



## Executive Management Team Meeting

Wednesday, January 11, 2023, 1:30 pm

This meeting was held in a hybrid environment

### Meeting Minutes

#### EMT ATTENDEES

Chair David Postman  
Member Ollie Garrett  
Member Jim Vollendroff  
Rick Garza, Director  
Toni Hood, Deputy Director  
Chandra Wax, Director of Enforcement and Education  
Brian Smith, Communications Director  
Becky Smith, Licensing & Regulation Director  
Justin Nordhorn, Director of Policy and External Affairs  
Marc Webster, Director of Legislative Relations  
Dustin Dickson, Executive Assistant to the Board  
Gloria Hong, Special Assistant to the Director

#### GUESTS

Penny Allen, Senior Counsel  
Jonathan Pitel, Assistant Attorney General  
Dionne Padilla-Huddleston Assistant Attorney General  
Mary Segawa, Public Health and Education Liaison  
Kathy Hoffman, PhD, Policy and Rules Manager  
Josh Bolender, Captain, Enforcement and Education  
Linda Thompson, Licensing Cannabis Manager

---

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

*At 1:30 pm Chair Postman announced the Board would go into Executive Session. He anticipated the Executive Session would conclude at 2:00 pm*

*At 2:00 pm Chair Postman announced that the Executive Session had concluded.*

---

#### CANNABIS REGULATORS ASSOCIATION (CANNRA) CONFERENCE DEBRIEF

David Postman: The Board has finished its executive session on litigation review. And we're going to reconvene now in our public meeting to continue our agenda. And our next item here is to hear about last month's Cannabis Regulators Association Conference. Rick Garza was there with a team of folk and so we wanted to hear from people about what they learned and what they brought back and I'm just going to pass this down to you, Rick and let you manage all this however you wish.

Rick Garza: Right. Good afternoon. In early December, a number of us traveled to Florida for the annual meeting of the CANNRA, the Cannabis Regulators Association. I'll give a little bit of background, 32 states were present, which is the largest group that we've had. You'll remember

back in June of last year, we hosted CANNRA's meeting, and I think at that time, 26 states were present. It was only five or six years ago that there were four states that met here in Olympia for the first cannabis roundtable meeting with Oregon, Colorado, Washington and Alaska. So, we've seen as more states become legal, the association grow. Almost 200 people were present. We've always, our state, Colorado, Oregon, have typically had a lot of staff that would attend because, frankly, a lot of states learned from us, because we were the first states to legalize adult use. There was some reference in a committee hearing yesterday that there are 11 states that are still illegal. That's not quite true. There's 21 states that have adult use cannabis, and almost all but three states have some form of legal medical cannabis. But not only states were present, Health Canada and their cannabis program was there, other governmental agencies can come to our meetings, there are a number of agencies in our state that are part of CANNRA, Department of Health, Washington Department of Agriculture, those agencies that have some responsibility around cannabis, whether it's adult use, or medical. There were 17 sessions, our staff were a part of six of those sessions. Unfortunately, we missed a couple of those sessions, all of us because of the Tuesday afternoon board meeting where many of us had to come and be part of that two-hour meeting. So unfortunately, we missed a couple of sessions. So, think about that, the next time, but it was the first time that so many of us have been together. We'll share what we gained from those sessions, and probably start with the staff that presented on the panels that they were on, and frankly, share, maybe what you learned from the other states that were on those panels with you. And this is informal. So, there were a lot of us there, including our AAGs, our two Board Members, Ollie, and so I want to make sure that Jim and others, please just walk into the conversation, wherever you'd like to add what you gained from those sessions. But I think there are 11 special committees that have been formed over the years that CANNRA has. And I think because we get so busy in the work that we do every day, one of the reasons I wanted to take more staff there was for you to see the value that they bring and the resource that they are to us. Just thinking about John, and Penny and the work that they do just over legal issues that we're involved in, you know, Jim, and Ollie and David involved at the highest level, trying to figure out this cannabis policy rules and legislation that we're involved in. So I guess I wanted everybody to walk away not only with knowledge that you gained from the sessions, but knowing that with the special committees, I already know some of the folks that went have jumped on some of the committees because the committees regularly meet, typically once or twice a month, and they share information about challenges and issues that they're having. And it basically becomes a place where you can get information. And because we're part of CANNRA, from time to time, and we get a lot of requests for information from us, from states that are grappling with an issue in this area or that area, but we provide information. I know Justin, probably more than anyone in the agency and because of his position, I often see those responses that you provide on questions that come from, it's called base camp, that come from base camp asking fundamental questions about, frankly, how we're organized, even as much as can I see the position descriptions you have for the positions that regulate the industry. So, it can be something as simple as that, or a topic that's problematic or challenging at the time, but I think one of the things I wanted with all of our staff there was to recognize that they are a resource to us. There's a policy tracker that Jillian Schauer, the director created several years ago, and she surveyed each of the states to gain all kinds of information. I know, you all know, because Becky, I was bothering you for weeks to get information. And so, all of that information: how we license how we enforce, what are the taxes. We were just talking about the presentation next week, Mark, and is there anybody got something that shows us what the tax rates are of the various states because as you all know, we're one of the higher in the country. But I know that it's in the policy tracker. So I know Kathy is looking to grab that information for us so that we can provide it in a slide next week in the House. But again, it's something that is a resource that you won't find anywhere. There is no other conference like

