

Co-Chairs Lininger and Burdick, Members of the Committee,

I am generally supportive of the -6 amendment to SB 844 but would like you to revisit a comment offered by Co-Chair Lininger last Monday concerning inspection of grow sites. While her question indeed centered on grow sites, Mr. Mayer gave assurances such authority did not extend to people's homes. I believe Sen. Prozanski stated emphatically that such authority was not intended, as well.

Unfortunately, this discussion occurred during discussion of the processing component later in the bill, whereas lines 10-16 on page 22 of the bill do appear to allow overly broad authority to inspect grow sites generally. In other words, there is really no distinction between a patient growing for themselves vs. a 96 plant "Grow-Op."

Where is the line between inspecting our homes vs. larger grow operations? There might be a limit of 12 or 24 plants before such inspection could occur vs. the carte blanche authority granted in Sec. 5 of the bill as described above. Similarly, Sec. 6 requires (otherwise reasonable) reporting requirements but again does not distinguish between patients growing for themselves or others since patients are required to designate themselves as growers if they wish to grow their own product.

It appeared that the committee made it clear that the intent of Sec. 5 & 6 was to not have OHA inspecting people's homes but as written the bill appears to allow for that. One only needs to read the lines noted above to arrive at such a conclusion so it would be helpful to incorporate language that better distinguishes between people's homes vs. say a 96 plant "Grow-Op" located in a warehouse somewhere.

Again, there appears to be little doubt about the literal interpretation of language – one either designates a grow site for themselves allowing for production of 6 plants or a substantial card-stacking operation is designated a grow site for 96 plants. Based on the language of the bill, OHA can inspect and require reporting of any grow site. Where is the "line of demarcation" for inspection by OHA?

I urge the committee to revisit Co-Chair Linger's concerns since the language, as written, clearly does not make the necessary distinctions nor intent as expressed by Sen. Prozanski and Counsel Mayer.

Thank you very much.

Les Helgeson