

OHA Psilocybin Services - 2026 Part 1

Independent Transcript - Public Hearing - September 15, 2026

IMPORTANT: This is an independent transcript prepared from the public hearing audio recording. It is not an official Oregon Health Authority transcript and may contain transcription errors. The Psilocybin Alliance will upload and link the official OHA transcript when OHA makes it available.

Source: English audio recording of the OHA public rulemaking hearing. The supplied transcription report was generated with automated speaker detection.

Speaker 1: Good evening, everyone. We will get started in just a few moments. Buenas noches a todos.

Speaker 2: Estaremos iniciando en unos momentos.

Speaker 1: All right, we can go ahead and get started.

Speaker 2: Perfecto, podemos dar proceder a dar inicio.

Speaker 1: Good evening, my name is Brittany Hall, and I have been designated as hearing officer for this rulemaking hearing.

Speaker 2: Buenas noches, mi nombre es Brittany Hall.

Yo he sido designada como oficial de audiencia. Por la junta.

Speaker 1: We welcome everyone and want to ensure that everyone is able to participate in this public hearing.

Speaker 2: Queremos darle la bienvenida a todos y queremos asegurarnos de que todos puedan participar en la audiencia pública.

Speaker 1: Today we have simultaneous Spanish interpretation, which can be accessed by clicking the interpretation button.

Speaker 2: Hoy tenemos interpretación simultánea en español, la cual pueden acceder haciendo clic al botón de interpretación en la parte.

Speaker 1: Once the interpretation button is activated, we request that all participants click on the interpretation button and choose either English or Spanish. This will ensure that everyone will be able to hear all comments, whether provided in English or Spanish.

Speaker 2: Una vez se active la interpretación, le vamos a pedir a todos los participantes que hagan clic en interpretación y seleccionen su canal, sea inglés o español, para asegurarnos de que todos puedan escuchar todos los comentarios, sean estos en inglés o en español.

Speaker 1: This hearing is now being recorded. American Sign Language interpretation is also provided. Real-time captioning is available by clicking on the closed caption live transcript CC button.

And/or selecting Show Subtitle. And again, Spanish interpretation is provided and accessed by clicking on the Interpretation button and selecting Spanish. This hearing is being recorded and transcribed. A recording of audio and video will be made available online after the hearing.

Please remain muted until your name is called and it's your turn to speak.

Please also keep your video camera off unless it's your turn to speak. In addition to providing comments during the hearing, you can send written comments by 5 PM Pacific Time on Monday, September 21st to publichealth.rules@odhsoha.oregon.gov. Please remember that comments received after this deadline will not be considered.

I would now like to call this hearing to order. Let the record show that the time is approximately 6:05 PM and the date is September 15th, 2026. The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony regarding the Oregon Health Authority Public Health Division's proposed adoption of Oregon administrative rules in Chapter 333, Division 333, related to Oregon psilocybin services. The Oregon Health Authority Oregon Psilocybin Services Section is proposing to permanently amend administrative rules in Chapter 333, Division 333.

The proposed 2026 rules supplement prior rules and make further refinements. The proposed rules address all aspects of implementation. The proposed rules increase license fees significantly, as the authorizing ballot measure anticipated the program would be self-sustaining and currently is not. The proposed rules are necessary to effectively implement the act because they make important changes to the previously adopted rules that will provide greater clarity and efficiency of operations for both licensees and the Oregon Psilocybin Services Section of the Oregon Health Authority.

Some of the proposed changes increase flexibility for licensees while continuing to center client safety. The rules also implement Oregon Laws 2026 Chapter 109, which was House Bill 4040. The proposed rules implement this legislation by making changes to align with revised statutory language for facilitators who hold other license types. Changes to reporting average doses, and describing requirements for individuals who want to apply for facilitator licenses in Oregon, including completion of facilitator training programs that have been approved by other states and meet or exceed Oregon requirements. The Public Health, Health Division will not respond to questions during this hearing.

The division will not cross-examine or debate the material at hand. All discussion shall be directed at the hearing officer. Testimony is limited to the matter at hand. The hearing officer may exclude or limit cumulative, repetitious, or immaterial testimony.

The virtual sign-up sheet for this hearing has now closed. If you have not signed up to speak and would like to provide oral comments, we will open up to additional speakers as time allows once we have heard from everyone who has signed up in advance. We will call on people in the order they signed up to speak, and we will give you a heads up when your turn is coming by announcing the names of the next few people on deck. If you miss your name being called, I will circle back to ensure that everyone who wants to speak will be able to.

When we call your name, please unmute yourself by clicking the microphone button, or if you are on the phone, you will need to press star 6 to unmute yourself. Before providing your comments, please state your name and that of any organization you represent, if applicable. We request that everyone keep their comments to 3 minutes.

So that we can hear from everyone.

Speaker 3: You will-

Speaker 1: when you have 30 seconds left to speak, you will hear a beeping sound. At the end of your time, you will hear the sound again. When providing comment, please speak clearly and at a regular speaking cadence so that the interpreters can simultaneously interpret your comments. Tonight's hearing will close at 7:30 PM.

If we are unable to hear from everyone who wishes to provide oral comments today, there will be another hearing tomorrow, September 16th, at noon. Written comments are also being accepted until 5:00 PM on Monday, September 21st. Finally, OHA will not tolerate any comments that involve the use of profanity or any threatening remarks. and may mute any individual who uses profanity or threatening language. We ask that you are respectful of everyone who is on this call.

I'm now going to open up the floor for testimony. The first person I have signed up is Amy Charlesworth, and then on deck will be Melinda Halpern, Sam Gross and Gina Grazza. And I apologize in advance if I mispronounce any names this evening.

So, Amy Charlesworth, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Okay, next we have Melinda Halpern, and then after that is Sam Gross, Gina Grazza, and Max Kellerman. Melinda, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself.

Speaker 4: I'm going to choose to wait until later and circle back around if that- if I have that opportunity.

Speaker 1: Yes, I can do that.

Thank you. Sam Gross.

Speaker 2: Good evening. My name is Sam Gross.

I'm a licensed psilocybin facilitator in Bend at Drop Thesis.

I'm also a therapist and a veteran. Today I spent 7 hours helping a combat vet process trauma. As a fellow veteran, it meant a lot to be able to sit with her.

These are the kinds of real people that we are able to help with the program that we have. There are also real people behind these licenses. OPS reports that there's 422 psilocybin businesses in Oregon, including facilitators. That represents hundreds of families plus employees who depend on this industry for their livelihood.

As a veteran, I currently pay \$1,000 a year for my facilitator license. My therapist license cost me \$143 a year. Most facilitators are paying \$2,000 a year, and we're proposing raising that to \$4,000. Service centers and manufacturers would go from \$10,000 to \$20,000 a year, while reduced fees for veterans and others would disappear.

I served on the Rules Advisory Committee in July. I was concerned enough about these increases that I conducted my own survey. I contacted 331 licensees and received 146 responses. 17 said that they would renew, 12 said maybe, and 117, which is more than 80%, said that they would not renew. Based on those responses, I projected license- licensing renewal falling from just over \$1 million to about \$463,000, which is a 56% decrease.

