council want to run off these companies and or set up the owner’s association with undue legal expenses?

Our mayor and council should recognize that many of our businesses must comply with the federal guidelines which their customers require to do business on a national and global level. To have a pot grow located next door could easily cost them business opportunities. These lost opportunities translate into lost jobs and ultimately lost revenue to the city.

Some at our city hall may believe that our industrial and manufacturing businesses are a financial liability because we pay only use tax and the triple rate property taxes to city hall. This perspective overlooks the hundreds of millions of dollars of payroll we generate. This in the form of paychecks that support our Louisville families and ultimately is spent in our retail businesses.

The balance of the city’s industrial area is the old Louisville Glass site. This property extends west all the way to the intersection of highway 42. Do we really want a pot grow at the gate way of our downtown district?

Why would our council want a K-12 school set back that runs in conflict with our state and or federal requirement of 1,000 foot? Why would we want to set ourselves up for undue legal issues? Our city council should question the rush to push this pot ordinance through? Is this really to align the rules with alcohol? Or, is this simply about driving revenue to fund city hall’s projected financial crisis?

I have no issue with those who responsibly use marijuana and want my friends to have a safe place to purchase a quality selection at a competitive price. With our current ordinance, nobody is standing in line to get their goods. According to Planning Commissioner Williams, Louisville currently have two recreational marijuana stores in operation with two more in the application process. Lafayette has three and Boulder more than 17. That’s over twenty within less than a twenty-minute drive.

Again, this ordinance will affect every resident and business in our community. It will forever change the character and face of Louisville. My request is that this council back up and give this ordinance the comprehensive public outreach and true public process it deserves.

Respectfully,

Michael Deborski
Mayor and city council members -

Vote No on Louisville Ordinance 1769 which changes the current ordinance for pot shops and marijuana grows in the city!

Since 2009, Louisville has consistently been voted as one of the best places to live in America. The city has invested in parks and safety for our children, additional bike lanes, trails and other amenities that make it a "dream" community for all generations who live here. If you vote for this ordinance you will personally be responsible for tarnishing the reputation, quality and safety of this community. See stats below.

Our family consists of first, second and third generation Louisville natives. We are proud of this community, please be so as well and vote NO.

Scott and Marianne Kranker

680 W. Hickory Street

Louisville, CO

Supporting statistics:

- The ordinance states “unlimited” pot shops with a 1500 sq ft buffer. City Staff says we could have up to 15 shops. We don’t need up to 15, 5000 sq feet super pot stores, with only a 500 ft buffer between shops and where kids congregate. More pot stores could have a HUGE NEGATIVE impact on the community.

  o According to the Centennial Institute study, for every dollar gained in sales tax revenue, up to $4.50 is spent on social services that are pot related, from police issues to education, handling addiction, and environmental hazards.
  o Facts show driving fatalities and impaired driving increase, which means more police involvement.
  o Property crime and even violent crime increases in surrounding neighborhoods around shops-
  o The proposed ordinance calls for unlimited grows.

    o The smell from grows is almost impossible to control—and we don’t want to smell marijuana everywhere.
    o WATER—the environmental impact is HUGE. It takes 6 gallons for ONE plant, and these plants aren’t the scrawny twigs of 30 years ago. These are giant shrubs.
    o Homeless, gangs, and black market activity could increase. It has in other communities, with studies to prove it, and we don’t have the
infrastructure to handle that.
City Council Members,
Recently I have come across an article about Marijuana and different studies and findings about the effects of its use. It is a little long, but it is eye-opening. As members of a board elected to care for and do what is best for all its citizens, you really ought to consider these studies. I would really appreciate you taking the time to read it and give me some feedback on it and maybe other studies you have read that would support the expansion of marijuana.
Here is the link.

Marijuana, Mental Illness, and Violence

Thank you,
Teresa Peck
Dear City Council,

I have looked at the entire Council package, and more importantly, the letters to city council and the articles cited as an authority on the current issues of MMJ usage. The largest package from Patricia Ross which includes a couple of reports clearly supporting the hurtful nature of the MMJ business. One needs to look further to the reports included in Patricia Ross’s letter making it appear the information doesn’t necessarily represent factual information on the industry but may be opinion. I have also included articles that indicate that usage by teenagers is the same percentage as 2013.

https://www.huffingtonpost.com/russ-belville/kevin-sabet-is-misleading_b_8192098.html

Another issue highlighted in these letters is that business will not want to be located next to such MMJ businesses. If this were true Ball Aerospace and Boulder Community hospital would have left Boulder sometime ago. I know of grow operations residing within blocks of Ball Aerospace and Boulder Community Hospital, and they haven’t lost any business due to this locale.

No matter how you judge the industry, it must be analyzed with an open mind. I believe this process has been long and difficult and when claims are made that may not be factual, make this process more difficult.

Please consider the attached, and I request this be entered on the record. Thanks for your continued deliberations on this issue.

Best,
Tom Tenessen
Kevin Sabet Is Misleading You Again About Marijuana Legalization

In his latest Huffington Post piece, “Rand Paul Gets It Wrong, Sonia Sotomayor Gets It Right on Pot,” Kevin Sabet, the professional anti-pot propagandist with a Ph.D. in public policy, not medicine or science, trots out more half-truths, distortions, and outright lies to confuse the national discussion on marijuana legalization. With apologies to the late John Denver, let us examine this...