this, by the way, in the country, there is no place that all cannabis regulators go to meet other than CANNRA and the purpose that it was created. And I'll remind everyone that the industry is not allowed into that meeting. And in many associations, like we're part of, NCSLA, and NAPCA, on the alcohol side, the industry is part of those discussions. And maybe someday that will happen. But it was really important for many of the states, when we formed, that we have a place where we as regulators can go, that we don't have the industry in the room with us to be honest with you. And that we can share some of the challenges we're having from a legal perspective, some of the challenges that we're having in general, and kind of brainstorm solutions. I will share and I'll kind of get started with one of the plenary sessions was cannabinoid hemp, you know, updates from the state task forces. And Kathy was part of that panel. But I kind of walked away, I'll just share, I kind of walked away from that panel, I think I'll share after Kathy shares because I thought, well, we're all trying to deal with this in a different way. Because it's come to our states in different ways. And we have different authority within the states both by law and by rule of how we deal with these impairing cannabinoids that are outside of our marketplace, let alone inside of it, because we have issues there too. And as you all know, we have proposed legislation to try to address that. So, I guess to kick it off, Kathy, since that was a panel that I sat in on, maybe share with us what you learned, and we learned from that panel.

Kathy Hoffman: Thanks very much, Rick and good afternoon, everyone. Just to kind of give you a composition of the panel, it was me and representatives from Oregon, Colorado, Virginia, and Maryland. And I want to say, Rick, to your point that while we're all existing under these different regulatory and statutory structures, what I came away with was, how many of the same things we were all grappling with, even given the different legislative authority that we had, and the different legislative sort of authority conferred to create task force or go about serving or what have you. I took so many notes, it's just too long to share all of it. But I'll give you the high-level view.

So, our panel opened by just giving brief updates to the most important pieces of the scope and the charges of the task forces in our states. So, including composition of the task force, so the members of the task force, task force consensus and outcomes, and any major lessons learned from the task force process that we can offer. And so for that reason, my contribution to the discussion was very limited. I think Justin talked about this last time you met based on a variety of factors, but I share that WSDA had assembled a food in hemp task force and LCB was not part of that work. But that's based largely on the way that hemp is regulated in Washington, and our legislatures emphasis on hemp regulation as a function that rests solely with the WSDA. So, there's that very clear distinction. So, I didn't comment on the WSDA hemp and food taskforce report, because at that point, it was early December, it had not been publicly released. And as I understood it, it was still in draft form. And there was really very little information on the WSDA website about task force meetings. But as far as I can tell, it was largely industry and therefore hemp proponent driven. But here's what I sort of gleaned from other panelists. And these are the several common themes that I thought emerged during the discussion. And they'll probably sound familiar to you because we've talked about them. The first was: what's synthetically derived versus what's naturally derived. And then next, intoxicating versus non-intoxicating, and really what that even means and is that the right word, or is it impairing. So other states are grappling with this as well. And then the difference between consumable and non-consumable hemp products and what that means. And then even, I think Colorado talks about ingestion. And that's something that we in Washington kind of grappled with about what does ingestion mean. These are kind of subjective terms. We talked about laboratory testing for hemp derived products and products containing hemp. We talked about packaging and labeling to a degree. Use, and more to the point perhaps, inappropriate use of therapeutic claims in this space around hemp,

cannabinoids. Part of the application of federal manufacturing standards, and then where these products should be sold and what the determinants of those factors are. So, I'm going to stop there. But just as a high-level view, really, we heard, we have a lot more in common than we thought we did in terms of addressing these issues. And each state is going about it very differently. I will share that since CANNRA, I know that at least, the hemp and food task force report was issued in Washington State. We also have a report from OLCC. So that's our Oregon neighbors about hemp. The end of December saw the release of the Colorado report. So that was a report that was issued by a taskforce that was legislatively constructed to look at intoxicating hemp products and how they could address that through statutory or regulatory change. And then, recently, and I think this was just in the last couple of weeks, Maryland released their report as well, that is very comprehensive. And I've done analysis of all three of these reports; paid a little more attention to the Washington and Colorado reports. I just thought it was a really interesting panel to be on. We were supposed to speak, I think for an hour and a half, and it just flew by. And I'll just leave it right there. If anybody else wants to chime in on what they heard or learned from that panel. That was one of the first ones, I think.

