

Michelle Caracaus Long  
38790 Van Ward Road  
Abell, MD 20606  
**UNFAVORABLE SB 537**

Hello, I'm Michelle Caracaus Long. I spoke last week in support of Senate Bill 158 with suggested amendments and shared my personal negative experiences from the cannabis growing and processing facility that established itself a mile away from my home in a critical area. Today I'm here to oppose SB 537 cross-filed with HB 805. Please understand I'm not here as the angry resident using this as my personal forum against cannabis. I'm here to remind you that there are real people, like me, on the end of this bill that are about to be significantly and negatively impacted if this is passed.

First, this bill unfairly supports only the cannabis licensees and cannabis related businesses and dispensaries. Where are the considerations for the people, other businesses, and environment this bill will impact with these proposed zoning and distance alterations? If children and families are the underlying theme for the locations that prohibit dispensaries to be located 500ft from, then why is it acceptable for this bill to allow dispensaries to essentially be zoned for areas closer to their homes? How does this make sense? Which demographic and/or locations will these zoning and distance alterations favor? How will this bill address the increase in crime that other Maryland localities have already seen? Can you guarantee that

these dispensary zoning re-designations won't inadvertently depreciate neighboring home and land values, if not devastate them? These questions can't be answered by this bill because stripping the powers from political subdivisions silences the voices of those who could be heard and that this bill directly impacts.

So let's look at the language in line 9 and 10 for B1. What is the reasonableness standard that will be used for the political subdivision to establish reasonable zoning requirements that doesn't unduly burden a cannabis licensee? I'm sure the term 'reasonable' will be open for the political subdivision to interpret, but that unduly burden clause makes it impossible for any argument that supports "reasonable" zoning requirements to carry any weight or merit against language structured to supersede anything that makes it difficult for cannabis businesses to open and operate.

Additionally, if this bill is passed and allows for outdoor cannabis cultivation that prohibits my county from imposing more restrictive zoning requirements, you have just further shifted the undue burden onto neighboring residents regarding nuisance subsequently depriving us of life, liberty and property without any recourse or due process.