Colorado Rocky Mountain Lie...

Kevin is trumpeting the proclamations of the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (RMHIDTA) Report, “The Legalization of Marijuana in Colorado, The Impact, Volume 3,” which he claims proves that legalization of marijuana “has already had an alarming impact on Coloradans’ public safety and health.”

The RMHIDTA “is an important component of the President’s National Drug Control Strategy” and uses federal taxpayer dollars to “help eliminate or reduce drug trafficking and its harmful consequences.” In other words, it is an arm of the Drug Czar’s office, which is statutorily required to oppose all legalization efforts, and it is a bureaucracy that requires finding failure in legalization to maintain its budget.

For an example of the thorough scientific analysis RMHIDTA performs on marijuana data, look no further than page 30. In its review of a crash risk study from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), RMHIDTA writes “Researchers found that marijuana users are 25 times more likely to be in an accident than those that did not use the drug. By comparison, drunk drivers are four times more likely to crash than sober drivers.”

RMHIDTA didn’t compose that sentence. That was cut-and-pasted verbatim from an article in the International Business Times, entitled “Drug Use On US Roads Rises As Drunken Driving Drops“.
That article links to a study from NHTSA entitled “Drug and Alcohol Crash Risk Study”. The problem for RMHIDTA and, by extension, Kevin Sabet, is that the study referred to stated there was a 1.25 odds-risk ratio for THC-positive drivers versus sober drivers.

That’s a 25 percent greater risk, not 25 times greater risk. That’s far safer than the roughly 400 percent greater risk posed by drunk drivers the study noted.

But wait, it gets worse for Kevin. The study then goes on to conclude, “When demographic factors (age and gender) and alcohol use were controlled, the study did not find an increase in population-based crash risk associated with THC use.” In other words, young male drivers are the nation’s worst drivers, statistically speaking, especially if they are drinkers, and they also happen to be the demographic with the greatest marijuana use rates.

I’ve seen it raining fire in the sky...

Kevin then trots out other scare stats from RMHIDTA that bear a similar disdain for honest evaluation of the facts. Like a “32 percent increase in marijuana-related traffic deaths in just one year,” neglecting to mention that “marijuana-related” means “we discovered active THC or inactive THC-COOH (THC metabolites) in the bodies of drivers who died in car wrecks.”

You’re probably more likely to find married gays or married lesbians dying in car wrecks these days, too, now that gay marriage is legal. It doesn’t mean legalizing gay marriage has led to more traffic deaths. The problem with the “marijuana-related” deaths is that THC-COOH can be detected for up to 30 days and even THC can be detected for up to 5 days after total abstinence from marijuana. Now that marijuana is legal in Colorado, what are the chances any random person might have used some in the past month?

And by the way, overall traffic deaths in Colorado are down. Either everyone else is driving a hell of a lot safer to compensate for the stoned drivers, or marijuana legalization hasn’t really had any effect on traffic safety. After all, legalization didn’t invent cars and driving;
stoners didn’t all walk to Woodstock and Haight-Ashbury.

Kevin uses the same RMHIDTA sleight-of-hand to proclaim “A 38 percent increase in the number of marijuana-related hospitalizations,” which, like the car wrecks, just tells us that sometimes people who smoke pot go to the hospital. If you smoked a joint Saturday night, then got into a fender-bender Monday morning and went to the hospital, and they found that marijuana metabolite in your urine, you’re a “marijuana-related hospitalization.”

Except with this data set, in addition to detection of THC or metabolites we also get to add in people who tell the attending physician they use marijuana. Now that marijuana is legal in Colorado, do you suppose people are a bit more forthcoming with their doctor about using it? Remember this point when he eventually trots out the talking point about kids and accidental marijuana ingestion admissions; do you suppose a parent is more likely to report their kid getting into their now-legal marijuana stash, rather than lie about whatever it is that is making the kid sick or just wait it out at home?

Then there’s Kevin and RMHIDTA tossing out the *non sequitur* “Colorado youth usage (ages 12 to 17) ranks 56 percent higher than the national average.” Here’s an example of something that is true but totally misleading without context. Yes, after legalization, in 2012-2013, Colorado’s teen monthly use rate was 11.16 percent, compared to the national rate of 7.15 percent, a difference of 56 percent. And before legalization, the average Colorado rate for 2008-2010 was 13.25 percent, the national rate was 8.61 percent, a difference of 54 percent. Colorado has always had greater teen usage rates than the nation as a whole.

Reforming marijuana laws *doesn’t lead to greater marijuana use*; places with greater marijuana use demand reforms of marijuana laws.

**They say that he got crazy once and he tried to touch the sun...**
But that’s typical of Kevin’s propaganda, because he’s clearly losing the battle for the hearts and minds of Americans when it comes to marijuana legalization. Even two-thirds of Republicans in the early primary states think it is a matter to be left up to the states. It’s gotten Kevin so shaken up that his organization desperately latched on to a new 2014 statistic showing “HEAVY MARIJUANA USE SOARING AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE”, when, in fact, they transposed the data that showed heavy marijuana use actually decreased almost 15 percent.
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Kevin used to warn that “taxes gained on legal drugs would be quickly offset by the social costs resulting from this increased use: witness how today society receives about $1 in alcohol and tobacco tax revenue for every $10 lost on the social costs of those two legal drugs.”