Rick Garza: I think it was placed in the first morning, because it's probably the most difficult, challenging issue that the states are grappling with. during the question and answer, I stood up and said it seems like we're all grappling with this issue. But we know that the answer might lie in the Farm Bill, which that hemp provision that was placed in the Farm Bill in 2018, created the situation that we're in, and after the meeting, I met with Jillian and Tyler, our president from Nevada, and some of the other members of the executive committee just said I really believe that CANNRA as an association should try to come up with either a white paper or uniform kind of position that we would take to DC to work with the Farm Bill to further clarify. Because remember, back then it was called rope not dope, that we were basically allowing hemp into the marketplace, but not anywhere near what happened, where it became now a separate cannabinoid, that is even now impairing, because in our state, for example, is Delta-9. And so we do have a committee and I think, are you on the hemp committee Kathy?

Kathy Hoffman: Both Justin and I are.

Rick Garza: So typically, what we'll do with this information, we'll take it to the special committee, the hemp committee, and they'll work on bringing something back to the group. We really believe, because I think the farm bill's up this year, that this is the opportunity that we'll have to amend the hemp provision in it to further clarify that it wasn't meant to go as far as it went. So, I'll just share from the meeting, we kind of walked away from that. So, I think your committee will be working on that, Kathy?

Kathy Hoffman: Yeah, absolutely. I think another thing I wanted to bring up, and maybe Mary wants to speak to this, but we did touch briefly on what states are doing about public health messaging in this space. Jillian shared this, and I kind of spoke to the, you know, the material hasn't been updated, and probably needs to be, but I think in early 2021, states were issuing health advisories and tear sheets and materials to prevention partners to share and I think that I haven't seen anything updated recently. And I think maybe there's some more work we could do there, that would be helpful, because the landscape is just continuing to change all the time, very hard to keep up with. I think the other thing I came away with was, whether or not the work of the task force in this space is more powerful, or the work of just to possibly, you know, people within an agency going about the research in a different way. So through interviews and surveys, and

that sort of thing. And I think that there's a sort of general agreement that the second option results in stronger recommendations.

Justin Nordhorn: One of the important things to know, as we're talking about CANNRA, with regards to the farm bill. So CANNRA's organization is not one that is going to lobby the way it's set up. It's not designed for that, but it is designed to provide education. And so a lot of the committees are not necessarily putting forth legislative recommendations, but highlighting some of the key issues that need to be considered when policy development occurs at the federal level, so we were talking a little bit about what that should look like, in the form of, you know, informational letters, do we do presentations, something along those lines, but they're not going to come out and specifically champion for a particular issue. So just something to be aware of.

Rick Garza: Yeah, that's a really good point, Justin, because if you remember the document that we created CANNRA to respond to the federalization bill; Schumer, and the like, provided guidance about what our concerns were when you look at federalization, and you're right on specific conditions or, lobby areas, so thanks. So, I'll move us on. The first panel of the morning was one that Justin was part of. And the name of it was Structural Factors and Markets and Related Implications for Market Diversity. It asks the basic questions about, so what about the structure that you're regulated under? I'll use one example: vertical versus non vertical. In our state, you're not allowed to be vertically integrated. And people were interested because New York just became legal and putting their system in place does not allow for vertical integration. So, more like us, and I know that they had discussions with our staff, and Kathy and Justin and others about their system when they put it together. I think, Josh, you were in those discussions, too. But I guess I'll hand it over to you Justin and maybe share what you learned from that.