I was shocked that this information did not change the proposal. I was even more surprised to see no indication that in the notice that OPS conducted its own licensee retention survey. It took me about an hour to gather that information from the people who actually have to decide whether or not to renew. And OPS itself acknowledges the risk.

Your own impact, fiscal impact statement says increased fees may reduce the number of licensees and create a more significant program budget shortfall. But there is an even bigger problem. My calculation, even if everybody renewed and paid double, that still doesn't eliminate the budget shortfall.

So what do we do with that?

If OPS is still underfunded after doubling fees, you would still have to find another way to source Or to fund the, the program, and the underlying problem is still there. If those decisions will have to be made anyway, I question the wisdom of first imposing fees that will drive facilitators and businesses out of the regulated market, reduce access for clients, and potentially reduce the revenue of OPS that it's trying to increase. The fact that other approaches have not solved the problem is not evidence that doubling the fees will solve it.

So I'm requesting that we pause the increase, uh, conduct a survey, run the revenue projections, and see what we can really do to fix this problem.

Speaker 1: All right, thank you.

Next on the list is Gina Grazza, and then up on deck will be Max Kellerman, Renee Mirno, and Matt Curran. And again, I apologize if I'm messing up names.

So Gina Grazza, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 5: My name is Gina Grazza. I'm a licensed therapist, a licensed psilocybin facilitator, psychedelic researcher with the Social Neuroscience and Psychotherapy Lab, and former lead educator at InnerTrek. I've spent the last 14 years of my career specializing in the treatment of complex trauma and severe mental health conditions. And for the past several years, I've trained and supervised the next generation of psilocybin facilitators.

I'm speaking today from that vantage point as a clinician who has watched this work change lives, and as a trainer whose students' futures are directly on the line in this rule. This program is working. Oregon's model is the first of its kind in the country, and it has already served more than 24,000 people- veterans, cancer survivors, people living with depression and addiction. I've sat with clients through this work myself, and I've trained facilitators who've watched people find relief.

That's not unique to one or two people.

It's now backed by research showing meaningful and measurable improvements in mental health outcomes. Doubling facilitator fees, doubling service center fees and manufacturing fees, and raising worker permits while eliminating reduced fee options will restrict access for the Oregonians who need it most. Providers don't absorb these costs.

They pass them to the clients, pricing out exactly the low-income and rural Oregonians this program was meant to reach. And OHA A hasn't shown its math. This summer, 117 of 146 licensees surveyed said they would not renew at these proposed rates. And I personally do not know if I will be able to afford this increase of \$4,000, as this is not my full-time work, nor should it be, as this type of service was never meant to be intended to be a revolving door.

What will happen is that people who can afford these increases most likely those connected to big money, will overshadow and leave out small businesses and individual facilitators, thereby erasing a large majority of facilitators who just spent thousands of dollars to be trained and show up to support the people seeking services. If that holds across the program, these fee increases will generate less revenue than doing nothing at all while shrinking the workforce I helped train and supervise. Before raising fees this dramatically, OHA owes licensees, trainers, and the public its actual financial assumptions, projected expenses, expected attrition, and projected revenue after that attrition. Oregon built this program from nothing and it is working.

As a clinician and a trainer, I'm asking you not to price out the people delivering the care Oregon so clearly needs. Help keep the people providing these services able to contribute with lower fees, because if you- if not, you will see big businesses take over our state and leave behind valuable people unaffiliated to larger corporations and businesses. And I really don't think that's the Oregon way. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Uh, next up I have Max Kellerman, and then on deck will be Renee Mirno, Mirno, Matt Curran, and Louis Birdseye.

So Max Kellerman, if you are on the line, please feel free to unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 3: All right, thank you.

My name is Max Kellerman. I serve as the executive director of the Portland Psychedelic Society and its Action Fund, a nonprofit that provides education, community, and advocacy around psychedelics. And I have been deeply involved in Oregon's psychedelic community since 2018.

So I'll echo many of the sentiments here.

I have sat in rooms with veterans, people in recovery, members of BIPOC and LGBTQ+ communities, and many others who found hope through psychedelics after other approaches have failed them. And before Measure 109, many risked breaking the law to pursue that healing. Then they came to communities like ours seeking a safe place to speak honestly about experiences they often felt they had to hide. Regulated access opens entirely new channel for people who want to seek healing without entering the underground or fearing legal consequences.

It allows people to make that choice within a system designed to support their safety. That distinction matters, especially for people who would never otherwise consider breaking the law. Oregon did more than create a new state program. We became the first state in the country and in the world really to test what safe legal supported psilocybin access can look like in the real world.

More than 24,000 people have now participated, and emerging research on this program from the OHSU Open Lab is showing tremendous promise. Because I'm connected to this movement locally, nationally, and beyond, I can tell you that many eyes are on Oregon right now. What happens here will help shape what other states and communities believe is possible. Oregon's mental and behavioral health systems are already deeply under-resourced.

We do not have time to take a promising option off the table just as evidence is value- of its value is emerging. If these services help people recover, return to work, reduce their reliance on crisis care, or reconnect with their families and communities, the potential cost savings to the state could be substantial. We should be studying and strengthening that opportunity, not putting it at risk. This program is also supporting an emerging economic ecosystem of facilitators, service centers, educators, researchers, integration providers, and community organizations.

Many have invested substantial time and money while operating on razor-thin margins because they truly believe in this work, and they witness the impact firsthand. Rising fees force them out. Oregon will lose jobs, expertise, investment, and its position as a leader in a rapidly developing field. This is not the moment to retreat from a groundbreaking program just as we are beginning to understand its impact.

Restricting access will harm Oregonians, push people back underground, and surrender an opportunity Oregon worked hard to create. Please protect this program and help Oregon continue leading the way.

Speaker 6: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Next on the list is Renee Mirno, Matt Curran, Louis Birdseye, and Robert Combs. Renee, if you're on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record. All right, next will be Matt Curran, and then on deck Louis Birdseye, Robert Combs, and Andrew Pegram. Matt Curran, if you're on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself.

Speaker 2: Brittany, I'm having a technical issue, and I'm gonna have to respectfully wait until later until I can rectify it.

Speaker 1: Okay, thank you. I will, I will circle back around.

Speaker 5: Thank you.

Speaker 7: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Next is Louis Birdseye, and then we have Robert Combs, Andrew Pegram. and Sonia Towner. Louis, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 6: Yeah, can you hear me?

Speaker 1: Yes, I can.

Speaker 2: Great.

Speaker 8: My name is Louis Birdseye. I'm a licensed psilocybin facilitator and QMHA 1 in Oregon.

I know there's a lot of people here with a lot to say, so I'm going to try and keep this as brief as I possibly can. I entered this profession believing I could spend decades helping build what Oregon courageously started, and today I'm seriously considering not renewing my license. Not because I've lost faith in this work, but because the cost of remaining licensed is becoming increasingly difficult to justify. The Oregon Health Authority is proposing substantial increases to licensing fees while eliminating reduced fees for qualifying applicants.

