

Angela Arno  
Lewiston  
LD 40

Good Morning VLA Committee Members,

My name is Angela Arno and I'm an edibles producer.

For starters, I would like to say that cannabis companies, much like their counterparts in various industries, should have the autonomy to diversify their product offerings beyond cannabis-related items for which they are licensed. The ability to produce a broader range of products within their designated licenses aligns with standard business practices and promotes entrepreneurial flexibility. Imposing restrictions on the types of products a cannabis operator can manufacture not only hinders business innovation but also places an undue limitation on the industry's potential growth. Granting cannabis operators the freedom to explore a spectrum of products within the bounds of their existing licenses, particularly hemp derived cannabinoids, contributes to a more dynamic and robust cannabis market.

Also, if someone owns both a cultivation facility and a manufacturing facility in the cannabis game, why not let them share common areas and hallways? It's no different from having a joint venture under the same roof. Companies can cut costs, share resources, and run things more smoothly. This kind of arrangement isn't uncommon in other industries, so why not let cannabis companies do the same? It's just common sense – when it's the same owner, let companies share space and make things easier on themselves. There's no downside.

The prohibition on selling returned cannabis products, provided the tamper-evident seal remains intact, appears counterintuitive and wastes perfectly good products. The whole point of the tamper-evident seal is to ensure the safety and integrity of the product, signaling that it hasn't been compromised. In light of this, allowing the sale of such items can be seen as a pragmatic approach, acknowledging that the product's security has been maintained. Restricting the sale of products with an intact seal causes unnecessary waste and financial losses for cannabis businesses without a clear benefit in terms of consumer safety. As a reminder, full panel tests cost around \$400-500, and nobody is running full panel tests for single returned items. I thought we were trying to become less wasteful as a society. Let's not forget all the electricity, time, ingredients, labor, and plastic packaging that goes into producing these products.

It's also incredibly frustrating to see we mandate opaque packaging for cannabis products, a move that seems completely backward in the realm of cannabis policy. These requirements, rooted in outdated stigmas, completely ignore the broader trend toward transparent and well-informed cannabis regulations. Opaque packaging actively hinders consumers' ability to visually assess products, making it difficult for them to make informed choices and differentiate between products. This approach directly contradicts the principles of responsible and transparent marketing, which are crucial for building a legitimate and trustworthy cannabis industry. Enforcing opaque packaging at a time when transparency should be paramount comes across as a misguided and counterproductive measure, hindering the industry's progress toward normalization and acceptance.

Thank you for considering my testimony. Please pass LD 40.