



OREGON STATE SENATE
900 COURT STREET ST NE
SALEM, OREGON 97301

February 23, 2026

Testimony on SB 1548 A | House Committee on Economic Development, Small Business, and Trade

Chair Nguyen, Vice-Chairs Isadore and Skarlatos, and members of the committee, I want to share with you concerns I have with SB 1548 A. I was unfortunately excused for family matters on the day that this bill came up on the Senate floor, though I had planned to speak and vote against it.

I want to start by simply saying: I get it. I certainly understand the problem that my friend from District 17 is trying to solve, and I absolutely understand why. My concerns are with the how. The approach in the bill seems to take one step forward and two steps back. What it gets right is limiting each edible in a 100-milligram package to no more than ten milligrams per edible. No more of the single 100-milligram edibles. Those products are far more potent than anything I was familiar with growing up, and from what I have heard on this topic, this step is broadly supported by research.

My concern with the bill is its second component about individual wrapping, which is where I truly fear we would take steps back. The bill points to Washington's packaging laws, and I have seen provided data that show a correlation between Washington's law, which this bill is based on, and lower instances of child ingestion. The problem is that this conflates both the individual serving limit and the physical packaging, when they are distinct issues. Further, it compares both Oregon and Washington to Colorado, which saw a similar drop in child ingestion to Washington. Colorado, though, does not share Washington's packaging. In fact, its packaging is essentially the same as Oregon's. The difference is that both of those states ran a significant education campaign in collaboration with the industry. SB 1548 does not include that, which is a real step that would make a difference, and I understand from the industry that they would be supportive of this.

The reality is that Oregon's current edible packages meet well-established federal regulations for child safety. Washington's do not. The packaging requirements in SB 1548 would result in none of our packages meeting child safety standards, so the bill would have the opposite of the intended effect. Federal guidelines prescribe exactly what we have – a single child-safe container, with unwrapped product inside. This is because human nature is that folks will take the individually-wrapped products and leave them scattered about, going from a single access point inside of a child-safe container covered in clear labeling with warnings to 10 contact points scattered about in wrappers that look like candy. Someone would be much more likely to leave a wrapped gummy lying around the house where a child or dog could easily get it than they would be a loose gummy. And none of this addresses someone leaving out a cookie or brownie that looks just like any other dessert, but is infused with cannabis.

California recently conducted a study on their packaging requirements, and it consistently referenced Oregon as a model they should move toward. This is because not only does Oregon meet strict federal guidelines for child safety, but all products sold in Oregon must have their packages pre-approved by the OLCC to ensure safety and compliance.

Oregon's cannabis industry is uniquely dominated by small businesses and community operators. In my district in particular, it is a huge driver of our economy. And I have heard from these businesses in my district – from the entrepreneur owners to the shop workers – that this bill would wipe them out. Our state's largest retailer reports that of its over 50 manufacturers, there is only one that would be able to survive the new packaging requirements in this bill – requirements that are estimated to cost them \$2 million just in equipment, eliminate jobs, and not have the intended effects.

These are legal businesses in this state – businesses which Oregonians overwhelmingly voted to permit. They are huge drivers of economic activity across our state, including paying millions of tax dollars into local governments and critical behavioral health services. SB 1548 is estimated to eliminate approximately \$5 million of these funds. If this were a measure that I believed would truly address the issues it is trying to address, that would be one thing. But as it is, it would ravage these small businesses without the benefits it seeks.

The cannabis industry is the most heavily regulated industry we have in this state – and for good reason. At the same time, children are getting access to cannabis at an alarming rate. Unfortunately, the data we have doesn't tell us where or how they are getting these products. What we do know is that, in fact, dispensaries are tightly complying with state regulations and have a 93 percent minor decoy passage rate, with significant penalties for failing to meet OLCC rules and statutes. The disturbing reality is that it is most likely that children are getting these products from the illegal market, including through online purchases where dosage and potency restrictions, labeling requirements, rigorous product safety testing, and child-safe packaging don't exist. The most *unlikely* scenario is that these products are getting into children's hands from legitimate dispensaries and their products. We should be supporting the approach of these well-regulated businesses, not passing a bill that would needlessly drive them out of the market to be replaced by unregulated and unsafe sellers.

I would be most interested in collecting more meaningful data to answer some of these questions and cracking down on that issue in any way we can. I understand that the Governor is already going to convene a group of folks to really address this problem in a meaningful and comprehensive way. I fully support that effort. I do not believe that a bill like this, which will close down small businesses across our state, should be rushed through a short session in this way. Across our state, and in my district in particular, the legal cannabis industry has created an opportunity for folks in underrepresented and marginalized communities to have a place in Oregon's economy. This bill would destroy that critical piece of our economy – an industry built almost entirely by personal loans and without any bankruptcy protection. What I hear from them, and what I recognize to be true, is that SB 1548 A causes harm without the benefits it seeks to achieve.

The -A2 amendment to delay implementation one year does not alleviate these concerns, does not fix the underlying issues, and only postpones the inevitable unnecessary harm to this industry. Unfortunately, SB 1548 A will result in more harm than good, so I urge your opposition to this bill in the interest of a more considered and evidence-based approach in the near future. Thank you.