For facilitators who currently qualify for reduced fees, the financial impact would be especially severe. These changes risk pricing people out of the profession and discourage others from ever even entering it. That's particularly troubling because Oregon's psilocybin program has explicitly recognized the importance of increasing access for communities that have historically faced barriers to healthcare and other services. Yet eliminating reduced licensing fees and dramatically increasing the cost of participation risks making it exponentially harder for people from those very communities to become facilitators and participate in building this new profession.

Speaker 9: Yeah.

Speaker 8: We can't meaningfully increase access to psilocybin services without also considering who can afford to provide those services. Becoming a facilitator already requires a substantial investment in training, education, licensing, continuing education, and time. If maintaining a license becomes financially viable primarily for people with significant disposable income or established financial resources, Oregon risks creating a profession that becomes less and not more representative of the communities it hopes to serve.

My background is in crisis intervention, where I learned the importance of remaining present with people during some of the most vulnerable moments of their lives. Those values brought me to psychedelic facilitation. This is my first year doing this work. I haven't worked with as many clients as I expected, but I've sat beside many people confronting fear, grief, mortality, their identity, relationships, and questions about their lives that can't easily be reduced to diagnoses or outcomes on a spreadsheet.

I really want to continue doing this work. I'm a younger facilitator, and I speak English, Spanish, and French fluently. I want to serve people across cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds and spend decades becoming better at this profession. But increasing licensing costs and eliminating reduced fees for those who qualify for them may make that impossible for me and many others.

And this issue is bigger than any individual facilitator. If financial barriers continue to rise, Oregon risks determining who can participate in psychedelic facilitation, not according to competence, compassion, training, or commitment, but simply according to those who can afford to remain licensed. That would undermine one of the most important promises of Oregon's experiment. Diversity, equity, and accessibility can't exist only on the journeyer side of the equation.

They've got to exist among the people providing these services as well. A system seeking to expand access for historically underserved communities should not simultaneously erect financial barriers that make it harder for people with fewer economic resources to become the practitioners serving these communities. I understand that Oregon psilocybin services must be financially sustainable. A pioneering regulatory system costs money.

It must also be economically possible for facilitators, service centers, manufacturers, and journeyers to participate in it. These are human beings behind these numbers. I'm one of them. I don't want to surrender my license.

I want to continue doing this work. Please consider eliminating reduced licensing fees and dramatically increasing the cost of licensure. I'm not asking Oregon to subsidize my career. I'm asking Oregon not to build financial barriers that contradict the accessibility and equity this program was created to advance.

Speaker 6: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Next on the list is Robert Combs, and then on deck will be Andrew Pegram.

Sonia Towner and Josh Goldstein.

So Robert, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Okay, next will be Andrew Pegram, and then Sonya Towner, Josh Goldstein, and Michael Rhodes.

So Andrew, please feel free to unmute yourself and provide your name for the record. And as a reminder, if you're on the phone, you can press star 6 to unmute yourself.

Okay, next on the list is Sonia Towner, and then we'll have Josh Goldstein, Michael Rhodes, and Paul Volk.

So, Sonia, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Next is Josh Goldstein, and then Michael Rhoads, Paul Volk, and Lisa Ginsburg.

So, Josh, if you are on the line, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Next, we have Michael Rhodes. And then Paul Volk, Lisa Ginsburg, and Jim Yu.

So, Michael, if you would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record. Yes, thank you.

All right, next up is Paul Volk, and then on deck will be Lisa Ginsburg, Jim Yu, and Andrea Smet. Paul, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, Please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 10: Yeah, thank you for the opportunity to comment today. My name is Paul Volk.

I'm a Portland, Oregon resident currently in training to become a licensed Oregon psilocybin facilitator, and I'm also developing a wellness business that I'd hope someday might include a licensed psilocybin offering as a service center, but that's a plan I'm now reconsidering because of this rule. My concern is pretty simple. Using OHA's published data, this proposed license fee increase doesn't appear to close the budget gap it's meant to solve, and it puts access at risk for the people this program is designed to serve.

Now, the budget itself is the main crux of this comment.

It's commonly cited as this \$3.5 to \$3.7 million annual budget. or budget shortfall. It's honestly hard to verify which and how much because there's no clear cost or budget record published specifically for OPS operations.

But let's just have that number in the back of our head for now. Because of course, fee increases mean license attrition.

And even in the best possible case where every licensee renews, the proposed fees only cover about 34% of that \$3.5 to \$3.7 million figure. And in a plausible license attrition scenario, that drops to roughly 21% of budget coverage. But in either case, license cost increases barely close the gap. And OHA's own impact filing for this rulemaking say that the overall fiscal and economic impact of the rules cannot be quantified.

But I'd like to push back on that because from the perspective of someone on the outside looking to enter this marketplace, these fee increases are deterring new entrants like me. Under the current reduced fee tier, a facilitator and a service center

license cost about \$6,600. But under this proposal, with that tier eliminated, those same 2 licenses cost \$25,000, nearly 4 times as much overhead applied before we've served a single client. And Oregon's client demand is already down over 30% year over year for the last 2 consecutive quarters, and it's served by just 22 service centers nationwide or statewide.

And fewer providers means higher pass-through costs, deepening an already shrinking client base, hitting our low-income and veteran clients the hardest, who make up roughly 16 to 21% of clients served.

So my ask is for OHA to publish an itemized breakdown of the actual OPS budget and the budget gap that this rule is designed to close, as well as model realistic outcomes rather than admitting it can't be done. And to adopt a phased transition of reduced fee tiers instead of eliminating them overnight. But more than anything, I'm asking for transparency.

People like me want to be a part of this industry, and we want to help solve this budget shortfall, but we can't be a part of the solution without the data and transparency to understand the problem. Thank you so much for the opportunity to comment today, and I'll be submitting written feedback as well explaining this analysis that I've done, and I welcome any further feedback and collaboration.

Speaker 1: Thanks. Thank you.

Gary, I see that you have your hand up. Did you have a question, or were you raising your hand to sign up to testify?

Speaker 11: Yeah, actually, I thought I'd already signed up to testify. Maybe I didn't go through, or maybe I accidentally signed up for tomorrow.

So, yeah, I just wanted to double-check that.

Speaker 1: Okay, great. I'll add you to the list for this evening. I do have a few more people on the list to get through.

And but yeah, I'll add you to the list. Thank you.

Next up will be Lisa Ginsburg, and then on deck is Jim Yu, Andreas Metz, and Gary Braceland.

So Lisa Ginsburg, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 12: Thank you. My name is Lisa Ginsburg. I'm affiliated with Changa Institute. I would like to testify that proposed license fees increase will harm the current model and make CL-7 service unacceptable for majority of population, given the recent open published data showing that current population consumers that access the services are predominantly white people who make over \$200,000 a year, which signals that at the moment only upper middle class is able to access service as is.

