

Submitter: Rochelle Koch
On Behalf Of: Whole Circle Farms
Committee: House Committee On Business and Labor
Measure: HB3049

March 9, 2023

RE: HB 3049- OIHFA Public Testimony

Chair Holvey, Vice Chairs and Members of the House Committee on Business and Labor,

My name is Rochelle Koch and my husband and I own a small hemp farm in Silverton, OR. We have been growing hemp since 2017. There are still a few of us founders around. We have seen the hemp industry experience the gold rush and the fall. No one in the business is making any money. I don't want to put blame on anyone but every year there is more regulations and most come with a cost. We are not apposed to regulations on labeling because those of us that do it correctly, having permits, testing and accurate labels, 3049 will put us all on a level playing field. At least in Oregon. The problem is adding another level of authority. We are now governed by ODA, OLCC, Background checks, LUSA approved in each county and Farm Service Agency. Along with this oversight we are heavily vetted. Our Bank, Credit card processor and insurance company. Trust me we are squeaky clean (I mean permitted)

I am in complete agreement Courtney Moran who represents us in OIHFA. I have copied her main concern, which rings true with our apprehensions.

"Regarding HB3049, specifically, I must express concerns from the industry that have emerged

over the past several years. In particular, with OLCC for not following legislative intent in the

2021 rulemaking on HB3000, banning D8 and nonintoxicating cannabinoids, including CBN.

What we agreed to in the 2021 Legislative Session was to regulate them, NOT ban them. This

was evidenced by Rep. Morgan's surprise during our Taskforce subcommittee meeting on June

30 that they were banned and not regulated. The industry does not trust OLCC in rulemaking

because of it. I'll note that this is not reflective of staff. I have appreciated and enjoyed working

with Amanda Bourp and Steven Crowly in particular, but the agency itself we do not trust.

We understand ODA does not want to take on a product registry. And there has been a concern

in the Legislature about the duplication of administrative costs, so we understand a

system like

this will likely need to go under OLCC- as that was what the Taskforce agreed to in the Final

Report as Representative Marsh stated in her opening statements.

That being said, we remind the Legislature that the industry remains adamantly opposed to

OLCC having any additional regulatory authority over hemp, especially manufacturing, and also

remains adamantly opposed to any METRC-type tracking for hemp or hemp products- METRC

does not guarantee consumer safety.

One of our primary priorities IS consumer safety and remind the Legislature that it was OIHFA

in 2016 with HB4060 that establish the first mandatory testing on hemp products in the country!

Know, we all want consumer safety, which is why we recommended presentations on GMP

during the Taskforce meetings and agree we need labeling regulation and don't have particular

concerns with those provisions. I believe we all want to create a robust market for our industry

participants for all cannabis products-hemp and adult use.

While the product registry is something we discussed during the Taskforce and agreed to as a

recommendation as a middle ground, the industry was not directly consulted on what this looks

like or how it would be implemented. With the -1 language just being released Sunday night, the

industry is left with many questions, such as how this applies to online sales; who is required to

file this registry- a distributor, wholesaler, product manufacturer; and what, if any, enforcement

there will be. We do appreciate that the product registry does not apply to topicals, grain or fiber

products without added cannabinoids, or registered animal feed.

Industry participation has declined dramatically over the past several years and we understand

this is not only because of the decline in market value. But also market access resulting from the strict rules, inconsistent