



Madison Brame

From: IRRC
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 10:26 AM
To: Michelle Elliott; Scott Schalles; Fiona Cormack
Cc: Stephen Hoffman; Madison Brame
Subject: FW: PHARMACISTS ARE PHYSICALLY NECESSARY IN DISPENSARIES

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Comment on #3290.

Kathy Cooper
 Independent Regulatory Review Commission
 333 Market Street Tower
 14th Floor
 Harrisburg, PA 17101
 717-783-5417

-----Original Message-----

From: Dylan Thibault <dteeb34@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2022 10:43 PM
To: IRRC <irrc@irrc.state.pa.us>
Subject: Re: PHARMACISTS ARE PHYSICALLY NECESSARY IN DISPENSARIES

CAUTION: **EXTERNAL SENDER** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please add to my statement that these are my opinons and do not reflect my company. Thank you.

Dylan Thibault

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 15, 2022, at 3:33 PM, Dylan Thibault <Dteeb34@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>

> TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

>

> My name is Dylan Thibault, I have been in the medical cannabis industry within Pennsylvania for nearly the last three years. I am writing to express concern over the lobbying of certain cannabis companies (Cresco, Jushi) to remove "unnecessary barriers" in the program. Corporate cannabis would like to have as few medical professionals checking as many patient certifications as legally possible in order to reduce their need to pay a licensed pharmacist. However, just recently, a patient came into our dispensary that received help that would never have been possible without the presence of a pharmacist. Would you allow a family member, who is completely cannabis naive, to enter a pharmacy to pick up medical-grade cannabis, without having the opportunity for a proper review of drug interactions; or proper consultation from a medical professional over what products would be best for them? Are you comfortable with that

fact/possibility? Having one pharmacist cover multiple locations, except in instances of pharmacist breaks as well as emergencies, is asinine. Permanent remote coverage, as well as simultaneous coverage, is a mistake and would be detrimental to our patient's safety in this program.

>

> With Kind Regards,

>

> Dylan Thibault

> Shift Lead

>