And increasing these fees will be- the cost will be definitely passed down to consumers, and it will squeeze out the practitioners out of the market, as most people already expressed that they're planning to surrender the license. And of course, the service centers as a brick-and-mortar business will be forced to increase the fees to stay afloat, facilitators as well.

So we're looking from \$2,500 at minimum cost for the psilocybin session go up to \$5,000 plus, uh, which will be considering that now these services in more and more states are legalizing psilocybin. New Mexico just joined, about to launch the program.

New Mexico charges zero, zero license fees for the practitioners.

They also have no requirements for licensing of healing centers. Medical staff able to provide this service for free at the medical service, meaning they're not paying any additional license fees for brick-and-mortar businesses. I think the whole fee should go for licensed healing centers, and licensed healing centers unnecessary at all.

And I would love to see Oregon thrive as a legacy state, and love to see more facilitators offering this incredible service to people who need it the most. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Next on the list is Jim Yu, and then it will be on deck Andreas Mett.

Gary Bracelin and Amy Charlesworth.

Speaker 13: Hello, my name is Jim Yu and I use he/him pronouns. I don't know if everyone can see me because I cannot see myself, but I assume that my camera is on. It's probably better I don't see myself anyway so I don't get too, you know, judgmental.

You know, I think what everyone here is talking about is the program solvency. And I have been fortunate enough to be part of the program for going on 3 years now. A little background, I worked for Vital Reset Service Center in Hood River, Oregon for the last 2 and a half years, and myself and my business partner Libby Volges, we purchased the service center from the previous owner. Which was not an easy, easy task to do, as those who have done it can prove to that.

And when we ran the numbers and we talked to professionals about financing and is this a good idea to purchase a service center, to even start a service center, everyone, everyone told us no, that it was a terrible idea. And that we were pretty stupid to do it. Well, here we are.

So we purchased Vital Reset Psilocybin Service Center in Hood River, Oregon, not because we're stupid, but because we feel passionate about this work.

Not only have I personally seen over 200 people go through this program and be profoundly changed by it, but it has changed my life and everyone that I've worked with. all the facilitators, my partner, my business partner and myself, we are profoundly changed by this work.

So we feel encouraged and passionate about taking up the mantle of owning a service center. But I will be honest that if anyone who reaches out to me through the service center by email or by phone and they are excited about being a psilocybin facilitator licensed here in the state of Oregon, or owning a service center or starting a manufacturing grow operation, and they ask me my thoughts, I tell them that it's probably not a good idea because I want to be honest and transparent with them, and that this is not a business where you can earn a survivable income, which is really sad. I don't know of any facilitator that is able to facilitate at one service center and be able to maintain a comfortable lifestyle for themselves.

All the other service center owners and manufacturers that I've talked to are basically just kind of hanging on by their teeth, and something has got to change.

Now, my experience in leadership as a manager first and as a service center owner Now, um, I'm not a big fan of people bringing me problems.

Okay, I am a fan of people bringing me ideas of how to solve problems. And with our budget shortfall, I understand that that has already happened.

It's in the past. We cannot change that. We cannot magically create or, uh, you know, gain more, more income for operating costs. But the OPS combining with cannabis is going to have some cost savings.

So I would recommend that we take what Sam Gross offered earlier and take a 1-year moratorium, okay, on the fee hikes. And we put together, um, running some projections and looking at, you know, where can we actually generate some revenue. I have some ideas because again, I don't like to bring problems, I like to bring solutions.

Speaker 11: Thank you.

Speaker 13: The 1-year moratorium on fee hikes would be the first. Second, I would recommend doing what Colorado has done and expand the number of permits that people can hold, and therefore expanding the amount of licenses that are available.

Currently, Oregon has basically 4 or 5 licenses that you can hold. the service center, manufacturer, um, what else? Service center, manufacturer, facilitator, service center representative, and I'm missing one, and then the testing lab.

The reason I'm missing it is because there's only one, but I think that there's more opportunity to have more license holders and to kind of grow the grow this body of practitioners that are working in the space. We can have additional permits and licenses for those who already have a clinical licensure that could be separate from a facilitator certification. We can have some levels that are between a service center representative or a license holder and the service center owner. I hold 2 licenses.

I own the Service Center license and I earn- and I own licensee rep.

Okay. The difference between those 2 licenses is about \$9,975, somewhere in that range.

Speaker 1: Jim, I'm sorry to interrupt, but we are past the 3-minute mark.

So, but I'm going to- I'll circle back around if you want to have another chance. But I'd like to get through the rest of the people that are signed up to speak right now.

Speaker 13: No problem.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Um, next on the list is Andreas Mett, and then we have Gary Braceland, Amy Charlesworth, and Melinda Halpern.

Speaker 6: Hi, Brittany. Can you hear me?

Speaker 1: I can, yes.

Speaker 12: Okay.

Speaker 6: I'm going to, uh, turn my video off because I'm going to be reading from a piece of paper.

So thank you for, uh, taking my, my testimony. My name is Andreas Mett.

I'm an Oregon-licensed facilitator, and I'm the co-founder of Satya Therapeutics. a licensed service center, and a manufacturing facility. I oppose OHA's proposed fee increases. OHA proposes doubling facilitator fees to \$4,000, doubling service center and manufacturing fees to \$20,000, and increasing worker permit fees from \$25 to \$200. OHA would also eliminate the \$1,000 reduced facilitator fee for qualifying lower-income applicants and veterans. imposing a 300% increase.

OHA requires licensees to create social equity plans and report on their implementation, yet OHA is removing equity from its own fee structure. OHA cannot credibly demand equity from the industry while pricing lower-income facilitators out of the profession. Under this proposal, social equity is something licensees must write about if they can still afford to be licensed. It is wrong policy, wrong as economics, and wrong as a matter of equity.

For my family, the proposal means an additional \$22,000 every year. We may have to close our manufacturing facility. 7 service centers currently purchase from that facility and benefit from our low prices. If we close, they will lose an affordable supplier and may face higher costs. that ultimately burden themselves and their clients. OHA has protected laboratories by delaying their increase until 2029.

Why is equivalent transition protection being denied to manufacturers, service centers, and facilitators? OHA claims to have enough analysis to justify these increases while at the same time saying it cannot reliably estimate their economic effects. That is like trying to stop a boat from sinking by charging the remaining passengers more for staying aboard. Doubling prices without determining whether customers will leave is not financial planning.

It is gambling with the survival of the system. Government should not be permitted to gamble with businesses it requires to fund it. I have requested the supporting financial records, submitted multiple alternatives, and formally requested postponement of final action. I renew that request tonight.

OHA should disclose its analysis, preserve an equitable reduced fee option, and provide the rest of the industry with the same transition protection provided to laboratories. OHA cannot create a sustainable program by making participation financially unsustainable. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Next on the list is Gary Braceland, and then I'm circling back around. We have Amy Charlesworth, Melinda Halpern, and Renee Mirno. Gary, if you would like to unmute yourself and provide your name for the record, and please provide your comments.

