
From: Les Helgeson
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 1:52 PM
To: rep.annlininger@state.or.us; sen.ginnyburdick@state.or.us; rep.carlwilson@state.or.us; sen.tedferrioli@state.or.us; Sen.FloydProzanski@state.or.us; Rep Fahey; rep.kenhelm@state.or.us; Rep.AndyOlson@state.or.us; Sen.LeeBeyer@state.or.us; Sen.JeffKruse@state.or.us
Cc: JMR Exhibits; Jeffrey.Rhoades@oregon.gov; Rep Gomberg
Subject: SB 1057 -11

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

As you may have seen from comments submitted previously for the record on SB 1057, I am generally supportive of the direction the committee is taking.

But given the compelling testimony on the -2 amendment provided by the Sun Growers Guild, it might be necessary to revisit the specifics and cost of METRC as is being done with the draconian testing rules OHA adopted nearly a year ago. For but one example, the requirement to keep "waste material" (as in pruned leaf, stems, roots, etc.) for three days is beyond extreme and poses a mold hazard that is unacceptable. Is this material to be weighed upon initial removal or at the threeday mark? Or both? What is the objective here? Maximize the time and expense of doing business?

As I have pointed out many times in the past, it is inappropriate to take out a fly on the wall with a 12 gauge shotgun.

If we expect compliance from both medical and recreational people, OLCC et al need to recognize that building a financially insurmountable wall is only going to drive many, many people underground, which of course threatens the viability of our fledgling legal system. Unfortunately, the industry has become dominated by businesses with significant outside investor contribution as a result of the needlessly overbuilt wall. And of course these very businesses and their lobbyists object to the very things that might minimize black market competition - giving small OMMP growers some tangible incentive to comply. I'm afraid we cannot have it both ways.

Finally, I urge you to kill the -11 amendment and bury it deeply in the sea. The precedent being proposed is unacceptable. I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Bovett's assessment of the proposed change.

While I cannot necessarily condone the actions of Deschutes County, it is their call and I am not in a position to second guess the County Commission. I respectfully don't believe the M91 Committee should do so either.

This is a particularly slippery slope on a very steep mountain.

After listening to testimony on the -11 amendment it is clear that certain businesses may have made hasty business decisions to cash in on the the perceived M91 "gold rush" prior to securing local approval ("...we invested millions in our glass greenhouses..."). To be honest, if these individuals were long time family farm owners/landowners I might support the change but clearly that is not the case. The facts support my conclusion that we shouldn't be second guessing what is a rightly a local decision.

How may folks on this committee would move into a new town, build an exorbitantly expensive house and then seek a building permit and/or zoning approval after the fact? That appears to be exactly what proponents of the amendment are asking you to allow for themselves.

Finally, such a bailout might compel Deschutes County (and perhaps others) to revisit an opt-out thereby affecting many additional businesses.

Thank you.

Les Helgeson