

John Spencer
Pinehurst LLC
LD 1669

I am writing to offer testimony neither for nor against LD 1669. At its core, I believe the intent of this bill is constructive. The proposed 10-member committee appears to provide well-rounded representation across all sectors of the cannabis industry — including patients, cultivators, storefront licensees, municipal and scientific voices — and ensures geographic diversity across the state. This structure has the potential to generate thoughtful and valuable recommendations for the Office of Cannabis Policy (OCP).

However, I believe it is critically important that the formation of this committee does not alter the existing statutory process required for substantive changes or rulemaking. Any major policy shifts — such as those involving the track-and-trace system — must still be introduced through legislation and remain subject to public testimony and legislative review.

There have been past instances where guidance was misinterpreted, resulting in significant consequences, including businesses being forced to close. To avoid similar outcomes, it is essential that this new advisory body remain just that — advisory. I support the committee's ability to provide recommendations, but urge that LD 1669 be clarified to ensure that it does not bypass or weaken the current public and legislative processes for enacting change.