Speaker 11: Yes, my name is Gary Braceland, and I'm speaking on behalf of the Psilocybin Alliance, a trade organization recently formed to represent our industry.

We represent 70 licensed facilitators, 10 service centers, and 3 manufacturers, and Oregon's only testing lab. These are the people who make up Oregon's regulated psilocybin community, and our numbers of membership are growing daily. These aren't abstract numbers to us. Every one of our members has built a business, a career, or a lifeline for clients around this regulated system.

These fee increases OHA is proposing puts all of that at risk. We oppose the proposed increases. For brevity, I will skip the numbers, but we are doubling the annual facilitator fee. We are doubling the service center and manufacturer fees to \$20,000, raising the worker permit fee 8-fold, and eliminating reduced fees altogether.

OHA says these increases are necessary for the program's survival, but just yesterday OHA released some projected fiscal analysis and it tells a different story. OHA modeled a scenario around what could happen if these fee increases cause licensees to leave the program. In that scenario, the projected deficit could be potentially about \$400,000, or \$4,000,000, \$4.25 million, which is roughly \$360,000 worse than if OHA doesn't raise the fees at all.

We know OHA took this risk seriously when considering Oregon's only remaining testing laboratory.

OHA recognized that losing that lab could disrupt the entire regulated system and provide special treatment- and provided special treatment intended to preserve that essential function. We agree with that decision. With no lab, there's no program. That tells us OHA understands that fees drive renewal decisions and that losing licensees threatens the whole system.

But the same care needs to be applied to facilitators, manufacturers, and service centers. Every one of them is just as essential. No manufacturers, no regulated product. No service centers, nowhere to deliver it.

No facilitators, no one to guide a session in the legal market. The Alliance has submitted a formal protective objection to OHA's fiscal impact statement. Along with real alternatives, including phased increases, revenue-based fees, installment payments, and keeping reduced fees in place, and administrative savings that could raise revenue without pushing viable businesses out of the program. We're not denying OPS has a budget problem. We're saying doubling fees without accounting for attrition isn't a solution.

It's simply a bigger problem. We're asking OHA to delay the final action, release the full analysis and assumptions behind it. Respond seriously to the alternatives we've submitted and build a fee structure based on what revenue will actually look like after the attrition, not on the hope that existing licensees will simply absorb the increase. We have ideas that we think could make a difference.

OHA's own numbers say this plan couldn't- could shrink the regulated system and deepen the deficit it's meant to fix. That should be reason enough to stop and get it right. We have ideas that we think could genuinely make a difference. We want to be collaborative and transparent for the betterment of the industry.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Speaker 11: I also have a personal statement, but I can wait till the end if you would like.

Speaker 1: Yes, thank you. We are over the 3-minute mark, so I'm going to go ahead and call on some other names on the list, but I will circle back around if we have time.

Speaker 11: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Next up is Amy Charlesworth, and then on deck will be Melinda Halpern, Renee Mirnu, and Matt Curran.

So Amy, if you are on the line and would like to provide your comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 14: Hello, my name is Amy Charlesworth. I'm a licensed Oregon psilocybin facilitator and an educator of psychedelic science, in addition to a military veteran. I've served- who served 16 years in the Army and accessed the reduced fee program that Oregon offers for licensing upon my initial license I oppose several parts of the rulemaking, and I just want to note for the record, I served on the Rules and Advisory Committee this year for the State of Oregon Oregon Psilocybin Program, and I was disappointed to see that a lot of that feedback wasn't taken into consideration. First, the fees.

Licensees already fund this program. Raising fees pushes costs onto the clients, which is going to make this service already, which is very inaccessible as it is, it's going to double or triple it in some cases, as we know that fees roll downhill and affect the people that need these services the most. Many facilitators offer sliding scale sessions to keep that door open, and higher fees make that harder to sustain. We're already unfairly requested and required to submit equity plans, which is frustrating to see when the state of Oregon is trying to remove low-income and veteran access for reduced fees, not match touching the integrity of having the equity plans in place.

We're removing- you're removing that from your own standard. Many facilitate- sorry, as a veteran, this is deeply important to me. This matters a lot because, as has already been mentioned on this call, a lot of military veterans use and rely on these services to get treatment for situations and diagnoses that have been untouched by Western modalities that we've tried for years and years. I urge OHA to protect an avenue for low-income and veteran access, including fee relief for practitioners who serve these communities.

So even if the license increases still go through, I am strongly requesting that you put back an avenue for those low-income persons and veterans to still be able to access a reduced fee program.

I also oppose the \$500 fee for curriculum changes for institutions teaching. As we know, this is an emerging market and a new and rapidly changing field. Training programs would be updating- training programs should be updating their content as research and best practices develop.

That's rapidly happening.

So costs are already rising across the board, and charging \$500 to the schools every time they need to make a change to their curriculum will tell them to stand still and not evolve. We need more evolutions, not fewer. Second, I oppose OAR 333-333-3070, uh, number 10, which would bar practicum students and site supervisors from acting as client support persons.

Serving as a client support person is a solid real-world practice. Students already struggle to find practicum experience, and this rule removes one of the few avenues they have. We should be expanding hands-on learning, not closing it off, because there's also other rules being proposed to make it harder for practicum sites to be established in an already reducing field, as we're also on top of that having service centers at risk of closing, going from 22 to probably maybe 10 to 12 will be left standing after this. Third is what I call OHA's proposed licensee speech ban.

Proposed rules including OAR 333-333-2010 4480, 5120, 6030, and 6100 would discipline licensees for promoting or encouraging unregulated activity, including sharing information about home cultivation and microdosing, and would hold us responsible for what others say on our behalf. These rules reach beyond licensed facilities into what we write, teach, and publish. They never define promote or encourage. When a wrong guess could cost you your license, you stay silent.

That raises serious concerns under First Amendment and Article 1, Section 8 of the Oregon Constitution.

They also ignore religious freedoms. For many people, psilocybin is a sacrament. In Gonzalez versus O Centro, the U.S.

Supreme Court ruled unanimously under the Federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act for a church that uses sacramental tea. Oregon's Constitution guarantees freedom of worship. Religious speech is protected speech, and OHA should clearly state that these rules do not reach religious practice or teaching. I ask OHA to withdraw these provisions and at least to propose, uh, postpone final action until it discloses analysis, defines its terms, and gives public, uh, time to respond.

Um, it is really imperative for also safety and for education that we allow the people who have been trained with psychedelics and for psilocybin to be able to speak openly and publicly and freely. Even if they hold license in Oregon, it does not mean that they're violating the law to talk to their clients and to curious minds about psychedelics and microdosis and cultivation of mushrooms. It's an overreach and an overstep. Thank you so much.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Next on the list is Melinda Halpern, and then on deck will be Renee Mirnue, Matt Curran, and Robert Combs. And again, we have about a half hour left for this hearing, so we are trying to limit comments to about 3 minutes. We do have our second hearing tomorrow at noon.

