



## Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board Meeting

Wednesday, April 9, 2025, 10:00 am

This meeting was held in a hybrid environment

### Meeting Minutes

---

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

*Member Garrett called the regular meeting of the Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board to order at 10:00 am on Wednesday, April 9, 2025. Member Pete Holmes was also present. Written public comments will be attached to the meeting minutes.*

#### 2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

**Member Holmes made a motion to approve the March 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2025 Caucus minutes; March 12 & 26, 2025 Board Meeting minutes; May 2, 9, 16, 23 & 31, 2023 Caucus minutes; May 10 & 24 Board Meeting minutes; and May 10, 2023 EMT minutes. Member Garrett seconded Motion was approved.**

#### 3. RULEMAKING TIMELINES – ALL INDUSTRIES

**Kevin Walder, Policy and Rules Manager**

Kevin briefed on current and upcoming timeline items, including four active rulemaking projects, a CR 101 scheduled to be filed later this month and four unique petition requests.

#### 4. CANNABIS RELATED RULEMAKING

##### **ACTION ITEM 4A – Public Hearing regarding Second Substitute House Bill 2151 (2024)**

##### **Regarding the Transfer of Cannabis Lab Accreditation**

**Denise Laflamme, Policy and Rules Coordinator**

Denise previewed the public hearing on a CR 102 with proposed rules to implement Second Substitute House Bill (SSHB) 2151 to amend sections of chapter 314-55 WAC related to the transfer of cannabis laboratory quality standards and accreditation from the LCB to the Washington State Department of Agriculture. SSHB 2151 which passed last year, amended RCW 69.50.348 transferring the authority for cannabis laboratory accreditation from the LCB to the Washington Department of Agriculture.

*Member Garrett opened the public hearing and invited citizens to address the Board. The Board heard from the following people:*

Caitlein Ryan  
Lara Kaminsky  
Amber Wise

*For full detail of public comment, the meeting recording is available on the LCB website.*

Member Garrett closed the public hearing and thanked everyone for their input.

## 5. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 10:24 am.

Minutes approved this 20th day of May 2025



---

Jim Vollendroff  
Board Chair



---

Ollie Garrett  
Board Member



---

Peter Holmes  
Board Member

Minutes Prepared by: Deborah Soper, Administrative Assistant to the Board

<b>LCB Mission</b> - Promote public safety, public health, and trust through fair administration, education, and enforcement of liquor, cannabis, tobacco, and vapor laws.
--

---

**Written comment regarding SHB 2151 and WSR 25-06-033**

---

**From** Amber Wise <amber@medicinecreekanalytics.com>

**Date** Wed 4/9/2025 10:30 AM

**To** LCB DL Rules <rules@lcb.wa.gov>; Vollendroff, Jim (LCB) <jim.vollendroff@lcb.wa.gov>; Garrett, Ollie A (LCB) <ollie.garrett@lcb.wa.gov>; Holmes, Pete <pete.holmes@lcb.wa.gov>; Frost, Gretchen D (LCB) <gretchen.frost@lcb.wa.gov>; Nordhorn, Justin T (LCB) <justin.nordhorn@lcb.wa.gov>; Laflamme, Denise M (LCB) <denise.laflamme@lcb.wa.gov>

**Cc** Ty Padilla <Ty@ptceinc.com>

External Email

Hello WSLCB board and staff,

I am writing to comment on the language changes under WSR 25-06-033 related to the implementation of SHB 2151. I gave oral comments at the Board meeting this morning and wanted to ensure you had the specifics for review.

I am proposing a small change in Section 314-55 -0995 3h to ensure the language aligns with other existing WAC sections. I am requesting the insertion of the words 'required' or 'quality control' to describe the test results that should be reported to the LCB's CCRS platform. The sentence should read "Certified laboratories must report all quality control test results directly into LCB's traceability system within 24 hours of completion." This is the same language that can be found in WAC 314-55-102 2b.

The WSLCB has recently announced changes in reporting requirements for non-mandatory tests and these decisions should be addressed transparently with public comment and stakeholder feedback. Requiring "all test results" to be reported is outside the scope of the lab accreditation transfer bill 2151 that we are discussing today.

I respectfully request that the final rules reflect the current requirement, i.e. that mandated required test results only are to be reported into the CCRS system, to avoid an expansion of reporting requirements without proper due process.

Thanks for your time and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have regarding my comments.

