COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

MEDICAL MARIJUANA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

* * * * * * * *

BEFORE: DEBRA BOGEN, M.D., Chair

COL. CHRISTOPHER PARIS, Member

CHRISTINE ROUSSEL, Pharm.D., Member

MATTHEW EATON, Member

DAVID SPLAIN, Member

JOHN ADAMS, Member

GEITH SHAHOUD, Member

BHAVINI PATEL, Member

DANIEL KAMBIC, D.O., Member

I. WILLIAM GOLDFARB, M.D., Member

SHALAWN JAMES, Member

DIANA BRIGGS, Member

HEARING: June 28, 2023

10:30 a.m.

LOCATION: State Capitol - East Wing

Commonwealth Ave,

Harrisburg, PA 17120

Reporter: Madeline Helmsteter

Any reproduction of this transcript

is prohibited without authorization

by the certifying agency

		_					
1	APPEARANCES	2					
2							
3	ANNA LAMANO, ESQUIRE						
4	PA Department of Health						
5	625 Foerster Street						
6	Harrisburg, PA 17120						
7	Counsel for The Department						
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

					3
1	INDEX				
2					
3	DISCUSSION AMONG PARTIES	5	_	39	
4	CERTIFICATE			40	
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

			4
1		EXHIBITS	
2			
3			Page
4	Number	Description	Offered
5		NONE OFFERED	
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3 CHAIR: Good morning. It is 1030, so we're going to start right on time. Thanks, everyone, 4 5 for being here. Thank you for attending today's 6 Medical Marijuana Advisory Board meeting. To help 7 ensure that we have a better experience today with technology, we're here. We've called upon the experts from the Commonwealth Media Services to assist us with 10 allowing board members the ability to participate virtually in addition to offering a live broadcast for 11 12 those who can't attend.

So I'd like to officially call this meeting to order. Again, this is a Medical Marijuana Advisory Board Meeting being held at 1030 on June 28, 2023. First, we will take the roll call. For your reference, you were provided a board member list in your packet. When I read your name, please acknowledge that you're present for the record, Colonel Paris or Designee?

DR. GOLDFARB: Hello.

CHAIR: I'm not sure if there's somebody present for Colonel Paris. You all need to mute your microphone because we're getting a lot of feedback. I don't think we have a response to that

```
6
   one. Christine Roussel?
1
2.
                   MS. ROUSSEL: Present.
3
                           Thank you. Matthew Eaton?
                   CHAIR:
                   MR. EATON: Present.
 4
 5
                           John Adams?
                   CHAIR:
 6
                   MR. ADAMS: Present.
7
                   CHAIR:
                           Dr. Shahoud? I think I saw a
               Thank you, Dr. Shahoud. Bhavini Patel?
   hand wave.
9
                   MS. PATEL:
                               Present..
10
                   CHAIR:
                           Thank you. Dr. Kambic?
11
                   DR. KAMBIC: Present.
12
                   CHAIR:
                           Thank you. Dr. Goldfarb?
13
                   DR. GOLDFARB: Present.
14
                   CHAIR:
                           Shalawn James?
15
                   MS. JAMES:
                               Present.
16
                           Thank you. Diana Briggs?
                   CHAIR:
17
                   MS. BRIGGS: Present.
18
                           Wonderful. Before I ask Legal
                   CHAIR:
19
   Counsel to confirm that we have a quorum today, I want
20
   to take a moment to acknowledge the recent changes.
   Earlier this month, Katelyn Maltais, who was the Board
21
22
   Counsel for the last couple of years, left the
23
   Department of Health for new opportunities. I want to
24
   thank Katelyn for her dedication and the commitment
25
   she made to ensuring that the Board was operating
```

1 effectively and in accordance with the Medical 2 Marijuana Act.

2.4

So on behalf of the Department of
Health and the Medical Marijuana Advisory Board, I
want to congratulate her and offer her best wishes as
she takes a new path in her career journey.

Additionally, I ask that you all please join me in welcome Anna LaMano, who will serve as the Board's legal counsel moving forward. Anna, sitting to my left here. Ms. LaMano has been on the legal team at the Department of Health for two years. She oversees or leads the Department's Right to Know program, and she's kindly and graciously agreed to serve as legal counsel for the Board. So thank you, Anna, and welcome.

And as your first duty, could you please confirm that we have a quorum for today's meeting?