But now that Washington and Colorado have added $200 million in pot revenues to the state treasuries, you don’t hear that talking point anymore, since he’d have to come up with $2 billion in devastation to back it up, or even $200 million to break even, and that’s without considering the savings in police, probation, parole, prison, and rehab no longer wasted on marijuana consumers.

Kevin used to warn that legalization wouldn’t affect the Mexican drug cartels, arguing that “the drug trade is so profitable that even undercutting the legal (taxed) market price would leave cartels with a handsome profit.”

But now that farmers in Mexico are giving up on marijuana planting because there is no profit in it, you don’t hear that talking point anymore, either.

**His heart still knows some fear of a simple thing he cannot comprehend...**

Kevin Sabet is trying desperately to maintain the criminal
prohibition of marijuana. He will offer that “arresting and imprisoning people solely for having or using small amounts of marijuana... is not the solution for such cases, and often aggravates addictions.” But his Kinder, Gentler Drug War solution is to continue arresting and imprisoning people who grow marijuana, sell marijuana, or possess a medium or large amount of marijuana. For those caught with the small amount, he proposes mandatory interventions with rehab doctors who will enforce involuntary abstinence from marijuana by requiring urine tests that carry criminal punishments for failure.

Kevin’s latest talking point is fearmongering about the legal marijuana industry becoming “Big Tobacco 2.0”. While Kevin is notoriously opaque about how Project SAM is funded (I found, through Open Records Requests, that he is personally paid $3,000 plus expenses to lecture), the beneficiaries of his propaganda couldn’t be more transparently obvious.

- Big Rehab: Over half of their referrals to rehabs that receive taxpayer money for marijuana alone are forced there by the criminal justice system. Plus, marijuana is so non-addictive that those “addicts” can easily stop, boosting the success rates of Big Rehab. It’s no surprise that a majority of Project SAM’s board work in Big Rehab.
- Big Pharma: Research indicates that “medical cannabis laws are associated with significantly lower state-level opioid overdose mortality rates,” because “medical cannabis patients have been engaging in substitution by using cannabis as an alternative to alcohol, prescription and illicit drugs.” Even at the over-the-counter level, how many people will forgo the pain reliever or sleeping pill for a relaxing puff off a legal marijuana joint?
- Law Enforcement: Cops get federal money to pull marijuana plants and bust marijuana consumers, as well as assets forfeited when cops make their drug dogs false alert to marijuana. Drug courts enjoy misleadingly-high success rates by threatening marijuana consumers with jail for dirty urine screens. Private prisons benefit from the occupancy rates and slave labor of well-behaved marijuana consumers.
Friends around the campfire and everybody’s high...

As for Justice Sotomayor, Kevin is referring to a snarky comment she made that said more about her desire to see students become passionate about other social justice issues she finds more important. Just like the RMHIDTA quoting an article that misquoted the data on traffic risk, Kevin quoted an article that misquoted Justice Sotomayor on marijuana.

Kevin relayed Sotomayor’s quote as, “I don’t care what kind of thing you become passionate about, just not legalizing marijuana.”

Amherst’s GazetteNet transcribed Sotomayor’s quote as, “I don’t care what kind of thing you become passionate about, except legalizing marijuana.”

But the video, archived by Marijuana Majority’s Tom Angell, shows Sotomayor clearly said, “I don’t really care what kinds of things you become passionate about. Maybe legalizing marijuana, but, you know, even that has people who are passionate and have accomplished something, OK?”

Remark starts at 2:00

My agenda is pretty simple and selfish. I’m a middle-aged, self-employed, childless adult who owns no car and travels on Portland, Oregon’s marvelous public transit, the Pacific Northwest Amtrak line, and airlines all across the country. Since we’ve legalized marijuana here, today seems no different than the day I got here twelve years ago, except I don’t fear police anymore and I don’t have to wait in a parking lot for some weed dealer. I can see no logical reason why any government in America should punish me to coerce me to stop using cannabis. I see no logical reason why any government in America should force me to purchase my cannabis from criminal underground markets.

Unfortunately for Kevin Sabet, more and more Americans are agreeing with me.
Analysis | Following marijuana legalization, teen drug use is down in Colorado

By Christopher Ingraham

Following legalization, the rate of adolescent marijuana use in Colorado has fallen to its lowest level in nearly a decade, according to new federal survey data.

State-level numbers from the National Survey on Drug Use and Health show that a little more than 9 percent of Colorado teens age 12 to 17 used marijuana monthly in 2015 and 2016, a statistically significant drop from the prior period. That's the lowest rate of monthly marijuana use in the state since 2007 and 2008.
And it's not just marijuana: Rates of teen alcohol, tobacco and heroin use are down sharply in the state, as well.

Colorado, which was the first in the nation to open recreational marijuana markets in 2014, is viewed as a bellwether by both opponents and supporters of legalization.

For state-level data, the survey uses pooled two-year periods to increase sample sizes and statistical accuracy. Last year the survey showed that Colorado was ranked No. 1 in the nation on adolescent marijuana use, a fact seized by marijuana opponents to argue that legalization was failing to protect children from drug use.