We also are accepting written comments until 5 PM on Monday, September 21st.

So, Melinda, if you would like to provide your comments now, please feel free to unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 4: My name is Melinda Halpern. I'm a facilitator at Drop Thesis in Bend, Oregon.

I've also been a licensed professional counselor for 25 years in Oregon. Throughout my career, I've worked with people facing some of the most difficult experiences imaginable, including treatment-resistant depression, PTSD, and the lasting effects of abuse and trauma. When Oregon created a regulated pathway for psilocybin services, it felt like a natural extension of the work I had already devoted my professional life to. I made a very deliberate choice to participate in Oregon's regulated program rather than do this work underground, and that distinction is important to me.

We all know psilocybin is readily available outside of the regulated system. It would have been easier, less expensive, and required far less investment for me to simply do this work outside the framework that Oregon created. I chose not to. I believed in what Oregon was trying to build.

I believed that people deserved to have access to psilocybin in an environment where safety, preparation, informed consent, support, and accountability were taken seriously. I put my time and my own money behind that belief. I completed a 10-month facilitator training program that cost more than \$10,000. That was a significant personal and professional investment.

On top of more than 2 decades of education, training, licensure, and expert- and experience as an LPC. I made that investment because I wanted to do this work responsibly and because I wanted to be part of a regulated system that could serve as a model for the rest of the country. Since becoming a facilitator, I've sat with over 35 individual journeyers and 7 group journeys. I have provided 4 partial scholarships and 1 unpaid journey.

I have done this because I believe access matters. I don't want this work to be available only to people who have plenty of financial resources or who are desperate for help with no legal option in sight. Sitting with someone during a psilocybin journey is a responsibility I take very seriously. The medicine itself is only one part of the experience.

The preparation beforehand, the relationship between facilitator and journeyer, the ability to recognize when someone needs support, and the care provided throughout the experience all matter. My 25 years as a mental health professional inform how I approach this work, but I also recognize that psilocybin facilitation requires its own specialized training and responsibilities. OHA is aware that Oregon facilitators have experienced- have provided a severe adverse experience rate of less than 1%. Behind that number are individual people who trusted us to be there with them during some of the most vulnerable moments of their lives.

I've witnessed people experience meaningful insight, moments of connection, increased hope, and a renewed sense of possibility. I have watched people who have struggled for years approach something new with courage. OHA is asking practitioners to reach lower socioeconomic populations and to demonstrate those efforts through a social equity plan. I understand and support the intention behind that.

In fact, I'm already doing that through my scholarships. But there is something deeply contradictory about asking small practitioners to make this work more accessible while simultaneously making it financially harder for those practitioners to stay in business. I am willing to serve people who cannot afford the full cost and to continue investing my time and professional experience in this program, but I cannot make an economically unsustainable practice sustainable simply through good intentions. Oregon made a grand gesture by being the first state to allow psilocybin to be used with a structured model.

To eliminate a highly successful program within 3 years by adding outrageous facilitator and facility fees not only does a disservice to my profession, but to the residents of Oregon who asked for this opportunity to work with psilocybin for health and healing. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

Um, next on the list is Renee Mirnew, and then on deck will be Matt Kieran, Robert Combs, and Andrew Pegram.

Renee, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Okay, next will be Matt Curran, and then Robert Combs, Andrew Pegram, and Sonia Towner. Matt, if you are on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 2: Hi, everyone.

Yeah, I'm not in a position to make comments at this point.

Speaker 1: Okay, thank you. I think I heard you say you were going to try to join tomorrow. I'm still getting a lot of echoing feedback.

That is correct.

Okay, thank you. And please also submit written comments if you'd like to.

Next up will be Robert Combs, and then we have Andrew Pegram, Sonia Towner, Josh Goldstein, and Michael Rhodes.

So next up is Robert Combs. Robert, if you're on the line and would like to provide comments, please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Okay, next is Andrew Pegram, and then we have Sonia Towner, Josh Goldstein, and Michael Rhodes.

So Andrew, if you'd like to provide comments, please unmute yourself.

Speaker 9: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Next is Sonia Towner, and then we have Josh Goldstein and Michael Rhodes. All right, Josh Goldstein, if you're on the line and would like to provide comments, Please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record. And as a reminder, from the phone, it is star 6 to unmute yourself.

All right. And then next up is Michael Rhodes.

Speaker 14: Hi.

Speaker 1: All right.

At this time, I will open up the sign-up sheet if there are additional people who would like to provide testimony. I would like to provide an opportunity for people who haven't had a chance to speak yet. to go first.

So please raise your hand using the raise hand button, or if you're on the phone, you can press star 9. Please remember to remain muted and off video until your name is called and it's your turn to speak.

And I will do my best to call on you in the order that hands are raised. But again, I would like to give an opportunity to people who have not had a chance to speak yet.

So the first person I see here, it looks like Phyllis, Phyllis Nasta. If you'd like to unmute yourself and provide your name for the record, please.

Speaker 9: Hi, yes, my name is Phyllis Nasta. I'm a licensed professional counselor, a licensed massage therapist. I don't have skin in this game. I'm not in the psilocybin business.

However, I was on the healthcare committee before it was voted in, and I was very enthusiastic and excited about it. The thing that I would add, I think it's absolutely horrifying, the licensure fees. I mean, my fees in my other 2 state licenses are nothing like this. which allows people like myself to provide low-cost services, do volunteer work, et cetera. But a few years ago, I was sent the questionnaire that the state wanted people who were taking the psilocybin journey to fill out.

And I was very shocked at the intrusive nature of it, all the personal questions, but I don't really talk to anybody in the field, so I didn't didn't really know why, but I think with this fee thing, I hate to say this, but there's something very fishy here.

Someone sent me a link to a news program a few weeks ago, and I heard that OHSU is getting a \$2 million-plus grant from NIH to study the effects of psilocybin. The original intent in the petition and the law was to keep Big Pharma out of it and big corporations, as I understood it, and psychiatry. They didn't want psychiatry controlling the whole thing.

And I've been a mental health practitioner for many, many years. I've been a psychiatric social worker. I've worked with psychiatrists. I understand mental health.

And that's exactly why I was very glad that they didn't allow psychiatry to take control of this. And they tried to protect it, protect it for the beautiful thing that it was. And this fee thing is completely prohibitive for normal people. I mean, who makes that kind of money that you can shell out all that money for licenses when you have so many other costs, not to mention you have to pay for your life?

So I think something is very amiss here. I don't know what it is. But that's- it just doesn't seem right. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you. And as a reminder, we are taking additional people to sign up to testify. You can use the raise hand button, or if you're on the phone, you can press star 9.

Up next, I have Gary Braceland.

Speaker 11: Yes, thank you. My name's still Gary Braceland, and I'm one of the partners of Drop Thesis and Service Center here in Bend, Oregon. I'm one of the co-founders of Psilocybin Alliance. I'm submitting this comment in opposition to the

proposed increase in licensing fees for facilitators, service centers, and manufacturers.