ATTORNEY LAMANO: I can.

20 And I can confirm that we do have a 21 quorum with nine.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. The next order of business is to approve the previous meeting minutes. You were all sent the meeting minutes for the last board meeting that was held on April 12,

1 2023. I hope you had a chance to review the minutes.

2 | We did not receive any suggested changes. So at this

3 time, may I get a motion to approve the minutes from

4 | the April 12 board meeting?

5

6

7

8

9

19

DR. KAMBIC: Kambic, so moved.

CHAIR: Thank you. Second.

MR. EATON: Matthew Eaton second.

CHAIR: All in favor of the motion to

approve the minutes, say aye.

10

program update.

11 AYES RESPOND

12

CHAIR: Is anyone opposed? Are there
any abstentions? It looks like the minutes from the
April board meeting are approved. The next agenda
item is an Office of Medical Marijuana program update.
I'd like to turn things over to Laura Mench, Director
of the Office of Medical Marijuana, to provide the

MS. MENCH: Thank you, Dr. Bogan.

21 Good morning, everyone. Can you hear me well enough?

22 Thank you. In the blink of an eye, 9 months has

23 passed from being hired as the Director of the Office

24 of Medical Marijuana, and this is now my third

25 in-person board meeting. I can say with confidence

that there is never a dull moment and no shortage of 1 2. work to go around. Part of that is due to the 3 consistent growth we continue to see in the program, which we'll look at in the slides to come. 4 But it's 5 also because of the staff's commitment to continuously 6 look for ways to make improvements to the program as 7 well as the stakeholders - as well as the consideration given to suggestions and ideas from the 8 9 stakeholders.

As a result, we continue to expand the office to not only meet the demands that accompany program growth, but also to provide additional support to fill existing gaps in areas of need and to help implement program improvements as we determine ways to do it better.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

With a close eye on the ever-evolving world of medical marijuana at both the state and federal level, we not only take into account the current office needs, but we also consider what may be ahead to ensure that our foundation allows for continued growth and stability and service to patients well into the future. This proves to be challenging at times due to the unknowns. And we have made great strides over the previous months. And I'm excited for the work that lies ahead.

Before we get into the program 2. metrics, I want to share some program updates since the last board meeting. We had a research summit. And the update on the research summit is that it took place on April 17th, and it was inspirational and motivating to see so many bright minds on the research front speak to the hard work that they are doing to shine light to the benefits of the program as it relates to patient care.

The summit was an opportunity for the ACRCs to show off the innovative ways the data is collected, to speak to the improvements in the quality of life for patients enrolled. And equally as important, a chance for the research teams to discuss ideas on how to collaborate with each other to future – to further the opportunities for research in the future.

The Cann-Ra conference that I just got back from last night - Cann-Ra, it was in Annapolis, Maryland, and it stands for the Cannabis Regulators Association, of which Pennsylvania Office of Medical Marijuana is a member, along with more than 40 other states and U.S. territories. I had the opportunity to network with regulators from other states to discuss shared challenges, discuss ideas, and basically

collaborate to identify and share best practices to safeguard public health and consumer safety.

2.

There were a broad range of presentations and roundtable discussions, including subject matter on interstate commerce, emerging trends, best practices and challenges related to policies to support small businesses, education for consumers and prevention of youth access, federal and international cannabis policy updates, new directions in cannabis, equity and social justice, standards for cannabis and novel ideas to improve cannabis product safety, ongoing challenges with cannabis research and how to advance the science, detection of cannabis impaired driving, regulatory policies on cannabinoid hemp products and more than that. Just to list a few.

It was an excellent conference for networking and educational and ways to collaborate on issues that we all share and solutions that we can also attempt in each other's states. I am very grateful to have had the opportunity to attend, and I look forward to sharing what I learned with the Office – the Medical Marijuana Office Staff.

Coming soon is our aggregate data on the web page. We're working to develop a page on our website where we will begin providing and posting

various types of aggregate data as part of the

Office's continued goal for transparency. Our goal is

make program data available on our website in one

place where people can easily find it.

We plan to use a phased approach as we launch the page and continue to work through determining what information already exists, what can potentially be pulled, how often, and how best to share it. More to come on that. And we hope to launch the page by the end of the summer. The Office of Medical Marijuana Standard Operating Procedures. We continue thoroughly reviewing and updating the Office's SOPs, and this effort is to maximize the Office's efficiency and will include discussions with department leadership to ensure that our work will align with current leadership goals.

