

Hi my name is Jesse Koenig, I live in Portland. Thank you Chair Nosse and members of the committee, for this opportunity to testify to oppose senate bill 303 as written, but to support it with OPSCC's Data Privacy Amendment. My professional background is in aerospace engineering and electronics manufacturing. I recently left that to work in Oregon Psilocybin Services. I'm super excited about the potential of psilocybin to reduce suffering and increase well-being, and I hope OPS can be a great example for other parts of the country and the world.

I am sympathetic to the stated goals of this bill's backers, to assess safety and access for psilocybin services. Meanwhile as you know the community has had many concerns and objections to the bill regarding data privacy and data equity, and administrative cost and burden for providers and for OHA.

The group I've been working with, OPS Collaborative Community, has been working hard to address these concerns while actually improving the efficacy of the bill toward its goals.

It's important to note that since clients will have the option to not participate they will be looking to their facilitators and service centers for guidance. Clients' decisions will be heavily influenced by how this data program is viewed by their providers. We wanted to come up with a version of this bill that the community can be comfortable with. This will increase client participation, creating a larger more useful dataset.

Our group includes attorneys and technologists who have a lot of experience working with data. Senator Steiner mentioned the issue of how even deidentified data can be reidentified in certain circumstances, which was a good point. Our proposed changes much more precisely define the data in ways that ensure this won't be able to happen and that overall better protect privacy. Our language will also produce more consistent data, and will decrease administrative burden for service centers and OHA - both in rulemaking and in implementation. But note that regardless there will still be a cost to service centers and OHA, there is no way around that.

With data defined precisely, privacy protected carefully, and buy-in from the community, we can achieve the best results from this bill. OHA can then share all of the fully aggregated data with the public for full transparency, so that everyone can benefit from the knowledge it brings, and there will be no concerns about monetization of data, data access for a particular privileged

institution, or burden on OHA as to who is allowed to receive data. This would achieve data equity for the program.

Sam Chapman of Healing Advocacy Fund has responded in written testimony to parts of our amendment, mostly saying they are not necessary. Our proposed language changes are precise and targeted, and I would be more than happy to continue a discussion on these changes and their impact or necessity, happy to talk about it with the bill's backers, other legislators, and any data experts.

Thank you.