

Lucas Fortenberry
Buxton
LD 1567

Honorable Committee Members,

I am submitting this testimony in strong opposition to LD 1567, which would require cannabis producers in Maine to label products treated with microbial reduction equipment such as ozone or irradiation, and mandate registration and inspection of that equipment.

An Over-Regulated Industry Doesn't Need Another Layer

The cannabis industry in Maine is already one of the most heavily regulated markets in the country. Adding yet another layer of regulation—especially one not based on risk or necessity—further burdens businesses that are already struggling under the weight of compliance costs, taxes, and market instability.

Beyond the impact to businesses, this bill would create costs for the state of Maine, particularly if the inspection process requires hiring specialized staff such as physicists or technical experts to evaluate treatment equipment—equipment that, by most accounts, poses no safety risk to the operator or consumer.

Where Do We Draw the Line on Transparency?

From the testimony we've heard, it's clear that even supporters of this bill agree that treatment equipment is safe. Their argument centers around transparency. But if that's the case, do we also need to label:

- If we hand-trim or machine-trim?
- What soil we use?
- Whether we use UV lights?
- What fungicides or nutrients are applied?
- How we dry and cure
- What kind of equipment we use
- Etc

These are all factors that may influence quality, yet we do not mandate labeling them. The proposed labeling for irradiation or ozone implies a health risk or product defect, when in reality it's a sterile, preventive safety measure—comparable to filtration in other industries.

No Public Health Risk – No Need for a Warning

This is not a public health issue. There is no evidence that properly treated cannabis poses any risk to consumers. In fact, we have performed hundreds of double-blind tests through independent labs and with experienced cannabis consumers—none of whom could distinguish between treated and untreated flower. If a customer disliked the product, they wouldn't buy it again. That's how quality control works in a competitive, adult-use marketplace.

Cannabis products already include warning labels for health and safety. There's no justification for adding another label for a treatment that is proven to be safe, effective, and invisible to the end user.

Conclusion

LD 1567 will add unnecessary regulation to an already strained industry, place unjustified burdens on the state, and stigmatize a proven safety practice. I urge you to vote Ought Not to Pass.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
Lucas Fortenberry