With the sharp drop in this year's data, Colorado has fallen to No. 7 in the national ranking of teen marijuana use, behind Alaska, Maine, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island and Vermont. A separate survey administered by officials in Colorado has found that teens in the state are in the middle of the pack on marijuana use.

“Teen use appears to be dropping now that state and local authorities are overseeing the production and sale of marijuana,” said Brian Vicente of Vicente Sederberg LLC, one of the drafters of Colorado's marijuana ballot measure, in a statement. “There are serious penalties for selling to minors, and regulated cannabis businesses are being vigilant in checking IDs.”

Attorney General Jeff Sessions is an outspoken critic of marijuana legalization, but thus far he has hewed to the prior administration's policy of noninterference with state-level legalization efforts. While marijuana remains illegal at the federal level, voters in eight states plus the District have legalized the recreational use of the drug. Lawmakers in Vermont have signaled they will legalize the recreational use of marijuana early next year.

The new federal data shows that adolescent marijuana use fell nationwide in 2016. In no states did the share of teens using pot increase by a significant amount, and in a number, including California, Colorado, Maryland, New Jersey and Texas, rates of teen marijuana use fell considerably.

Use is up, however, among young adults age 18 to 25 and adults age 26 and up. Alcohol use, meanwhile, is falling across the board,
according to the federal survey data.

In Colorado, for instance, the number of 18-to-25-year-olds using alcohol on a monthly basis fell by four percentage points between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. That's the group with the highest propensity to use marijuana, suggesting that a number of young adults are opting to smoke weed instead of get drunk now that the option is available to them.

If that's the case, it could be a big public-health win, considering what public-health experts know about the harmfulness of marijuana vis-à-vis booze.
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Dishonest Government Report Assumes Marijuana Legalization Has No Benefits

Jacob Sullum

Colorado Gov. John Hickenlooper (Photo by Jason Connolly/AFP/Getty Images)
During a debate while running for re-election in 2014, Colorado Gov. John Hickenlooper was asked whether voters in his state had been “reckless” when they approved marijuana legalization two years earlier. “To a certain extent you could say it was reckless,” he replied.

Last May, after repeatedly saying he would reverse legalization if he had “a magic wand,” Hickenlooper told the Los Angeles Times, “If I had that magic wand now, I don’t know if I would wave it. It’s beginning to look like it might work.”

See if you can guess which Hickenlooper quote appears in the latest report on marijuana legalization in Colorado from the drug warriors at the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (RMHIDTA). It’s not much of a puzzle. Since suppressing the use of marijuana and other illegal drugs is RMHIDTA’s mission, its reports on legalization are indictments masquerading as objective assessments. The same organization that last year falsely claimed public support for legalization had declined in Colorado this year portrays a governor who sounds cautiously optimistic about legalization as unambiguously against it.

Also on Forbes:

The report’s treatment of Hickenlooper is of a piece with its one-sided approach, which focuses exclusively on the negative consequences of legalization and exaggerates what we know about them. RMHIDTA likes to present dramatic, seemingly scientific charts that make legalization look like a big mistake. The difficulties of interpreting the data presented in the charts are usually relegated to a footnote, assuming they are mentioned at all.

On page 79 of the new report, for instance, there is a column chart showing a dramatic increase in “marijuana-related emergency
“department visits” between 2012, the year Colorado voters approved legalization, and 2013, the year the initiative began to take effect. The footnote says, “2011 and 2012 emergency department data reflects [sic] incomplete reporting statewide. Inferences concerning trends, including 2011 and 2012, should not be made.”

Similarly, a line graph on page 17 shows a sharp increase in “traffic deaths related to marijuana,” which a footnote defines as “fatalities involving operators testing positive for marijuana.” A footnote in the introduction (on page 11) warns, “This report will cite datasets with terms such as ‘marijuana-related’ or ‘tested positive for marijuana.’ That does not necessarily prove that marijuana was the cause of the incident.”

On reason “marijuana-related” crashes are not necessarily related to marijuana is that people can test positive for THC, marijuana's main psychoactive ingredient, even when they are not impaired. In fact, as the report notes in its summary of an Associated Press story published last May, “There is no science that shows drivers become impaired at a specific level of THC in the blood. A lot depends on the individual. Drivers with relatively high levels of THC in their systems might not be impaired, especially if they are regular users, while others with relatively low levels may be unsafe behind the wheel.”

RMHIDTA’s habit of inviting inferences in headlines while warning readers not to draw them in footnotes reaches ridiculous extremes on page 45, where a column chart labeled “Colorado School Dropouts” (above) shows what looks like a dramatic increase between 2013-14 and 2014-15. Although the difference between the 2013-14 total (10,546) and the 2014-15 total (11,114) is about 5%, the graph makes it look like the number of dropouts more than doubled, because the Y axis begins at 10,200. But never mind: “Rocky Mountain HIDTA has been asked about the number of school dropouts in Colorado numerous times and is, therefore, providing the data. Rocky Mountain HIDTA is not equating the number of dropouts with marijuana legalization.”
Similarly, a chapter offering “related data” includes this warning: “Some of the data reported in this section is because [sic] there have been so many inquiries on the particular subject, such as crime and suicides. This is not to infer [sic] that the data is [sic] due to the legalization of marijuana.” When you present trends in the context of a report that purports to describe “the impact” of marijuana legalization in Colorado, the clear implication is that they show the impact of marijuana legalization in Colorado. If the data don’t do that, including them at the behest of curious readers makes little sense.