Mow we can move on to the program metrics, which I believe are up on the screens. The first slide that you're going to see is going to show the program statistics as of 6/1 of 2023, its program today has 922,705 patients and caregivers registered, 426,015 active patient certifications, 1,857 approved practitioners, 32.9 million patient dispensing events. 93.5 million products dispensed. \$7.5 billion in total sales, \$9.2 billion by grower processors to

dispensaries, \$4.6 billion by dispensaries. 1 2. currently we have 178 operational dispensaries.

3 The next slide is going to show month-to-month dispensary sales. And that will show a 4 5 continued tread on increased sales from the previous 6 year. Of note, all the numbers are increased from last year, the same for July and October, which are basically even. And the program continues to grow. 8 But that increase continues to level out. We've said 10 that in the last three meetings.

The next slide will show a similar trend, but it's a combination of all years from 2022 to March of 2023. And the next slide will show the 1.3 sales from January, February, and March from 2020 to 2023, clearly still growth, but that growth has slowed.

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.3

24

25

Patient purchase trends. There is no change here and that has been consistent. Dry Leaf is still the top seller, followed by vapes concentrates infused and others.

21 And that's the program update. Thank 22 you.

CHAIR: Thank you, Laura. Does any member of the Board have any questions on the material that was just presented? All right. Hearing no

- 1 questions, we'll move on to old business. As you may
- 2 recall, at our last meeting on April 12th, the Medical
- 3 Research Subcommittee shared findings and
- 4 recommendations regarding the July 2022 Research
- 5 | Initiative presentation by Organic Remedies on the
- 6 efficacy of a process designed to clean contaminated
- 7 cannabis product. The next step for the Board will be
- 8 to review the report of the Medical Research
- 9 | Subcommittee. I understand that the subcommittee
- 10 | intends to present their report today.
- 11 Pursuant to the Medical Marijuana Act,
- 12 | I will review the report and make a determination on
- 13 the Board's recommendation in accordance with section
- 14 | 1202 of the Act. I also want to share that my office
- 15 has received written feedback regarding the findings
- 16 and recommendations presented at the last meeting.
- 17 | These comments are included in your Board packet as
- 18 they constitute written comments, which pursuant to
- 19 Section 1201 of the Act, should be accepted and
- 20 reviewed by the Board as a whole.
- 21 Let me be clear that I'm not adopting
- 22 or taking any position, either positively or
- 23 negatively on these comments, but merely sharing them
- 24 | for general awareness and transparency.
- Any discussion on that? All right.

With that, let me move on to new 2. business. I've asked Sirisha Reddy, better known as Siri, in our office, to assist me with the management and oversight of the Medical Marijuana Advisory Board. Siri will serve as the lead for dissemination of all Board communications, including requests and/or inquiries that are directed to and from me as the Board chair.

Outlining a clear process will help to ensure proper and timely review and dissemination of Board-related messages and materials. Additionally, I want to make sure that the current board members and subcommittees take the opportunity to review and revise current board policies and procedures accordingly.

To accomplish this, I'm proposing that the following Board policies and processes be reviewed and revised, if needed, by the following subcommittees. The reports policy by the Patient and Caregiver Subcommittee, Serious Medical Conditions Process and Serious Medical Conditions Processes for research only by the Medical Review subcommittee, and bylaws by the Regulatory Subcommittee.

As a follow up to the meeting, Siri will send this information in writing and include the

subcommittee assignments, as well as additional details and guidance regarding the board related communications.

2.2

2.3

Does anyone have any thoughts or questions or feedback regarding the subcommittee assignments? Hearing none, next, as it relates to the subcommittees and staying aligned with our agenda, are the subcommittee updates.

As was discussed at previous meetings, in order to share information on an ongoing basis, each subcommittee chair will provide an update at each board meeting regarding the activities since the previous meeting. Board members are also queried ahead of each board meeting to determine if they have additional or specific agenda items that they would like to include that may require deliberation.

At this time, I'll ask each of the subcommittee chairs to share an update. First, I'll start with the Medical Review Subcommittee. I'm aware that there currently is a vacancy for the chair position for the subcommittee. And my goal is to get this role filled in the near future.

While I can confirm that there have not been any new serious medical condition applications received for review, and therefore there

weren't any that needed to be discussed or considered
for this particular meeting, I don't want to assume

3 that others may not have something to share.

