

## Testimony of Phillip Riggan

### Opposition to SB215/HB132 – Cannabis On-Site Consumption Establishments and Events

Chair, Vice Chair, and Members of the Committee,

I respectfully oppose SB215 and urge the committee to issue an unfavorable report.

The original intent behind on-site consumption was to provide a safe space for residents—particularly those in low-income neighborhoods—who may not be allowed to consume cannabis in their own residences. This bill, however, shifts that focus and primarily benefits those with greater financial means, leaving behind the communities it was meant to serve.

#### Concerns with the Bill

##### 1. Impact on Public Cannabis Events

The cannabis community is deeply concerned that this bill could restrict public events where individuals share, rather than sell, cannabis. Can the committee assure that this legislation will not apply to such gatherings? Additionally, can this bill be amended to prevent counties from banning consumption-only events held on private property?

##### 2. Event Fee Structure is Cost-Prohibitive

The proposed fee structure makes small events (under 1,000 attendees) financially unviable. Retailers would face event fees that effectively amount to \$2.50 per attendee—regardless of whether they purchase cannabis. Event fees should be based on actual sales, not attendance.

##### 3. Unreasonable Restrictions on Personal Cannabis Use

This bill prohibits attendees from bringing their own cannabis to events and from taking home cannabis they have legally purchased on-site. Who will enforce these provisions, and how? This creates unnecessary enforcement challenges and burdens consumers.

##### 4. Ban on Smoking and Vaping at Events

Given that smoking and vaping account for 60–70% of cannabis consumption, banning these methods at cannabis events is a significant red flag. Events should allow designated outdoor smoking areas in jurisdictions where tobacco smoking is already permitted.

##### 5. Safety Concerns with Edibles at Large Events

The bill allows the sale of standard edibles at large events, which is a recipe for unintended hospital visits. Many first-time users will inevitably be present, and the 45–60+ minute onset time for edibles makes dosing unpredictable. Experienced consumers will have little incentive to pay a premium for on-site consumption when they can consume beforehand and avoid delays in onset. This issue can be addressed

through regulation but underscores a broader lack of foresight in the bill's design.

#### **6. Green Waste and Safe Handling Issues**

The bill presents logistical and environmental challenges by restricting consumers from taking home partially consumed single-dose cannabis products. This increases waste and complicates disposal efforts. A more practical approach would be to allow consumers to take home their unused portions to reduce green waste.

#### **7. State-Level Permitting vs. Local Control**

Unlike alcohol event permits, which are typically managed at the county level, this bill centralizes permitting at the state level. I strongly urge the committee to shift permitting authority to the counties to better reflect local needs and enforcement capabilities.

### **Conclusion**

This bill, as currently written, fails to serve cannabis consumers effectively and presents significant regulatory, economic, and enforcement challenges. It requires substantial revision to align with its intended purpose and ensure fairness and accessibility. I urge the committee to reject SB215/HB132 in its current form.

**Thank you for your time and consideration.**

**Phillip Riggin**