

SUBMITTED TO: [Joint Committee On Ways and Means SubCommittee On Transportation and Economic Development](#)

SUBMITTED BY: Dee I. Myers, Baker City, OR, 541-519-2036
As a citizen and Oregon Liquor Store owner
OLCC Liquor Agent Store #1036-La Grande
OLCC Liquor Agent Store #1092-Baker City

RE: SB 1559 (Task Force creation related only)

DATE: February 24, 2014

Honorable Co-Chairs and Members:

I was greatly disappointed in the passage of this bill out of committee at all and even more disappointed with the -7 amendment rather than the -4 amendment. As currently written, there is no provision for positions on the task force for those who have the **most to offer** in the required tasks and have the **most to lose** if decisions are made without their consideration; namely, Oregon liquor agents and Oregon craft distillers. I realize the argument could be made that those four Governor-appointed positions might give access to agents and distillers, but why must those liquor-related entities **most vital to small business in Oregon** be required to vie for an opportunity to contribute?

Other considerations about this bill (regarding the Task Force) as written:

- Performance: The time allowed for the organization and administration of the tasks is unreasonable if anything of value is expected to result.
- Cost Effectiveness: If the Grocer's initiative passes, was there **any** value in the Task Force effort? If the Grocer's initiative fails, will the activities of the Task Force result in implementation of any action?
 - Over the past 12 years, several **costly** studies have been done and "task forces" mobilized regarding liquor distribution and sales in Oregon, purportedly to "modernize". Actual recommendations have been scarce and implementation of recommendations almost non-existent and certainly not evaluated for effectiveness after implementation (if they have been, those results are not evident to those on the front line).
- Depending on the selection, performance and cost of the Task Force, the Grocer's initiative proponents may have more fuel to garner support of privatization.
- Fiscal Impact: The fact that money "saved" by the "fix" of 2012's SB1528 oversight will off-set the cost of the Task Force is a ridiculously misleading view of the related costs. We weren't spending that \$166,500 before and this bill just gets the cost back where it was—we aren't going to "make" \$166,500 more.

I would like to be able to support this bill. I would like to see a Task Force that would truly investigate, make supportable recommendations, and then follow through with administration of implementation and evaluation of implemented strategies. I would like that Task Force to be given the time frame to actually produce a responsible result. I would like to see Legislative support for the costs of **implementation** of recommendations.

Unfortunately, the Task Force described in this bill won't have the time or ability to produce a valuable recommendation. I urge you to can this ill-conceived, poorly executed attempt at thwarting the Grocer's Association. Keeping the cost-saving "fix" is a good idea. That's the only bill that should have been introduced in the first place.

Respectfully,

Dee I. Myers