That said, does anyone else who
participates in this subcommittee have anything to add
or report at this time?

Next is the Patient and Caregiver
Subcommittee, chaired by Shalawn James.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

MS. JAMES: Good morning. The Patient and Caregiver Subcommittee met over the last couple of months a total of two times. We did review all of the information that was submitted online from Patients and Caregivers. And we do have a report to submit our responses back to those individuals - each individual submission. We do have a report to submit to the board that will go out today for those responses that we have.

In addition, there was some legislation that passed out of the Senate Law and Justice Committee. And so we wanted to see if we could get an overview of those changes that were voted on as they affect the medical marijuana program.

CHAIR: Are you asking a question?

Sorry, I'm not sure. Can you clarify your question or comment? Yeah.

MS. JAMES: Yeah. 1 So there were a 2. number of laws - a number of issues that were passed out of the Senate. I believe it's SB 835 that passed 3 maybe a week, week and a half ago. I'll listened, and 5 I know one of the major things was a lift of the ban 6 on restriction for physicians to advertise. There were some other issues around edibles that were passed. There were a number of issues. I just wanted to make sure that the board is aware of them and to 10 try to get some clarification, if not at this meeting, 11 but very soon at an upcoming meeting. 12 Speaker4: I think at this point, it's 13 not appropriate for the Department to comment on 14 pending legislation. There is an established 15 procedure for the department to weigh in when 16 appropriate, but at this juncture, because it is 17 pending, I don't think that we would provide any 18 comment as to the actual legislation. 19 MS. JAMES: Okay. 20 So once it's passed, we will have a 21

discussion. Is that - just to clarify?

22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY LAMANO: Well, if there's an agenda item relating to legislation, then at that point, I think it might be appropriate. There would still be some procedural restraints or constraints on 1 | the Department's ability to comment. But certainly at

2 | this juncture, it's not an agenda item and the

3 department doesn't comment on pending legislation.

MS. JAMES: Okay.

5 That concludes for this portion - the

6 report.

4

7 CHAIR: Thank you for your report.

8 Our next is the regulatory subcommittee chaired by

9 Christine Roussel.

DR. ROUSSEL: Hello.

The regulatory subcommittee met on

12 June 21st. We discussed two topics with a focus on

13 Doctors of Podiatric Medicine's ability to provide

14 | medical marijuana certifications to patients in

15 Pennsylvania. And then we also discussed the use of

16 edibles as an approved dosage form. But both of them

17 | are their own agenda topics, so I guess I will save

18 them for that. But we did meet and we did reach

19 consensus, specifically about the agenda item which we

20 asked to have put on the agenda, which was related to

21 the Doctors of Podiatric Medicine.

That's all for our update, and then

23 | we'll save it, unless you want us to do that now, but

24 | I figure we'll go in order.

25 CHAIR: Thank you again. Those are, I

- think, are later on in the agenda, so I'll leave them
 for that part of new business. Thank you for your
 report.
- Our next subcommittee is the Medical Research Subcommittee chaired by Bhavini Patel.
- 6 MS. PATEL: Thank you. So the Medical 7 Research Subcommittee actually did receive the letters of feedback through email yesterday. And taking into consideration that feedback, were hoping to know if it 10 would be possible to reevaluate our assessment and 11 come back with another presentation, as Christine did 12 provide feedback at the last meeting indicating that 13 we had a conversation, but we would like to look into 14 the letters provided and reevaluate.
 - CHAIR: So it sounds like you're requesting delay in your report at this point to reconsider.

15

16

17

2.4

25

- MS. PATEL: Correct. We would like to
 take into consideration the feedback that was provided
 in the letters. And so the subcommittee will take
 that information in, have that discussion, and then
 provide a presentation for the board to consider and
 then provide a report following that.
 - CHAIR: Thank you. I appreciate your due diligence. Thank you. Is there anything else

you'd like to report?

2.3

2.4

MS. PATEL: No. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you so much. I want to thank all the subcommittee chairs or their designees that spoke today and shared their updates.

At this time, I want to turn things over to Diana Briggs. Diana requested that edibles as an approved form of medical marijuana be added to the agenda for discussion. So, Diana, thank you for leading that discussion.

MS. BRIGGS: Thank you, Dr. Bogen.

It's no surprise since November I have been advocating and sharing my support for edibles in our program.