This proposal was raised and extensively discussed during the RAC process, where licensees and stakeholders voiced substantial concerns about its impact on the program's viability. Based on the fee schedule that has moved forward, it does not appear that this feedback meaningfully shaped the proposal. I would ask OHA to explain how RAC input on this specific issue was incorporated, And why the committee process did not result in any changes. OHA has not released the underlying financial analysis supporting these fee increases, including projected program expenses, expected renewal rates, anticipated license attrition, and projected revenue after that attrition.

These matters be- this matters because the data we do have points to the opposite of the intended outcome. In a survey of licensees conducted this summer, 117 of 146 respondents indicated they would not renew their licenses at the proposed rates. In fact, the current attrition rate without raising these fees is over 50% of the licensed manufacturers, testing labs, and service centers. If that rate of non-renewal holds across the program, these fee increases would generate less total revenue than leaving fees unchanged while shrinking the number of businesses serving Oregonians.

Before finalizing this rule, OHA should publish its assumptions and demonstrate that the proposed fees will actually improve rather than worsen the program's financial position. Provider costs are ultimately passed on to clients. Raising license fees on facilitators, service centers, manufacturers will raise the price of psilocybin therapy at exactly the moment the state should be working to make it more accessible, particularly for low-income and rural Oregonians who are already the most price-sensitive population this program serves. To me, this is against the core values of accessibility.

Independent research, including analysis from Rose City Labs, Oregon State University, and others on illegal psilocybin products sold outside the licensed system show that the majority share of psilocybin currently consumed in Oregon comes from illegal sources, maybe even as high as 90%. These products are untested and often mislabeled and misleading, and in some documented cases, very dangerous. Raising costs on licensed, tested, safety-regulated providers does not shrink that illegal market. It risks pushing even more Oregonians towards it.

If protecting public health and safety is among OHA's core mandates, that goal is better served by supporting the legal, licensed, taxpaying market's growth rather than crippling it. Why is this illegal number so high? It's clear that laws are not being enforced, allowing the illegal market to exist and thrive. With all the costs and constraints we face in the regulated legal market, And with more proposed expenses now, how can we compete, much less survive?

We need your support to suppress this legal market. Oregon's program has already served more than 24,000 people with an adverse event rate below 1%. That is an extremely strong safety record, and the state's oversight structure should be right-sized to reflect that. It should be focused on efficient, cost-effective, common-sense regulations.

Rather than rising costs on the businesses that are operating legally and safely- safely. Quite frankly, these fee increases could be the difference between staying in business or closing our doors. The doubling of the license fees will not only affect operational costs and overhead, but impact the survival of some of the facilitators we work closely with. We'd like to have to- we will likely have to eliminate some staffing.

But still stay within the strict OHA guidelines, and we're already lean. As it is inevitable, inevitable that these costs will have to be passed on to our clients, we project a decrease in actual sessions and a significant drop in inquiries. The economy is hard enough right now, and we are challenged to find ways to serve as many people as we can, yet still survive. This will be a huge blow to our core values.

I ask that OHA reject the proposed fee increases that are currently structured and work with licensees to find a sustainable funding approach that does not put access, safety, or the program's future at risk. We have ideas, and we want to be collaborative and transparent so this industry can grow and thrive. Thank you for listening and considering these comments.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

And I see a hand for Andy Still, who has not had a chance to speak yet.

So please go ahead and unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 15: Hi, I'm Andy Still. I'm a facilitator from Seaside, Oregon.

We've talked a lot about the fees, but income is only one half of a budget concern. And quite frankly, OPS has not shown us what the costs are. what they're covering or what we're trying to make up for.

So I agree with all the other prior comments about our fees, and I, and I think that's important. But I also think that the OHA has to become fiscally responsible as an organization, first reducing the spending to what is the existing budgeted income.

The other part of this is that there are other issues in this, and I can't remember the lady's name, but she covered them really well. I agree with every point she made. We cannot muzzle people for, uh, who are professionals, um, simply for saying things to a prospective client or even having someone else say it on our behalf, uh, that might not agree with what the, uh, the organization or the government, uh, are, are upholding. I think a lot of times what we're doing is giving a last option to people who are not, you know, going to see us anyway, and they're going to resort to something outside of the system.

And we are not able to now speak even to say to, to be careful, to find a sitter, to provide instructions on how to find somebody that could help them in that journey.

So I feel like the, the muzzling is an overstep of a government organization that is already not providing the service that we asked them to provide. And then lastly, as part of this, we're looking at the organization providing more regulation, more confinement, more laws, and more rules that we have to abide by. But we haven't seen any benefit from that yet.

We're already at such a low incident rate that I think if we can just maintain that and give good service and reduce our ability or increase our ability to provide services at a reduced rate, we'll be able to reach more people who are desperate for these services. That's all I have. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

All right, we have a little less than about 15 minutes left. If you have not provided comments and would like to, please use the raised hand button. Or if you're on the phone, you can press star 9. Andreas Mett, I see you have your hand up again, so please provide your name again for the record and your comments.

Speaker 6: Thank you. My name is Andreas Mett. I'm an Oregon-licensed psilocybin facilitator and co-founder of Satya Therapeutics, a licensed service center and manufacturer. And I'm going to turn my video off while I read this statement.

I oppose provisions in proposed OAR 333-333 2010, 4480, 5120, 6030, and 6100. I refer to them collectively as OHA's proposed licensee speech ban. It is extraordinary that in the United States in 2026, Oregon licensees must defend their freedom to write, teach, publish, and discuss lawful subjects without risking their livelihoods. These provisions are not clearly confined to licensed premises, premises, or regulated transactions.

They prohibit providing information or instruction about home cultivation and processing, promoting unregulated consumption, and encouraging activities that are illegal under state law. They may also make licensees responsible for communications by employees, advertisers, influencers, and others acting on their behalf. I agree that OHA may regulate licensed operations and prohibit direct participation in unlawful conduct. My objection is that terms such as promoting, encouraging, information, and instruction are not adequately defined.

Although the rules do not mention books, their language could make an independently published book grounds for licensing discipline. The same uncertainty could affect websites, classes, research, journalism, policy advocacy, social media, harm reduction information, ordinary conversations, and lawful non-psylocybin businesses. This concern is concrete. Before OHA published these rules, I asked its compliance team about facilitator-authored ebooks and non-psylocybin products.

OHA responded by asking whether the books would discuss cultivation, production, processing, or use. That exchange demonstrates the uncertainty facing licensees engaged in lawful speech and commerce. I requested OHA statutory- I requested

OHA statutory, constitutional, factual, and economic basis for these provisions. together with its definitions and enforcement criteria. OHA estimates that those records will be produced by October 26th.

Public comments close September 21st. The public is therefore being asked to evaluate sweeping restrictions without access to OHA's supporting record. I ask OHA to remove or substantially narrow these provisions. Alternatively, postpone final action Disclose the supporting record, clearly distinguish unlawful conduct from protected speech, and provide a meaningful opportunity for public response.

