

Gina.

(I'm cc'ing a bunch of people here, so that no one can misrepresent my words.)

Obviously, I was shocked to learn that you formed a campaign committee to compete with your own campaign committee. This is a first-time experience for me to witness.

As you know, JP and I -- and then also Kurt and Heather -- had already agreed to about 99% of the issues before Heather left the U.S. for two weeks. There were only five issues left on the table, and it was my impression that MPP would compromise on three -- and your team would compromise on two -- in order to finalize the deal. I haven't heard any argument from anyone that would lead me to believe that this deal cannot happen. Heck, even your public statements didn't state what your concerns are, so I really have no idea what your concerns are. (Also, you have my phone number and my email address.)

Yesterday, JP and I had a good conversation, wherein he summarized where he thought the problems had arisen:

- One involved an innocent conversation that two of my staffers had with a few Arizona activists, but that conversation couldn't have been instrumental, because that conference call occurred on Friday at 11:30 a.m., and I know you were fishing around the Secretary of State's office before Friday.
- The other concern was that some people on your team were concerned that our final draft wouldn't adhere to the key points of agreement, but that also cannot be a good argument, because Heather hasn't even had a chance yet to receive the Legislative Counsel's review of our initiative, nor has she had a chance to tweak the consensus initiative after our pair of conversations with JP and Kurt.

So nothing makes sense here. I've come to conclude there's a sickness on your team, but I don't know where it's originating from. The accusations, the violations of agreements, and the debating of things that have already been agreed to are unusual, to say the least. This has never happened before in the 20 states where we've drafted bills and initiatives. Also, I've never witnessed the chair of a committee form a competing committee.

We were on the 1-yard line, but your action on Friday has caused me to make some "executive decisions" here. So here are the next steps ...

1. We'll obviously need to remove you from the "MPP of Arizona" campaign committee, so please assume this will happen on Monday morning.

- 3. A few days after Heather returns to Minnesota, she will complete the drafting process in accord with what JP/I/Kurt/Heather have already agreed to. So you'll be able to see this for yourself -- in writing -- before we file the final initiative with the Secretary of State. (This is not a capitulation on my part; rather, it's what we already said we would do, and we keep our commitments.) This final initiative will certainly adhere to our agreement.
- 4. After you see that we keep our commitment, if you file a competing initiative with the Secretary of State anyway, we will specifically launch a series of actions to harm your business, in the spirit of what social-justice movements do to boycott bad companies or bad business owners. Everything we would do would be legal. For example, I'm already budgeting \$10,000 (as of Friday) to pay people for 1,000 hours of time to distribute literature outside of your front door, and the literature will not portray you in a kind way. We will not target any other dispensaries; we will only target you. (There are other legal actions I have planned, so please just assume that distributing literature will be one of four or five tactics to disrupt your business; again, this will all be legal.)

As I told JP yesterday, I'm not joking around here. I spent 90 days in jail for marijuana when I refused to narc on anyone in 1989 as a student at Penn State University. As such, I'm certainly willing to spend no time in jail in order to disrupt the business of someone (you) whose actions are likely to keep people in jail for marijuana.

I'm 100% intent on keeping my two financial commitments, which are (1) to pay Carlos his salary through the end of 2016, and (2) to pay for the entire signature drive.

If your team decides to run a competing signature drive, that's a decision that you will make. It will not interfere with what we're planning. (You should also take some time to ask a random selection of political consultants whether it's better to have one initiative or two initiatives on the same ballot.)

I advise that you adhere to the process that we've created. If you don't like the process at this late hour, please at least let me know how and why? Thank you ...

Sincerely,
Rob Kampia, Executive Director
Marijuana Policy Project
2370 Champlain Street, NW
Suite 12
Washington, D.C. 20009
202-462-5747 ext. *2019
202-232-0442 (fax)
RKampia@mpp.org
http://www.mpp.org