One of my biggest concerns was legislation change.

And us as a board have the ability to change forms, add forms, to the product list. And as Shalawn had mentioned earlier, I know you can't speak on, but I'd like to share for maybe my fellow advisory board members who don't know that the PA Senate Law and Justice Committee passed out of committee, Senate Bill 835, Senate Bill 538, and Senate Bill 773, which would all amend our program, one being that edibles would be added.

There is some really positive things

2.2

they want to do away with the list of illnesses. So a

Doctor who prescribed or certified could say that any

illness could certify a patient for. They want to

also approve the ability for Doctors to advertise, as

there has been complaints to the Board before that

some of the bigger companies are advertising and the

younger - the smaller guys are not.

- So as I've said over and over again,
 my biggest concern with our legislature making changes
 to our program, it opens it up to any types of
 negativity. And if you read further into this
 legislation, there are some really negative things.
 And I think most of it comes with oversight of our
 program. So at this point, I think that it behooves
 us to take a vote plan for a vote on adding edibles
 and inhalation.
 - It passed out of the Law and Justice

 Committee with bipartisan support. So it looks like

 our legislature is on board for those types of

 additions to our program. And as advisory board

 members, I think it is our job to do that and add that

 ability for our patients.
- There are many, many patients being
 left out. We sent along some letters from just a few
 of the Doctors that we've heard from who certified in

this program, who support it. Patients are asking for it, dispensaries are telling us as well. So I think it's beyond time that we take that stand and try to pass that as a new product in our program that could help many, many more.

6 CHAIR: I'm going to let our board 7 legal team respond.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY LAMANO: Thank you, Dr.

Bogan. This topic raises an important legal issue I

think that we can address at this juncture.

First, just generally speaking, as I already indicated, the department monitors pending litigation and will continue to administer the medical marijuana program as currently prescribed by law and regulation. If governing law changes, the program would obviously adopt and adopt those changes. respect to the issue of edibles, I think it's important to clarify the Secretary's authority versus the board's authority as it relates to recommending new forms of medical marijuana and specifically edibles. As you're well aware, the Act presently lists lawful forms of medical marijuana, such as pills, oils, topicals, certain vaporization and nebulization, tinctures or liquids. Then the Act separately designates as unlawful the incorporation of

- 1 | medical marijuana into edible form except by the
- 2 patient or caregiver to aid ingestion by the patient.
- 3 Finally, the Act empowers the board to issue written
- 4 reports to the Governor, the Senate, and the House of
- 5 Representatives that include recommendations as to
- 6 change the form of medical marijuana permitted under
- 7 the Act.
- With respect to edibles, it's not
- 9 clear that the general authority to change the
- 10 permissible forms of medical marijuana overrides the
- 11 specific prohibition against edible forms. Under the
- 12 rules of statutory construction, the result of this
- 13 apparent conflict is that any form of medical
- 14 marijuana not specifically prohibited can be added to
- 15 the list of permitted forms. For this reason,
- 16 although the Board can recommend any forms of medical
- 17 | marijuana it deems appropriate and can issue a report
- 18 | with those recommendations, which would be sent to the
- 19 governor, the Senate, and the House, the Secretary
- 20 | would be constrained to disapprove any recommendation
- 21 that conflicts with the current law.
- 22 That's just a statement of the law as
- 23 it stands at the moment. So I wanted to make that
- 24 clear for the body.
- 25 CHAIR: Is there any discussion?

2.5

1 DR. ROUSSEL: As a pharmacist, I've 2. been involved in compounding many different products 3 to meet the needs of patients. Certainly for pediatric patients, we make rapid dissolving tablets 4 5 that dissolve in the mouth. Oral products that 6 someone may consider might be a gummy or of a gelatin 7 base or a polyethylene glycol base that might be suitable for patients, so would not be considered 8 incorporating edible into food, but would still allow 9 10 for presenting a product to a child for ingestion that 11 may be in a matter that they like.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I think there might be an option to use some more appropriate pharmaceutical dosage forms that maybe people don't realize, you know, we have other names for, such as troches or lozenges or chewables, and be able to meet the needs of the patients without touching the prohibited edible food incorporation, which I think, you know, can occasionally be problematic. I would be remiss if I didn't mention that the rates of pediatric accidental ingestion of cannabis edible products has increased more than 1300fold in the last five years, specifically occurring in residential settings. And up to 70 percent of the cases yield significant CNS depression based on some of the research studies.

