



MEMORANDUM

TO: Marijuana Control Board DATE: February 20, 2019

FROM: Erika McConnell, Director RE: Regulations Project – Fingerprints for
Marijuana Control Board Individuals

The board opened this regulations project at the October 2018 meeting. Public comments were accepted for over 30 days and are attached.

This change would allow AMCO to collect fingerprints and fees from an individual who is applying for a new license, a license transfer, or an ownership change, only once in a year, even if the individual is a part of multiple entities who are applicants.

AS 17.38.200(a) requires each applicant to submit fingerprints and fees. AMCO has interpreted applicant to be the entity that receives a license. When one entity applies for multiple licenses, only one set of fingerprints are required for each individual who is part of the entity. But when an individual is part of more than one entity, that individual has been required to submit more than one set of fingerprints, which is technically not necessary.

Options for the board:

- Vote to adopt as written
- Amend; if amendment is significant, put out for public comment
- Send back to staff for revisions
- Close the project without action

(Words in **boldface and underlined** indicate language being added; words [CAPITALIZED AND BRACKETED] indicate language being deleted.)

3 AAC 306.055(a) is amended to read:

(a) When filing an application for a new marijuana establishment license, [OR] transfer of a license, **, or ownership change,** the applicant, including each individual listed in 3 AAC 306.020(b)(2), must submit the person's fingerprints and the fees required by the Department of Public Safety under AS 12.62.160 for criminal justice information. **An individual who has submitted fingerprints and fees under this section is not required to submit a new set of fingerprints and fees for a second or subsequent application for a new license, transfer, or ownership change, if the second or subsequent application is submitted within 12 calendar months of the date criminal justice information is received in response to the initial submission of fingerprints and fees.**

(Eff. 2/21/2016, Register 217; am ___/___/___, Register ___)

Authority:	AS 17.38.010	AS 17.38.150	AS 17.38.200
	AS 17.38.070	AS 17.38.190	AS 17.38.900
	AS 17.38.121		



MIDNIGHT GREENERY

Tina M. Smith, CEO
Midnight Greenery
(907)727-2000
T.smith@midnightgreenery.com

To: MCB Board members, Director McConnell,

I am writing in regards to the listed proposed regulation changes,

3 AAC 306.055(a): In full support

3 AAC 306.060: in full support, suggest that “a reasonable time” is subjective and should be a solid timeframe. This gives a very clear picture of expectations and is not subjective.

3 AAC 306.015: I am in full support of allowing universities, both private and public to apply for a marijuana license. My only suggestion is to not prohibit the universities from having a retail license. All security measures and age requirements are still in place, assuring that only responsible aged adults are allowed to purchase or enter an establishment. The UAA campus at this time does have an active liquor license on its grounds inside the Alaska Airlines Center #5328, which also allows for university sponsored events and requires a UAA application process. To allow alcohol serving licenses and prohibit cannabis sales makes no sense, especially with what we have learned in the last 3 years regarding the detriment of alcohol vs. cannabis on the human mind and body.

3 AAC 306.020: In full support



MIDNIGHT GREENERY

3 AAC 306.100: While I do not object to license fee increases to cover the debt to the state general fund, I do believe the new fee schedules are very problematic with the very steep increases.

A 40% increase on the larger businesses is already a very steep incline for our very first fee change, then you consider in the 100% increase on renewals, being put upon the license types that are struggling the hardest to stay afloat (limited cultivation), its ridiculously steep incline. This in no way promotes small business, in fact is very much a hinderance that is not shared equally among license types in this proposed change.

I would suggest a 20% to 25% increase across all license types.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,

Tina Smith