

From: Jacqueline
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 4:35 PM
To: Crawford Adam
Subject: Comments on SB964-1

Mr. Crawford:

Please provide my comments to the Senate Special Committee on Implementing Measure 91.

I am 69 years old, was born and raised in Oregon, do not use marijuana and voted for Measure 91. I just read the staff summary of SB 964-1 and my comments are based upon a quick reading of it alone, because at this late point in the day I did not find the full text on the web.

I am appalled by the roadblocks the authors of SB 964-1 have proposed which are likely to eliminate the public's access to medical marijuana (in some locales) or to impede it. **The bill is a recipe for undermining Measure 91 rather than implementing it.**

It is apparent that there is concern that some marijuana may be sold on the "black market". It appears that the bill imposes extreme restrictions on production to eliminate "excess" production going to the black market. I suggest eliminating the restrictions on the number of plants commercially grown for medical uses. Otherwise the state is imposing inefficiencies on a commercial establishment akin to telling a pharmacist how many bottles of aspirin he or she may have on the shelf or a dairy farmer how many cows he or she may raise for milk. Also SB 964-1 incorporates deadlines that have already passed, which would be unfair to prospective farmers.

It isn't clear from the summary alone why the bill provides for the cardholder to reimburse the full costs of the grower. Shouldn't the business model of the grower address this rather than government?

The OHA should require that marijuana products be accurately labeled with the percentage or proportion of different genetic varieties of marijuana and with information about the relative hallucinogenic properties of these varieties. This is important to enable medical patients to avoid products with high hallucinogenic properties if they wish to do so.

I am especially concerned that the bill gives local government officials the authority to restrict growing and processing and dispensing medical marijuana. Any ordinances that restrict growing and processing should be required to be equivalent to ordinances for other horticultural operations in the same area. Any ordinances to prohibit or significantly restrict building and operating dispensaries should have to be the same as those applied to pharmacies within the same jurisdiction or should have to be approved by the voters at the next election in that jurisdiction before being implemented.

This is a complicated undertaking but I urge you to focus on expediting access to medical marijuana and quality control rather than placating those who remain opposed to Measure 91.

Jacqueline Wyland