So I hear the concern of those who 1 2. wrote the law considering pediatric ICU and non ICU 3 So I'm willing to help if anybody would admissions. like in drafting some opportunities. And maybe I 4 could summarize a couple of dosage forms that would 5 not be considered edibles, but would be available to 6 7 children, made with gelatin based gummies and whatnot. I'd be happy to support helping make some of that 8 language if that would help the committee. 9 10

CHAIR: Any other discussion? Are you
making any specific motions or at this point just
discussing?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MS. BRIGGS: I think after your explanation, certainly I would love to make a motion for a vote. But after listening to what you had to say, I'm so supportive of Christine and I may be sitting down and talking about a report that she can help you draft.

DR. ROUSSEL: I feel that possibly some of the physicians on the committee are familiar with troches, you know, oral chewable dosage forms. Would that be something where you'd want to make a proposal to have us evaluate that and come back with a list of them and doctors weigh in? I think you guys may feel that you're more familiar with those dosage

1 forms than the average person. Or we can wait. We'll 2 come back with language.

CHAIR: It's the agenda item, your agenda item. So I'm leaving it for you to make a motion or discussing.

MS. BRIGGS: I appreciate everything.

MR. EATON: I have another question.

When we make this recommendation, is this proposal or the bill that — and I'm supportive of edibles. But my question was, is this also going to go through on the same bill that allows any diagnosis to be included in what we're going to be using medical marijuana for? Is it a separate item or is this more of a line item? Support edibles but still need more clarification on what they're going to do, adding any and all diagnosis that anyone who wants to use?

ATTORNEY LAMANO: Just a point of clarification. The report would not be a bill. It would be a report of the board that would be submitted to the House, the Senate, and the governor. So it would not relate directly to any pending bill.

MR. EATON: Well, no. When she started her presentation, she had mentioned that there is a proposal that's going to allow medical marijuana to be used for any diagnosis, not just the 25 that

we've approved already. And then you went in forward 1 2. and said there's a direction going to include edibles. 3 So when we make our recommendation to the legislature, Governor, whoever we're going to make it to, are we 4 saying that we support everything they're trying to 5 6 do, which is including all diagnosis that have not 7 even been delineated by our Board yet? Or are we able to support and say we are in favor of edibles, and 8 we're not necessarily touching the additional wide 10 open diagnosis? That's my question.

MS. BRIGGS: I wanted us to act separately from what the Senate is currently passing through their committees. So mine was just for edibles and a vote by the advisory board as that being a new addition, not touching, you know, the Senate bills that are in action right now in the Capitol.

MR. EATON: Okay. That helps me with

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. EATON: Okay. That helps me with that.

And the other stumbling block I have on edibles are that there was discussion from in the last year for our board was that we had concerns about packaging because some of the mistakes that were made in some of the pediatric cases where there were bad outcomes in California was because their packaging allowed for confusion for children getting into

gummies that were - loaded gummies with THC as opposed to regular gummies.

So I thought were stating that we need to do a little more - or somebody needs to do a little more due diligence on the proper packaging. So the confusion in the residential setting is not going to be as easy as what has happened in other states.

MS. BRIGGS: I'm not sure if you've seen what a troche looks like, the packaging in our program, it is kind of a disc. And I can share with you that they are soft, they can be chewed, obviously swallowed. And I struggle to get the packaging open.

So I can share with you that there are things like that being sold in our program currently that make it very hard for a child to even open the packaging. So I would of course expect that we would continue that with any type of new ingestible edible as we move forward.

MR. EATON: Thanks.

20 <u>CHAIR:</u> Thank you. Any further 21 discussion? All right. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda was bought by Christine Roussel pertaining to Podiatrist ability to provide medical marijuana certifications to patients in Pennsylvania.

Dr. Roussel?

2.

2.0

DR. ROUSSEL: So the regulatory subcommittee evaluated this topic on 6/21, and we feel that Doctors of Podiatric Medicine are specialists in treating some of the serious medical conditions for which patients can be certified to access medical marijuana in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Just as a little bit of background, podiatrists have a four-year degree, bachelor's degree, and then a four year Doctorate of Podiatric Medicine, which includes education in pharmacology. There is a Podiatric Practice Act in our state allowing for the diagnosis and treatment of mechanical and surgical elements of the foot and related anatomical structures. And in that they have a subsection on therapeutic drugs. Doctors of Podiatric Medicine may administer prescribe a section of drugs - it's a list, but it's not restricted. It's a may. And it includes pain relievers, both narcotic and non-narcotic.

