

GIVENS PURSLEY_{LLP}

Attorneys and Counselors at Law

601 W. Bannock Street
PO Box 2720
Boise, ID 83701
Main: 208-388-1200
www.givenspursley.com

July 17, 2026

Phil McGrane
Idaho Secretary of State
700 W. Jefferson St., Rm. E205
Boise, ID 83702
secretary@sos.idaho.gov

Re: Final Determination Regarding Idaho Medical Cannabis Act Initiative Petition

Dear Secretary McGrane:

Please accept this letter on behalf of our client, the Natural Medicine Alliance of Idaho (NMAI), in response to your July 13, 2026 letter regarding the Idaho Medical Cannabis Act Initiative Petition.

NMAI appreciates your Office's prompt review of the counties' certifications and its responsiveness throughout the initiative process. Although the initiative will not appear on the ballot, NMAI remains proud of the sheer number of signatures gathered—approximately 150,000, over twice the 70,000 required—and the broad public support those signatures represent.

That said, NMAI does not agree with several issues raised in your letter. Although NMAI does not intend to pursue a legal challenge, it believes a response is warranted.

The letter states that county clerks accepted just over 58,000 signatures. This reflects an unusually high rejection rate. It appears that well over 10,000 signatures from registered Idaho voters were rejected based on technicalities or legally questionable grounds.

First, counties rejected thousands of signatures because each petition sheet must contain signatures only from residents of a single county. For example, a registered voter that lives in Canyon County could unknowingly sign an Ada County petition during lunch in Boise. The voter's signature would be rejected on that basis. Although this restriction may have served a purpose when clerks had access only to county records, Idaho now maintains a statewide voter-registration database.

Second, thousands of signatures were rejected because they were undated, even when the relevant date could be confirmed from surrounding signatures and the petition's signed, dated, and notarized circulator affidavit. These rejections are especially concerning because the governing statutes do not expressly require each signer to provide a date.

Third, thousands more were reportedly rejected because the voter was not “active.” The initiative statutes do not impose a specific registration timeline. To the extent these rejections were based on Idaho Code section 34-435, the statute does not appear to authorize retroactive cancellation of a registration that was valid when the petition was signed. It is also unclear whether affected voters had notice or opportunity to cure cancellation of their registration status.

These rejections should concern all Idahoans, particularly the registered voters who took the time to participate in the initiative process only to have their signatures rejected afterward.

Your letter also raises concerns regarding circulator residency and petition warnings. NMAI retained a contractor to identify, verify, and document qualified circulators and provided the contractor with accurate petition forms. To NMAI’s knowledge, its contractors obtained from all circulators the required information to confirm Idaho residency. In some instances, confirmation of residency may have been achieved by proof other than an Idaho drivers’ license. NMAI’s review of Idaho law identified no requirement to record a circulator’s driver’s-license information or to prove residency through any particular set of documents. If the contractor inadequately documented residency or used an incorrect form, NMAI nevertheless acted in good faith to comply with Idaho law.

Your letter identifies one petition sheet that contains signatures you believe could be fraudulent. NMAI has zero tolerance for fraud and stands ready to cooperate with any fraud-related investigation. That said, a small number of questionable signatures do not undermine the integrity of the broader signature-gathering effort.

Finally, your letter identifies possible reporting deficiencies. NMAI takes its reporting obligations seriously, believes its reports are complete and accurate, and will work with your Office to address any specific deficiencies. To the extent the concerns involve reporting of payments to petition circulators, NMAI engaged a professional contractor to manage circulator payments; that contractor held all payment data and was required by law to accurately report that information. In any event, reporting deficiencies of this kind do not provide a basis for rejecting otherwise valid signatures.

NMAI appreciates the opportunity to respond and remains available to discuss these matters further.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J. Chou". The signature is stylized with a large "J" and a cursive "Chou".

Jeremy C. Chou