Because RMHIDTA is keen to show that legalization has been a disaster in Colorado, it favors the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), which indicates that “youth past month marijuana use increased 20 percent in the two year average... since Colorado legalized recreational marijuana compared to the two-year average...prior to legalization” (emphasis in original). RMHIDTA does not like the Healthy Kids Colorado Survey (HKCS), even though it has a much larger sample, because HKCS indicates that adolescent marijuana use has been essentially flat since the drug was legalized. RMHIDTA argues that HKCS is unworthy of inclusion in the report because it had a low response rate (46%) in 2015. But one suspects the survey would have been acceptable if its results were more alarming. Even the increase found by NSDUH was not statistically significant—a point that RMHIDTA conveniently overlooks.

Although the data so far are equivocal, increased secondhand access to marijuana (through relatives, friends, and acquaintances who buy it legally) could still lead to an increase in cannabis consumption by Colorado teenagers. But it seems clear by now that pot prohibitionists were wrong when they warned that relaxing legal restrictions on marijuana, as more than two dozen states have done since 1996, would boost underage consumption by making the drug seem safer and more socially acceptable. In a recent analysis of NSDUH data, researchers at the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) note that the perceived riskiness of cannabis consumption fell among adults and teenagers between 2002 and 2014, a period when 16 states and the District of Columbia legalized marijuana for medical or recreational use. But cannabis consumption rose only among adults, and it actually declined...
among teenagers.

RMHIDTA views any increase in adult marijuana use as unequivocally bad. But since an increase in use reflects greater consumer satisfaction, it really should be counted as a benefit of legalization, except to the extent that it causes measurable problems. On that score the CDC’s analysis is reassuring, because the increase in adult use was not accompanied by a commensurate increase in “dependence and abuse” (as measured by questions about marijuana-related problems). In fact, marijuana use was less likely to qualify for that description in 2014 than it was in 2002.

Among 18-to-25-year-olds who reported using marijuana in the previous year, the incidence of dependence and abuse fell from 20.1% in 2002 to 15.3% in 2014, a 24% drop. That same rate fell from 10.9% to 8.7%—a 20% drop—among respondents older than 25. Abuse became less common even as the share of cannabis consumers reporting that they used marijuana every day or almost every day during the previous year rose from 14.5% to 19.9% among 18-to-25-year-olds and from 11.4% to 19.4% in the older group.

(Image: Lancet Psychiatry)

Another analysis of NSDUH data, reported last week in Lancet Psychiatry, notes that the overall prevalence of marijuana use disorders among adult cannabis consumers fell from 14.8% in 2002 to 11% in 2014, a 26% drop. That downward trend is broadly consistent with results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC), although NESARC generates larger rate estimates and measures a smaller drop.

Critics of prohibition have long argued that banning an intoxicant encourages bad habits and makes it hard to develop a culture of responsible use. It is also plausible that drug users who are undeterred by prohibition are, as a group, especially prone to excess. Therefore it is not surprising that cannabis consumers became less likely to abuse the drug as prohibition began to crumble. While that development is not conclusive evidence that repealing prohibition promotes self-control, it should be of interest
to anyone who recognizes that legalization has benefits as well as costs. Needless to say, there is no mention of this intriguing trend in the RMHIDTA report.
State’s Studies Show Marijuana Use Increasing Among Adults, Not Youth

DENVER (CBS4) — Two studies indicate the rate of marijuana usage by Colorado young people is relatively unchanged since 2015, and in fact mirrors the national average.

But a youth marijuana prevention agency warned the increase in
potency of marijuana and cannabis products since the drug’s legalization in 2014 poses equally increasing danger to its young users.

One in five Colorado kids use marijuana, according to data from the 2017 Healthy Kids Colorado Survey announced Thursday by the state health department. That is the same percentage as in 2013, before the drug became legal in Colorado.

Twenty percent was also the national average for youth marijuana usage.

(credit: CBS)

Retail (adult-use) marijuana use is illegal in Colorado for those under age 21.

Research shows underage marijuana use can impair developing brains, according the the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

“Preventing young people from using marijuana is a statewide priority,” said Gov. John Hickenlooper. “While youth use hasn’t gone up, we are working hard to educate Colorado parents and their children about the health and legal risks of underage marijuana use.”
The state credited its series of public health campaigns, initiated when marijuana was legalized, at educating Colorado’s youth about marijuana’s risks.

However, in a statement released Thursday, the executive director of Smart Colorado said “now is not the time to let our guard down.”

Henny Lasley responded to the Healthy Kids survey by saying its data was “encouraging,” but cautioned against reading too much into the rate of usage alone.

“It’s especially concerning that the state reported statistically significant increases in youth who usually dab high-THC resin (known as “wax” or “shatter”) or eat marijuana edibles,” Lasley said. “These two intake methods can provide highly potent doses of marijuana’s main psychoactive ingredient, which has been proven to harm growing brains.”
Colorado’s adults were surveyed separately. Marijuana use among Colorado’s adults increased from 13.6 percent in 2016 to 15.5 percent in 2017, most significantly among 18- to 34-year-olds.

