Les Helgeson
Beaver, OR 97108

April 10, 2017

TO: Joint Committee on Marijuana Regulation
RE: SB 1057

I would like to offer the following comments on SB 1057.

Sections 23-26 are commendable given uncertainties at the federal level.

Sections 31 - 33 (Labeling) might be amended to include the transfer of testing provisions to the Department of Agriculture where such responsibility belongs in the first place (see also Section 36b Testing by ODA). The Health Authority has failed miserably at regulating pesticides in particular. The legislature needs to seriously consider directing that cannabis be tested in accord with food crops and leave well enough alone.

The risk from pesticide consumption via cannabis is miniscule relative to what is otherwise consumed on a daily basis. In particular, OMRI listed products such as Pyrethrum, Spinosad, Piperonyl Butoxide and others are not monitored on food crops as in OHA's draconian cannabis testing rules. Furthermore, available research demonstrates that these products are either broken down substantially when smoked in tobacco or are otherwise harmless if inhaled when used according to their respective labels.

There should be no argument that ODA is far better suited to understand the nuances of pesticide use and is therefore the best place to regulate their use on cannabis. If pesticides mentioned above, along with a few others were removed from the list of analytes to be tested it is likely FIFRA would be largely irrelevant since the incentive to use illegal pesticides would be greatly reduced. Thus there should be no logical barrier to moving testing responsibilities to ODA.

Section 35-36 (Plant Limits) It appears that sec. 35 would allow possession of 10 mature plants given patients are permitted up to six plants while an additional 4 plants are otherwise legal per household. The provision appears to adequately clarify existing ambiguities in the law.

It also appears that sec. 36 would allow patients to grow up to 6 plants at their residence without the need for registering as a Grow Site with OHA.

This change is long overdue since the $200 Grow Site registration fee on top of patient registration fees is ridiculous, especially since patients who grow only for themselves do not enjoy the economic benefit of selling surplus to OMMP dispensaries . It is all too clear that OHA has been diverting patient and Grow Site registration fees for other purposes which adds considerable insult to injury.

Please remove the regressive limits on immature plants. The limits effectively eliminate the ability of patients to improve their genetics while still producing and maintaining existing strains. Growers typically must germinate at least 10, if not more, seeds to secure a desirable individual for production. Breeding for desired characteristics requires an even greater number of individuals who must be maintained, sorted , cloned, etc.

Most importantly, growers often share immature plants with other growers who are unable to grow from seed or propagate via cuttings. The immature plant limits therefore create an undue hardship with questionable regulatory benefits.

Section 46 (Technical Amendments) This section might allow for licensed producers to process *their own* concentrates in lieu of requiring an otherwise expensive processor license and related expenses.

The idea behind this suggestion is to provide a realistic incentive for OMMP growers to enter the OLCC system, which is otherwise prohibitively expensive for the vast majority of growers.

Furthermore, processors currently pay miserable prices for quality trim such that it is often cost prohibitive to test and transport relatively small batches for processing. Composting is often a better alternative, especially for rural growers.

Potential producer licensees might otherwise achieve enough additional gross sales to pay for the expensive security/ surveillance systems inherent to a producer license as well as compete more effectively due to their disproportionate size and corresponding cost ratios.

If needed, a permit from OLCC or some sort of registration might be implemented although METRC could easily accommodate all tracking requirements. Obviously, labeling and packaging requirements would apply but the production of concentrates entails no additional safety or security concerns beyond what producers are required to address. Please consider this crucial change as soon as possible.

Thank you very much.

Les Helgeson
Green Hills LLC