So for this reason, the Regulatory
Review Committee is in support of recommending Doctors
of Podiatric Medicine permitted to be eligible to
apply, to be included in the registry of practitioners
who can certify patients for medical marijuana.

Two things as a reminder, all
healthcare practitioners involved in the program from
certifying physicians, pharmacists, physician
assistants, and nurse practitioners, working
dispensaries must complete a four hour educational
training by a Department of Health approved entity.

2.4

And then the question is for this committee - and we would throw it out with our formal recommendation, would this be something where the committee might want to limit the providers to one specific indication? And would we want to limit that indication related to pain as a serious medical condition? And that's up for discussion. We kind of wanted to know about the steps to make that formal recommendation and then just get the feedback from those on the committee - on the board.

CHAIR: Any discussion on this topic?

MR. EATON: Hi, Matthew Eaton. I

would also like to add in addition to the vast
schooling that podiatrists do have to complete, they
also have to be licensed by the State Board of
Podiatry through the Department of State. And
obviously they need to be inclined with all laws and
regulations through the State Board of Podiatry.

I would also like to add that the

1 current board members for the state board support this 2 decision as well as its legal counsel. Thank you.

CHAIR: Any other comments, questions?

Is there a particular motion you're putting forward or just discussion at this time?

DR. GOLDFARB: Dr. - I have a comment.

We run into this problem credentially
at the hospitals also. And I certainly am not doing
anything to condemn or come down on any of my
podiatric brethren. I would support the narrow
diagnosis of not only chronic pain, but Podiatrists
are on a daily basis dealing with people with

diagnosis of not only chronic pain, but Podiatrists are on a daily basis dealing with people with peripheral neuropathy. So I would support to allow them to use the diagnosis of neuropathy and chronic pain, but perhaps not anxiety and cancer and other things that are more diverse and without the scope of their subset of the treatment. It's constantly a battle at the hospitals about who owns the ankle, whereas podiatry can do the foot and orthopedics will say, yeah, but the knee is definitely ours and the ankle, is that Podiatry or is that orthopedics. So

So I would be in support of peripheral neuropathy, which is definitely the feet. And chronic pain.

it's that type of battle that goes on all the time.

1 But I think we're on a slippery slope 2. if we're going to start saying hepatitis C and some of 3 the other diagnosis that we have that's probably not within their scope, certainly not condemning anybody's 4 four-year degree and training, but it all has to do 5 6 with constant evolution and continuing education on 7 how the practice of medicine continues to evolve through the years. And I'm not quite convinced that 8 9 everything is completely current in that regard 10 because that's beyond the scope of what podiatry does on a day in and day out basis. 11

12 MR. EATON: I'm in complete agreement 13 with that.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

DR. ROUSSEL: So would we be able to amend the proposal to say recommending Doctors of podiatric medicine be permitted to apply for eligibility with a limitation to severe chronic or intractable pain of neuropathic origin or severe chronic or intractable pain? And further, would you want something within the scope of the Practice Act, which puts it back to podiatric medicine shall meet with the diagnosis and treatment, including mechanical and surgical treatment of ailments of the foot and those anatomical structures of the leg governing the functions of the foot?

```
34
                   And around - it talks about
1
2.
   administration prescription thereto, including local
3
   manifestations of that systemic disease.
                   So is that - would that wording be
 4
5
   acceptable and then leave it up to who the Board
6
   promotes it to for further wordsmithing?
                   DR. GOLDFARB:
                                  Yes. From my point of
   view, I'm comfortable with that wording. Can also
8
9
   support that.
10
                   DR. KAMBIC: Kambic.
                                          I also support
11
   that.
12
                   DR. ROUSSEL:
                                  Then we would make a
   formal proposal then, if that's acceptable. Madam,
13
14
   Chair.
15
                           Sorry about that sneeze.
                   CHAIR:
16
   you making a formal motion at this time?
17
                   DR. ROUSSEL: Yes, we are, Madam
18
   Chair. And I can set a word and follow up in an email
19
   as well. I know I put them out loud, but I think that
20
   might be easier.
21
                           I'm just conferring with legal
                   CHAIR:
22
   just to look at the process. Hold on 1 second.
2.3
                   I think it would be helpful if you
```

could read sorry, it would be helpful if you could

reiterate the motion as best you can.