OHA can regulate Oregon's licensed psilocybin system without controlling the independent speech and lawful outside activities of an entire industry. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you. At this time, uh, okay, I see another hand up.

Courtney Campbell, uh, feel free to unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 16: Uh, yeah, my name is Courtney Campbell. Um, I'm the owner-operator of Chariot, a licensed service center in Portland. Um, we just renewed our license for the 4th time and have obviously a lot of concerns about these proposed rules.

You know, as Gary mentioned, a number of us met in early July on Iraq, and, you know, we discussed all these changes. We, you know, like deep into the, you know, the wording, the sense of like the very small parts deep into it and the implications and consequences of these rules if they were adopted. And it was a group of facilitators, operators, you know, industry folk, people with skin in the game, people who are the boots on the ground doing this work. And the consensus on nearly every rule change was that this is unhelpful unnecessary and will only add additional cost to this program.

And then when the rules were released, it seems as if all of our work during those days, which is not surprising based on sort of how these rule change sessions go, was, you know, it fell on deaf ears.

You know, most of the changes were adopted. None of what we were we're talking about really mattered. And, you know, that's very frustrating because we just keep adding on more and more to this program despite all the evidence, uh, the recently published, uh, OHSU data that shows just how safe this program is.

It feels like there's an opportunity here to get together, be collaborative, and talk about how we can make this program work. be accessible, have reasonable license fees for small business owners to stay in this work, because we love this work. We believe in this work. Many of us, most of us have benefited from this work. We see people's lives changed by it every day.

You know, we asked to be collaborative then, and I'm still hopeful that there's a path forward in which we can be collaborative. and make this program work because, as a number of other people have said, it really is changing lives. It's work that is not happening really anywhere else other than Colorado and maybe New Mexico. But yeah, I think we have an opportunity here to shape a program That is the first.

So we got some things wrong, and we can look at it now and say, hey, what was necessary?

What wasn't?

You know, where can we maybe like lower the guardrails a bit? Where do they need to be stronger? But ways in which it makes it all more accessible.

So thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you. We have time for just a few more people to provide comments before I do some closing remarks. I'm going to call on Jay Lamp since they have not had a chance to provide any comments yet.

If you'd like to provide comments, feel free to unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Okay, I saw that hand. Go down.

So I'm going to call on Amy Charlesworth.

Speaker 14: Hi, since there's just an extra minute of time, I just wanted to add one thing that's not necessarily on the docket for attention for most people, but I do want it to be stated at least while we have this moment. I've worked in the service centers for a while now, and I've been serving medicine for a long time, and one of the most frustrating dynamics that I think needs revision is that the service centers are not allowed to help clients prepare the beverage for consumption or the psilocybin for consumption. When you're actually serving these medicines, most of the people who are having these experiences, the psilocybin experiences at the service center, have never done this before. It's their very, very, very first time.

And, they're sitting there emotional, nervous, crying. They don't know what they're doing. And, I'll tell you, it is extremely destabilizing and extremely traumatic for them to have to fumble through packages, figure out how to mix the product, figure out what to do. And it creates a very tense moment.

And we do our best to take care of them and to support them and to serve them. But there are service centers in the state of Oregon being disciplined through extremely high, unnecessary, and ridiculous fees because we're trying to support the clients during these really difficult, challenging moments. And it's egregious.

And so I just want to propose that we do allow the licensed individuals, such as the facilitators or the service centers, to do what they're licensed to do, and that is to prepare and to serve a product that we have been entrusted with, that we've got the training for, and have paid the money to do so, so we can take care of clients in their most vulnerable moments in an experience that they've never done before.

That's what we're here and trained and licensed to do.

And so I'm strongly requesting requesting that we change that rule and allow service centers to, to serve the clients in the moments that they need it the most. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you.

I think we'll have time for one more person to provide comments. I see Jay Lamp, you have your hand raised again. Please unmute yourself and provide your name for the record.

Speaker 7: Hi, my name is Jason Lampman.

Um, yeah, I wanted to, um, uh, start by saying, um, uh, the- I agree with previous speakers on a lot of things. One of them, first off, was the, um, not being able to speak about, um, cultivation or promoting other things. I think that the new language- I think the old language was fine and, and had a it made sense. But with the new language, I mean, for me especially, we also, we carry a cannabis and hemp license.

If it were to, if that were the same rule in that industry, my whole entire- I have a YouTube channel that talks about cultivation and things like that, not specifically for it, but we're farmers. And it would just, I think you're creating criminals out of people who aren't, who are, who are not really trying to break the law. And, and creating income for themselves in a really expensive program. I wanted to say, this part of 333-5200, I think I want to thank OPS for listening about to the public and the professionals about allowing the music.

I think that's a positive change, and I really think that you did the right thing there by allowing that. I think that's an important part of this service if it's- if and when it's needed. I wanted to also agree with almost everyone on here that the price hikes are a- it is- it's just not going to work. And I say that with respect to everyone who works for OPS and OHA.

I know it's been hard to build something from nothing. But it's been too- the truth is it's been too expensive from the beginning. And doubling the costs and removing the discount for veterans and OHP people is going to ruin the already- everybody and everyone I know in the industry is hurting. I think we need to just recognize that, that the, that what the, what we have here is not

working.

And maybe, maybe OPS and OHA can't say anything. But if there is a way, I think that the public, the licensees, OHA and OPS need to really come together and say, this is our- because I realize doing nothing is not an option either.

So this is your probably what you can only do.

Speaker 15: Right.

Speaker 7: But I think it's time to agree that it's not working and moving forward, this is going to only hurt businesses and the people who need it most. And if that means we gotta come together and go to the legislature and say we want this to continue, what are other options? Because maybe your hands are tied with the OHA and OPS.

So yeah, I don't know.

Speaker 2: It's tough.

Speaker 7: I respect everyone who's worked on this from the beginning. I've watched the whole thing go through.

So, um, thank you for- thank you for letting me speak.

Please don't double the prices.

Speaker 1: Thank you. All right, we are at 7, almost 7:30.

Um, so that concludes our first hearing.

Our second hearing will be tomorrow, September 16th, at 12 PM noon until 1:30 PM Pacific time. To sign up on the virtual signup sheet, go to www.oregon.gov/psilocybin. Click on administrative rules and scroll down to 2026 public hearings. We are accepting written comments until Monday, September 21st at 5 PM.

And those can be sent to publichealth.rules@odhsoha.oregon.gov. After the public comment period closes on Monday, September 21st, the agency will review and consider all written and oral testimony before finalizing the rules. Responses to comments will be made available in the Hearing Office Officer report, which we expect will be finalized in late October or November. Once finalized, the hearing officer report and final rules will be linked to the Oregon Psilocybin Services Section website at oregon.gov/psilocybin and sent out through the Oregon Psilocybin Services mailing list.

You can subscribe to the mailing list by going to oregon.gov/psilocybin and clicking on the blue button that says sign up for distribution list. This hearing is now adjourned. Thank you and have a good evening.

Generated by WhisperAI

<https://whisperai.com>