Processors (Extracts) Technical Subcommittee

July 22, 2015 Meeting Summary and Recommendations

Committee Attendees: Amanda Jamrose (phone), Cameron Yee, Charles Weller, Ethan Felcher, Karen Sprague, Jason Wasserman, Michael Lausmann, Norris Monson

Absent: none

Other Attendees: Chris Lyons (RAC Chairperson)

OLCC Staff Representatives: Kelly Routt, Amanda Borup

The processors' (extracts) technical subcommittee met on July 22, 2015 to discuss packaging and follow up items. The following is a summary of that meeting and the subcommittee's rule recommendations on those topics. For purposes of this and future summaries and recommendations, these phrases are defined as follows:

- ***"Believes"*** or "***agrees"***: no member of the committee voiced a conflicting opinion or approach.
- ***"Generally agrees"***: some members of the committee voiced a differing sentiment than this prevailing opinion or approach.

1. Packaging and labeling

OLCC staff provided examples of statutory language defining "child-resistant packaging" by the FDA, Oregon Health Authority, and the States of Colorado and Washington. One committee member provided samples of the child-resistant packaging it uses for its products. The group agrees that opaque packaging is detrimental to their business – customers should be able to see the product. The subcommittee also agrees that they should be able to distribute their product in bulk to retailers. This allows retailers to package the extracts under their own brand.

As to labeling, the subcommittee agrees that the Oregon Health Authority has a good list of labeling requirements. The subcommittee agrees that the solvent used in processing should not be required to be disclosed on the label; whether to disclose the solvent used in processing should be a business decision by the processor. Subcommittee members stated that in other industries, it is not typical to require the type of solvent used. Subcommittee members also agree that the packaging should not be limited to drab colors. They believe that they should be able to use colorful labels that contain pictures of items such as fruits.

The group agrees that extract products sold at retail should be able to contain up to seven grams of extract per package.

2. Follow up items

a. Definition of concentrates and extracts

HB3400 defines concentrates and extracts (Section 1(3)(4)). These definitions include a provision for OLCC to add processes by rule. OLCC staff asked the group to identify any other process not described in the definitions. The subcommittee identified the processes of steam distillation and microwave (although steam distillation may be considered a process under Section 1(3)(b) of the cannabinoid concentrate definition).

b. Hexane

While hexane is a prohibited solvent in Washington and Colorado, the subcommittee agrees that hexane should not be prohibited in Oregon because it is allowed in processing in other industries, and, with the proper methodology, can produce a clean product.

c. Butane

The group agrees that open blasting should not be prohibited. However, the use of pressurized canned butane in processing should be prohibited.

3. Questions from Labs & Traceability subcommittee

The technical advisory subcommittee on Labs and Traceability requested the Extracts subcommittee provide input on the follow questions:

a. Testing for all residual solvents

The Labs subcommittee sought input on whether a lab should test an extract for all residual solvents, or only the solvent used to make the extract. For example, if a butane hash oil product was sent to a lab, should the lab only test for butane, or for other residual solvents? The subcommittee agreed that all residual solvents should be tested the first time a processor submits a sample to a lab. Subcommittee members mentioned that the cost of testing and turnaround time would increase with expanded testing. Labs can test for approximately 30 solvents, which could potentially increase turnaround time from five to twenty days.

The Labs subcommittee also asked if this should be done for a period of time for each processor, such as 180 days. The subcommittee disagreed, and suggested that there should be some middle ground, such as testing for all residual solvents on a product at first, but subsequently testing only for the solvents disclosed and conducting random testing of a processor's extracts.

b. Deionized water

The Labs subcommittee asked if Extracts subcommittee members use deionized water in processing. Of the subcommittee members that use water, one uses distilled water run through a UV filter, and another uses reverse osmosis. Subcommittee members stated that there is a chemical process that can ensure the water is sterile, and the product can be purified before packaging.

4. Recommendations for other committees

The subcommittee had the following recommendations for the remaining active committees (Rules Advisory Committee; Licensing, Compliance, and Enforcement subcommittee, and Labs and Traceability subcommittee).

a. Labs

Labs should be third-party certified as soon as possible. These labs should have the equipment necessary to conduct thorough testing, and should receive no outside influence from growers in determining appropriate pesticide testing.

b. Employee Training

The subcommittee requests that licensees be able to provide in-house employee training on topics such as general safety instead of through a third-party certifier.