24

25

1 DR. ROUSSEL: The motion is made on 2. behalf of the Regulatory Review Committee for Doctors 3 of Podiatric Medicine to be permitted to be eligible to apply to be included in the registry of 4 practitioners who can certify patients for medical 5 6 marijuana using a specific serious medical condition of severe, chronic, or intractable pain of neuropathic origin, or severe, chronic or intractable pain as 8 9 designated within the scope of the Podiatric Practice 10 Actor.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. EATON: I have a comment. I don't know exactly what the scope of the Podiatric Act is to allow - I think your idea about doing proper wordsmithing even outside this committee, if we can't do it today, and I don't know if it's in the scope of the committee, what we normally do at a hospital is even have an E vote on this to expedite it along. But I don't know for sure what I'm voting on. Especially adding as long as it's within the scope of the Podiatric Medicine Act.

CHAIR: Can I propose that you bring this back next - before the next meeting, you submit so that the whole committee can review the language and that we can vote on it more at the next meeting where you have the language in front of you and

1 everybody's clear on the language.

DR. ROUSSEL: That's definitely fine.

I'm happy to bring it back. And also, if it helps, I

do have it in front of me if you'd like me to show my

screen. But I think it would best to let people take

7 <u>CHAIR:</u> Okay. With that process?

MR. EATON: Yes.

it and digest it as well.

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MS. MENCH: It might be best to do an official motion to table the item until the next meeting just to preserve the issues going forward. I don't know if this Board generally operates that formally, but I see no harm in a motion to table and confirming. So we just need a motion to table and then a second.

DR. ROUSSEL: I will make the motion to table the topic pending formal wordsmithing for next time.

19 CHAIR: A second?

DR. KAMBIC: Second.

21 <u>CHAIR:</u> Thank you. I look forward to 22 seeing that next time.

Are there any other topics for
discussion? Otherwise I'll move on. Hearing no more
discussion.

DR. ROUSSEL: Yeah.

2.

MR. EATON: Dr. Bogen, if I can just add one comment and I defer to Counsel on this one, if it needs to be its own agenda item, or if we can add it to the discussion that we just had on the topic of the podiatrist able to provide medical marijuana certifications, I think that we should also add certified registered nurse practitioners to that conversation. And I don't know if the regulatory review committee needs to have that conversation and lump it in with Podiatrists or if it needs to be a separate discussion altogether.

ATTORNEY LAMANO: I would think it would probably better to raise it as a separate issue since it hasn't been noticed for today that we're technically only tabling the issue that's on the agenda. But it's a request for the next agenda.

MR. EATON: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you. I think we also have a request for our program to clarify something, so Laura is going to come back up. Thank you, Laura.

MS. MENCH: Hi again. Consistent with the prohibition on edibles, as Attorney Lamano had explained earlier, I just wanted to clarify that the office has approved certain troche forms of

1 medication. And the definition of troche is typically

- 2 | a medicated tablet or lozenge, intended to be
- 3 dissolved slowly in the mouth between the gum and
- 4 cheek, which is called buccally, buccal, or under the
- 5 tongue sublingually. This route of administration
- 6 allows medication to enter the bloodstream directly
- 7 from the mouth. This form is particularly helpful or
- 8 useful to patients who do not use vaporized products
- 9 and/or struggle to swallow pill forms and//or have
- 10 difficulty consuming or side effects from oil-based
- 11 tinctures.
- But just to clarify, they're not
- 13 approved as chewable or referred to as such. Thank
- 14 you.
- 15 CHAIR: Thank you for that
- 16 clarification.
- 17 Hearing no more discussion or more
- 18 questions, I want to thank everyone for your
- 19 participation and for joining today. I look forward
- 20 to seeing you at the next meeting scheduled for
- 21 | September 6th. May I have a motion to adjourn this
- 22 | meeting?
- MS. PATEL: Motion to adjourn.
- 24 CHAIR: Thank you.
- DR. ROUSELL: Rousell second.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings, hearing held before Chair Bogen, M.D., was reported by me on June 28, 2023 and that I, Madeline Helmstetter, read this transcript, and that I attest that this transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceeding.

Dated the 20 day of July, 2023

Madeline Helmstetter,

Court Reporter