While the majority smokes it, the number of Colorado adults who eat or drink cannabis products increased 5 percent in one year.

The number of adults who reported driving while high (3 percent) remained unchanged.

“The marijuana market in Colorado is evolving,” said Dr. Larry Wolk, health department executive director and chief medical officer. “Our job is to make sure those who choose to use marijuana, use it safely, legally and responsibly.”

The Healthy Kids Colorado Survey of middle and high schools throughout the state, conducted every two years, is supported by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, the Colorado Department of Education, the Colorado Department of Human Services, and the Colorado Department of Public Safety. The University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus administers the survey.

The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System is a telephone survey of adults that collects statewide data about residents regarding their health-related risk behaviors, chronic health conditions and use of preventive services.
Marijuana Report on Colorado by Anti-Pot Law Enforcement Group

**Pot Turning Colorado to Sh*t, Says Law Group's Latest Anti-Weed Screed**

**TOBER 11, 2017 | 6:45AM**
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Pot Turning Colorado to Sh*t, Says Law Group's Latest Anti-Weed Screed

Michael Roberts

| October 11, 2017 | 6:45am

The Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, a federally funded law enforcement group with an admitted anti-marijuana bias, has published the fifth volume in a series of reports about the impact of cannabis legalization on Colorado. Predictably, the new analysis, accessible below, is crammed with shocking statistics, and while many of the claims, including ones pertaining to an alleged spike in youth marijuana use in the state, aren't supported by other, more reliable studies, expect them to be touted by the roll-back-the-pot-legalization-clock crowd anyway.

RMHIDTA describes itself on its website as "an important component of the President's National Drug Control Strategy." It's said to provide "additional federal resources to those areas to help eliminate or reduce drug trafficking and its harmful consequences. Law enforcement organizations...assess drug trafficking problems and design specific initiatives to reduce or eliminate the production, manufacture, transportation, distribution and chronic use of illegal drugs and money laundering" in an effort to "reduce drug trafficking & related crime and violence."

Continue Reading

The local branch of the organization is operated under the supervision of director Tom Gorman, who has acknowledged in this space that some of the data assembled by the RMHIDTA is opinion-based, meaning it may not pass muster in a scientific survey. But in his view, the studies allow folks "to look at trends over a period of time to see if this data supports other data."
The first edition of "The Legalization of Marijuana in Colorado: The Impact" was released during the summer of 2013; much of its focus was on what was characterized as the increasing number of Colorado pot seizures beyond state lines. Part two, released in August 2014, argued that pot-related driving fatalities were up 100 percent in five years. Part three, which was teased in the run-up to 4/20/2015, continued its jihad against pot with more alarming assertions about driving dangers and teen dopers, while part four, from January 2016, doubled down even further.

Tom Gorman is head of the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area.

Fox31 file photo

Now comes part five, whose errors come fast and furious. Indeed, the press release for the document asserts that "Colorado legalized recreational marijuana in 2013," which is incorrect in two different ways; the vote for legalization, via Amendment 64, happened in November 2012, while recreational sales began on January 1, 2014. Keep that in mind when considering the following statements about what's happened in the state over the past four years:
• Marijuana-related traffic deaths more than doubled to approximately one death every three days

• In 2016, 20 percent of all traffic deaths were marijuana related compared to only 9 percent six years ago

• Colorado youth now rank #1 in the nation for marijuana use and 55 percent higher than the national average

• Colorado college-age group rank #2 in the nation for marijuana use and 42 percent higher than the national average

• Colorado adults now rank #1 in the nation for marijuana use and 124 percent higher than the national average

• Seizures of Colorado marijuana to other states increased 20 percent by vehicle and over 300 percent by parcels

The report itself contends that "marijuana-related traffic deaths when a driver was positive for marijuana more than doubled from 55 deaths in 2013 to 123 deaths in 2016," adding that "marijuana-related traffic deaths increased 66 percent in the four-year average (2013-2016) since Colorado legalized recreational marijuana compared to the four-year average (2009-2012) prior to legalization." However, it's important to note that prior to 2014, many jurisdictions didn't actually track the link between marijuana and traffic accidents, and meaningful stats are still hard to find — a fact that naturally inflates these digits in significant ways.
Similarly troublesome are the "Youth Marijuana Use" findings, summarized like so: "Youth past month marijuana use increased 12 percent in the three-year average (2013-2015) since Colorado legalized recreational marijuana compared to the three-year average prior to legalization (2010-2012). The latest 2014/2015 results show Colorado youth ranked #1 in the nation for past month marijuana use, up from #4 in 2011/2012 and #14 in 2005/2006. Colorado youth past month marijuana use for 2014/2015 was 55 percent higher than the national average compared to 39 percent higher in 2011/2012."