Justin Nordhorn: It was a challenging concept, because there were so many different ways that we could have tackled that, but on the panel, we had New York and Illinois. And we were exploring a number of the different issues. And the interesting thing for us is, so New York is modeling a lot of similarities that we have, and yet being in a position to implement it at this particular time, they're able to do things slightly differently than we did and so, what we were trying to highlight a little bit for the audience was, you know, some of the, I guess the pros and cons of each type. I wouldn't say that one format is necessarily stronger than the other because both of them have positives and both of them have drawbacks. When we were looking at the issues around some of the interest points that we've heard from stakeholders, for example, most of the states out there have a fairly limited number of product choices. And when I say fairly limited, there's still over 1,000 in the states, but our state, we have 18,000 SKUs that are available throughout our retailers. And so when you're looking at the vertical integration versus the open market, when we have, you know, over 1000 producers making product to go to all the retailers there's a huge variety. And I think one of the interesting things that we were correlating to as well with the Waterloo study is the fact that we have this huge volume, like 90% of the surveyed people said they were utilizing the recreational marketplace. And so when we look at that, I think one of the benefits that we have in this type of model is the availability of that competitive type of product. And so we were able to share kind of, you know, information that we've had over the years, since we've been doing this for so long. And so what we tried to do is tie in some of the concerns, but also some of the observations that we've had, as things have developed. Where some things were surprising, quite frankly, versus others. And so when we look at some of these markets, and maybe the closed system within each state right now contributes to this, but I know when we did the fiscal assumptions for I502, there were some assumptions out there that this would be like other businesses, and you'd have a particular

percentage of failure rate. It just naturally happens across all business lines. And we haven't seen that dramatic of a reduction in the number of licenses for people just saying, "no, I'm not doing this anymore", and so we have a lot of producers out there, even though they're small, they're surviving. And we do hear from producers out there, that it's a struggle, but a lot of them are still in business and contributing. And so I think it was an interesting part of the discussion we had during the formulation of the of the presentation because you sometimes will make assumptions, but they're not going to come out exactly the way you're thinking, and so I think that was something that we were able to highlight. And then you have, of course, when we look at Illinois, I think the interesting part from them, and they focused a lot on the social equity aspects. The program design was initiated with those factors in mind where I502 didn't have that as an element of the initiative. And so you know, as we see these states that are coming in later, they're trying to adopt different approaches, if you will, in their infrastructure, so that, you know, they can address some of these other critical issues that are out there. Unfortunately, we aren't seeing anything right now that there's a really, you know, gold star working equity program that's active. And so people are still challenged with that. And it doesn't matter if you're vertically integrated, or if you are a tiered type of approach like we have, those challenges remain very similar in both types of infrastructure. So you know, we were trying to weave some of that together for folks and we had a lot of good questions from the audience. It was really interesting talking with them and I'm sure that we're going to do some follow up. There was interest to have a broader discussion again on that at some point in time. I don't think that this will be the last that we engage in that particular conversation.

Rick Garza: Yeah, I think the one thing I didn't add is Axel, the Chief of Staff for New York moderated the panel, Kristin Davis-Franklin from Illinois and Justin, from Washington. And I remember there's a couple of things when you said that about being vertically integrated or not, and the products that are available, the SKUs. It was interesting because now I came to understand why in many of the vertically integrated states, only a percentage of your own product can be sold. You must sell other products in your store other than just yours. Sometimes 40 or 50% can be your product but it makes sense now because there wouldn't be much in there other than that of the grower or the processor if they didn't require that folks bring other product in. Did anybody else want to add anything from that panel? Okay, I'll move this along. Early in the afternoon, Penny Allen was part of a panel that was moderated by folks from the Nevada Attorney General's Office. Penny from Washington, Alison, from Florida. Steve from Missouri and Ross from Colorado. And the name of the breakout session was Legal Issues in Cannabis Regulation, Litigation and Case Law Updates. So Penny, would you like to start us off?

Penny Allen: Sure. I will say that we got together to discuss this topic. We all had a very hard time narrowing it down to the three topics that we discussed. Those were testing facilities, receiverships, and patient sales and registration. There are a lot of legal issues, I think I could have talked, and we probably could have spent the entire day talking about legal issues. But we chose these three, in part because a lot of newer states are struggling with it, and we wanted to make sure that they had, we shared information that might be helpful in building new cannabis laws and regulations, things to think about that you wouldn't normally think about. We started off with the testing facilities and what I will say is that Washington stands in pretty good stead. So we have our ag lab doing the testing, a lot of other states don't have that ability. And they're struggling either to set up a reference lab, or they have to use two competing private labs, to see and get the same result in order to be able to move forward, say on a pesticide case. So it was very interesting to hear how much other states have to go through in order to get testing that we can get from our state ag lab. And I do think we're very unique in that ability. I think most other ag

labs have declined to do that. We also talked about receiverships, because every state seems to have this issue. You're probably aware the federal law bankruptcy won't hear a cannabis case. And so states are trying to, most states have a receivership law and cannabis is using this because they can't access the bankruptcy courts. So in Washington, we have some rules surrounding that, it was interesting. What I've heard from Colorado from Ross is that they've actually litigated all the way up to the Supreme Court on receivership issues. So we tend to be a little bit better than everyone else. I think because of our rules. Other states, even Colorado still struggle with the receivership and how that works. The final area we did was patient sales and registration. In Washington, again, we're pretty streamlined. Ours is not a separate market for patient cells. Unlike a lot of other states that have separate licenses, ours is an endorsement to our regular retail licenses. And so that that is somewhat different. But it's very interesting to hear how everybody approaches these three different topics legally, and the problems that those present for each state. Hopefully, we provided some information that was helpful. So other states would not run into any problems.

