

# PT Workgroup Update & Motion

10/28/2020

# Meetings

- 9/28

- Ryan Zboralski, Sara Sekerak, Anastacia Green from Ecology
- Nick Poolman from WSLCB
- Qing Gu from WSDA
- Steve LaCroix from DOH
- Jay Burns from Treeline
- Steve Loague from Integrity
- Bonnie Luntzel from Praxis

- 10/20

- Ryan Zboralski, Sara Sekerak, Anastacia Green from Ecology
- Nick Poolman from WSLCB
- Qing Gu from WSDA
- Steve LaCroix from DOH
- Jay Burns from Treeline
- Steve Loague from Integrity
- Bonnie Luntzel from Praxis

# Items discussed

- Frequency
- Matrix Matching
- In-state provider

# Frequency

- Current model
- Other Cannabis states
- Ecology model

# Matrix Matching

- Diversity of “End product” PTs
  - Rotate?
  - Dictate?
- “Priority” List

# PTs must be manufactured in state

- Why is it needed?
  - Transportation across state lines
  - Critical for Potency, Pesticides, and Residual Solvents
- How to make it happen?
  - Policy makers must work together to find solution

# The Motion

# REQUIRED MATRIX-MATCHING PRIORITY FOR PTS

- This motion would establish which current fields of testing need to have in-matrix PTs available. In-matrix PTs are critical to assess method performance for potency, pesticides and residual solvents. In-matrix PTs must be available for potency, pesticides, and residual solvents initially. These PTs will be followed sequentially by the less critical mycotoxins, terpenes, microbial analysis, metals, water activity, moisture, and then foreign matter.



# Field of Testing in-matrix priority

- Potency, Pesticides, and Residual Solvents
  - Most critical to be in-matrix
- Mycotoxins
- Terpenes
- Microbial
- Metals
- Water Activity
- Moisture
- Foreign Matter

# Pros and Cons

## Pros

- Feedback to Laboratories
- Information to Agencies
- In-line with other CSTF recommendations
- Similar to other states

## Cons

- In-state manufacturer needed
- Limited availability

Questions?