Problem is, plenty of other studies come to very different
conclusions, as marijuana reformer Mason Tvert pointed out to us after the fourth RMHIDTA salvo. As he noted, "The federal government already spent money to research use by people in Colorado, and SAMHSA [Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration] has the national survey, and it showed teen use in Colorado hasn't changed in the last several years. The National Institute on Drug Abuse has a survey that showed teen use hasn't changed, the Centers for Disease Control shows the same thing, and Colorado has the Healthy Kids survey done by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment in conjunction with the departments of human services and education — and that shows teen marijuana use hasn't gone up, either. But this little group of narcotics officers has decided to put out something that says the opposite of what all these surveys show. And even though it's not news, it's being treated that way."

Indeed, TV stations such as Denver7 and KKCO have already published pieces on the report that portray it as an objective look at the situation rather than an attempt to undermine the entire rationale for marijuana legalization by an organization with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. And expect folks such as Jeff Hunt, the Colorado Christian University educator who just staged a daylong anti-pot event, to use the figures, as he's done in the past. That's the reason the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas has published five reports to date, and why it will undoubtedly keep on doing so for years to come.

Click to read "The Legalization of Marijuana: The Impact, Volume 5, October 2017."
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Please vote NO on ordinance 1769.

Myself and my neighbors, Hank Dalton and Charlie Heath on St. Andrews Ln, have all been victimized by our cars stolen from our residences.

The tax revenue is not worth the safety of my neighborhood.

Deb

Deborah Ruppert | Premier Travel
641 Saint Andrews Ln | Louisville, CO 80027 | USA
T: 303.604.2111 | F: 303.604.4335
deb.premiertravel@gmail.com
Dear City Council,
Please read my letter for Tuesday's meeting. I can only pray the appropriate and responsible decision will be made concerning adding any new Marijuana Dispensaries to what used to be a wonderful, clean, safe small town that I was proud to grow up in.
Thank you, Elizabeth Stahr
Elizabeth Stahr
549 Lincoln Ave
Louisville, Co

I am a fourth generation Louisville resident; my great, great grandparents homesteaded on Dillon Road where my cousin still lives to this day. And, my great, great grandparents owned several mines in Louisville. In 1949, my grandparents bought a grocery store on Main Street that has since been torn down and made into the Chase parking lot. In the 1960’s they built and then moved the City Market to what is now Lucky Pie, where they provided goods and services that met the basic needs and enriched the lives of our fellow Louisville residents. At the same time, they also owned and operated the grain elevator, Rex theater, and L & L drive in. From an early age, I worked long hours with my mother and my grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins, alongside many other long time-Louisville residents. We worked hard to maintain a healthy, small-town environment.

For many generations Louisville was a place kids could play freely through-out town and everyone looked out for the well-being of each other’s children. If kids were ever up to no good, chances were their parents knew about it before they returned back home.

This is why I chose to raise my daughter here in Louisville. Due to the rapid urbanization of our town, I fear that she may not have that same opportunity for her kids someday. I am greatly saddened by the over-growth of my town and the changes that have come from that. When I was growing up, we never locked the door to our home, whereas now, I can’t leave a bike in my yard for fear of theft.

Our city council needs to understand that the values of our small-town character go way beyond the architecture of our Old Town. Although Old Town has been horribly compromised by what I consider a flagrant disrespect of the true character of Old Town Louisville, where newer, larger homes are built on the foundations of the old ones, the history and small-town feel still lies within the culture of our people.

Multi-generational family events like the parade of lights and Labor-day celebration will be all for not if we allow the wide-spread sale of marijuana throughout our community. What a sad sight it would be if we had dispensaries less than a 1/3 of a mile from each other. Worse is the reputation that would come with that.

I urge our council not to enact this new marijuana ordinance and protect the values and character of the Louisville we all know and love. I fear allowing the widespread sale of an unregulated product that adversely affects the mind and body of the user, will create unsafe conditions in our community. Those who ingest the product could drive impaired—and the increase in unsafe traffic alone is something we do not want in Louisville. As there is no way to detect THC without a urinalysis or blood test, unlike alcohol, we are at greater risk on our roads, where our children have the state given right to cross without regarding traffic.

I urge our council not to enact this new marijuana ordinance and protect the values and character of the Louisville we all know and love.
Good Morning,

I can't make the Louisville city council meeting tonight, but I am AGAINST bring anymore Pot Shops into Louisville.

Thank you very much.

Mr. William B Ryan
516 Grant Ave
Louisville CO, 80027
Dear Members of City Council,

I am not able to speak tonight as I had hoped, but am sending the notes I planned to use. I have also asked Meredith to show a short (1.5 min) video clip on the topic.

Thank you,

Sherry Sommer

My concern is with the impact this ordinance as written would have on public health in young people. Other issues talked about in planning—odors, and measurable effect on crime rates are secondary in comparison in my opinion

My concerns with this ordinance have to do with the reduction and elimination of buffers around schools and public places frequented by children and young adults

Especially concerned by the potential introduction of marijuana businesses in the NE corner of Louisville within easy walking distance from Centaurus and LMS

The information I am presenting comes from this book—The Teenage Brain by Frances Jensen, a neuroscientist Harvard and U Penn

1) Marijuana can be perceived as being less dangerous than alcohol because it can be used medicinally, but it is actually more dangerous for teens

2) Use is outpacing alcohol as a public health problem—admissions to rehab. Teen users are more than 2x more likely to become addicted

3) Its use disrupts the development of neural pathways
in youth

<--[if !supportLists]-->4) <--[endif]-->The effects can last for days causing memory, reduced ability to learn, and decreased IQ