Sincerely,

Amber Wise  
Science Director  
Medicine Creek Analytics  
253-320-8530



DEDICATED TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF A VITAL, ETHICAL, EQUITABLE, AND SUSTAINABLE CANNABIS INDUSTRY  
[WWW.THECANNABISALLIANCE.US](http://WWW.THECANNABISALLIANCE.US)

## CR 102 FEEDBACK FOR [WSR 25-06-033](#)

8 April 2025

Dear Ms. Laflamme,

The stated intent of this rulemaking is to specify LCB certification requirements for laboratories and repeal outdated sections following the transfer of authority to WSDA. This CR-102 exceeds that limited purpose. By adding new language to WAC 314-55-0995, the proposed rule introduces substantive changes that fall outside the LCB's rulemaking authority. What should be a straightforward update now includes provisions that expand LCB oversight—particularly over laboratory reporting—in ways not contemplated by 2SHB 2151 or related statutes.

As currently written, the new language could be interpreted to grant the LCB authority over all lab test results, including those that are not required by rule. This represents a significant expansion of regulatory oversight that has not been explicitly authorized by statute. WAC 314-55-102 not only outlines required test types, but also establishes a testing schedule. The rule doesn't just say *what* needs to be tested—it also says *when* it needs to happen. It does not contemplate the reporting or regulation of optional, intermediary, or internal tests conducted outside of that framework. Expanding LCB's authority to include such testing exceeds the bounds of its rulemaking authority and undermines the legislative intent behind the statutory changes.

Further, the terms “mandatory” and “non-mandatory” are not defined in RCW or WAC. These distinctions appear only in informal guidance—primarily from traceability vendors—used to differentiate between test results that must be reported and those that are not. The existence of this guidance suggests internal recognition that not all test results are subject to LCB reporting requirements. If the agency intends to regulate beyond required testing, it must do so through a separate rulemaking process that clearly defines these terms and allows for public input.

The proposed amendments to WAC 314-55-0995—specifically subsection (3)(h)—should be revised to align with WAC 314-55-102(2)(b) by clarifying that only quality control test results are required to be reported in the traceability system. As currently written, the language risks creating confusion, expanding regulatory oversight beyond what has been authorized, and undermining transparency in the rulemaking process. If the LCB wishes to pursue broader

authority over lab testing and reporting—including non-required or internal business tests—it must do so through a separate, clearly defined rulemaking process that includes public engagement and a proper legal basis. I respectfully urge the Board to revise the proposed rule to remain within scope and to uphold the principles of clear, limited, and accountable regulation.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Caitlein', followed by a long, horizontal, wavy line that extends to the right.

Caitlein Ryan, PhD  
Executive Director, The Cannabis Alliance  
[caitlein.ryan@thecannabisalliance.us](mailto:caitlein.ryan@thecannabisalliance.us)  
425-314-9004

u

314-55-0995 (3)(h) new

Certified laboratories must report all test results directly into LCB's traceability system within 24 hours of completion. Laboratories must Retain language from WAC 314-55-103 for requirement that laboratories must CR 102 Memo 7 02/26/2025 2SHB 2151 Transfer of Cannabis Lab Accreditation also record in the traceability system an acknowledgment of the receipt of samples from producers or processors and verify if any unused portion of the samples provided to them for testing was destroyed in compliance with cannabis waste disposal requirements pursuant to WAC314-55-097 and RCW 69.50.3255, or returned to the custome

## Oral Testimony (Revised for Delivery)

Hi, my name is John Kingsbury. I'm a medical cannabis patient.

I'd like to comment on the proposed language in WAC 314-55-0995(3)(h)—specifically the part that says: *“Certified laboratories must report ALL test results directly into LCB's traceability system.”* I want to focus on that word: “all.”

As you know, sometimes I have things tested. I think it's a good thing when patients test—whether it's from their own gardens or just to have confidence in something they might buy at the store. But from this language, it sounds like *any* test result—even those ordered by patients—would now need to go into the traceability system. I'm not really sure how that would work, or if that was even the intention.

I've also heard concerns from processors that this “all” requirement could impact things like solvent refinement, or just basic research and development.

And honestly, I worry that patients might stop testing if they are afraid of being identified. That would be a step in the wrong direction.

More testing generally helps public health and safety—we should be doing more of it, not less. And we should not create rules that might discourage it.

Let's be clear: requiring *a//* test results to go into traceability would be a major shift from how things have worked for the last ten years. That kind of change could bring a lot of unintended consequences.

I understand Enforcement has concerns—like making sure under-reporting doesn't allow for things like unregulated remediation. But focusing only on that issue, without considering the broader impact, could lead to real problems.

The wrong response to those valid concerns would be to simply wash the LCB website of past policy and guidance that only mandatory testing be reported, adopt this overly broad phrase, and pretend that this has been the policy all along. The right response would be to have discussion about Enforcement or other agency concerns, about any potential collateral consequences, about patient privacy and responsibilities, and for a more thoughtful policy in that way.

So here's my suggestion: instead of saying *"all test results,"* the rule could say *"all required test results."* That small change would let this rulemaking move forward, while giving everyone time to have a more thoughtful conversation about what should actually be reported.

Thanks for your time.

John Kingsbury