<--[if !supportLists]-->5) <--[endif]-->Use can trigger mental illness, especially in youth

<--[if !supportLists]-->6) <--[endif]-->Tar and Carbon monoxide are 3-5 times greater in cannabis users than in tobacco users

7) Adolescent brains are not as resilient as adult brains when it comes to using marijuana. Their frontal and prefrontal cortexes are developing and these are two of the most sophisticated areas of the brain.
Please, please, please do not approve high density housing in the Sam's Club space. This small town was ruined when we were voted best small town several years ago. Everything that made us great exists no longer. Please do not rub salt in the wounds by adding more high density. Why not a market place like in Denver/Philly/Seattle? So many poor decisions have been made that can't be undone. And it breaks my heart every time I see another old town house torn down and replaced with a mansion. I know change is inevitable, but it can be controlled. Please keep what is left of the old great Louisville, Louisville.
Good Morning,
Please take the time to read this letter concerning allowing more marijuana dispensaries in Louisville, please feel free to contact Cimmaron if you have clinical questions or need copies of research.
Thank you, Elizabeth
To Whom It May Concern:

As a 5th generation resident of Louisville, myself and my family have watched this town grow and change significantly over the years. With the proposal for an increased number of allowed marijuana dispensaries, I fear that Louisville will soon appear indistinguishable from areas in Boulder, or even Aurora, and lose sight of the traditions and values my great grandparents, grandmother, and mother all worked hard to build. In addition to my concerns regarding a contradiction with Louisville’s small town values, I have deep concerns regarding the risks associated with an increased presence of legal marijuana in our community.

I am aware that marijuana is generally perceived as a harmless drug, but there is more than enough evidence to show that marijuana use has unwanted consequences like any other drug or alcohol. I graduated this past year with my BS in psychology with a specialization in cognitive neuroscience; my studies brought me into contact with plenty of research suggesting that marijuana’s impact on the brain, especially the developing adolescent brain, is in fact quite harmful. (For a list of the short-term and long-term effects of marijuana use please see the article published in the highly reputable New England Journal of Medicine I have listed at the end of my letter.)

I currently work at Louisville’s behavioral health hospital, Centennial Peaks. In the few months I have worked there, I have seen several cases of THC induced psychosis. In other words, patients have been brought in experiencing extreme paranoia, delusions, and even hallucinations caused by marijuana use. The psychotic symptoms they experience are not unlike those caused by illicit drugs like meth or LSD, only differentiated by a urine analysis showing legal marijuana in their system. Sometimes these symptoms fade as the drug leaves their system; other times, the debilitating effects linger indefinitely. On a less extreme (and personal note), I have watched friends and peers personalities dramatically change, decision making skills falter, and any motivation fade, from “just smoking a little weed.”

I know you may be thinking of the current, popular discussion regarding marijuana which boasts benefits such as pain relief, relaxation, mood improvement, etc. due to the CBD component of the plant. What you may not know is that most marijuana products sold in dispensaries today contain a THC to CBD ratio of 250 to 1 (for comparison marijuana in the 1990’s contained a ratio of around 10 to 1). THC and CBD content are proportionally linked; the more THC in a plant, the less CBD, and vice versa. Dispensaries purposefully breed plants high in THC content because that is what the vast majority of their consumers are looking for. The marijuana available today is considerably stronger and more potent; as such, the effects and consequences are more severe.

Even more alarming is the fact that, in most dispensaries, consumers do not know how much THC or CBD they are truly getting. The products are labeled as “70% THC & 30% CBD”, for example; however, this is only an educated GUESS made by the growers. Most dispensaries do not test the chemical makeup of their plants, as this is expensive, and instead market products based on a loose estimate. This estimate can have detrimental effects for a consumer who does
not use marijuana often, has not developed a tolerance to the drug, and does not know how much is safe to consume at one time.

In fact, most people, even chronic, daily marijuana users do not have any idea how much is safe to consume. This is because there are no standard regulations established by the FDA at this point. Consider this in comparison to alcohol; we know that a standard drink is about 12oz of beer, for example. With these standards in place it makes it more possible for a consumer to keep track of how much they are drinking per day or know if they are drinking too much. There are no such standards in place for marijuana. How much is one puff? One dab? One edible? With no standard, it is easy to overdo it and there is no way to monitor whether one may be consuming too much until it is too late.

At the very least we know that both alcohol and marijuana are linked to addiction, impaired motor function, and altered judgement; shouldn’t access to both substances be limited in our community? If we are to allow a limited number of liquor stores in Louisville, it is more than reasonable to keep the limited number of dispensaries allowed in Louisville at this point. Given the concerns I have detailed in this letter, I urge you to consider if is it worth giving more space in our community to allow for the sale of a product that is associated with such risks, many of which are not yet fully understood.

For a quick (only 15 mins) and informative video discussing the complexities of legal marijuana please check out the Netflix Original Explained and watch the episode entitled “Weed”. For more information regarding the evidence I mentioned in this letter, please feel free to contact me at 303-638-7242 or Cimmaron.retzikstahr@gmail.com. I have listed the sources below where much of the information I mentioned in this letter is from.

Sincerely,
Cimmaron Stahr