Rick Garza: So I'll move to late in the day on Monday, Josh, you were part of a panel dealing with violations and sanctions. When and why do we cancel licenses? Danica Foster from the Oregon Liquor Cannabis Commission moderated this panel with Courtney Cosgrove from Montana. Catherine Bolender from Washington and Jason Hansen from Oregon Liquor and Cannabis Connection. I'll give it to you, Josh.

Josh Bolender: Yeah, I attended the CANNRA conference as LCB's only enforcement representative. And it was a positive experience and this panel in particular was satisfying to serve on and it was impossible for me to serve on this panel without talking about the journey that LCB has been on in terms of enforcement and how we handle violations and how we triage violations or investigations that come to us. So I started out by talking about our initial approach, which was a very strict one. We had a zero-tolerance policy in a lot of different areas including license integrity and ownership. And we subsequently cancelled a lot of licenses for hidden ownership or hidden financing. And we had stiff monetary fines as well for other types of violations such as unauthorized pesticides and criminal conduct and traceability. Some of our violations were as much as \$60,000 and destruction of 50% of inventory on hand. But, as time went by, and the industry matured and hired good lobbyists and good representation, and we engaged in more dialogue with them, we had a kind of a wakeup call in 2018, where we realized that maybe some of the more punitive approaches that we were taking, were no longer necessary and that we could take kind of our front load education, take an education first approach rather than viewing the violations in terms of issuing ABNs or leveraging stiff fines. I talked about on that panel, that journey, that kind of paradigm shift, if you will, for us, in which we reduced our penalties and we transitioned a number of our enforcement staff into compliance consultant educators, field based educators that could provide face to face education with licensees and try to help prevent a violation from occurring or prevent a licensee from receiving a stiff penalty. But I also talked about the importance of taking serious public safety violations seriously. So there are things that we still do not tolerate, we don't tolerate furnishing cannabis to minors, we don't tolerate criminal activity within the regulated marketplace. We don't tolerate diversion. And so those sorts of things will continue to be a high priority for us, and our officers will continue to focus on those sorts of investigations and will continue to hold licensees accountable for serious public safety issues. One of my takeaways from this panel is that some states, cannabis regulatory agencies have commissioned police officers or law enforcement officers such as LCB, whereas other states do not. And it seemed that a lot of the other states that don't have commission law enforcement would like to have that. And the states that did have commission law enforcement

seemed to have a better handle on preventing or deterring unlicensed activities from occurring, because the states that didn't have law enforcement, as part of their cannabis regulatory agency, seem to have a real hard time getting general law enforcement interested in taking on that police work. So that was an interesting takeaway that I had there.

Rick Garza: You reminded me, Josh, of some of the stories that you told about some of the things that you've seen over the years on these premises, which was really kind of funny, candid and honest and appreciated the fact that you were able to take us through the history that we started, because this is a story we all know, that have been here. I'm thinking about the workshop on Thursday and having Josh share some of the stuff that he shared at that conference because they want to talk about Hillard and Heintze at the hearing on Thursday. And so that's going to take some time, because there's a lot there. But I think that the story that you told is so accurate, where we started so strict and then learned over time, which is the whole program, whether it's enforcement, or licensing, the whole system was strict to begin with. Because for nine months, we didn't even know what the Feds were going to allow us to move forward. And I think we're such in a different place now that folks don't, if they weren't back there with us, really don't know what we had to do in order to get this thing kick started, and that we've made changes over time to adjust, to evolve, as far as enforcement, and that goes with everything, not just enforcement. So appreciated you being on that panel, Josh. And then, of course, we put you on another one if I remember right. And so I'll let you speak to that one, before I kick off and allow others in, but I'm trying to find it here, Josh. Oh, so you were part of a panel that spoke to best practices for field surveys, inspection, compliance, youth decoy operations, and more, moderated by Jason Hansen from Oregon, Benjamin Labelle from Florida, yourself, and Devin Keller from Montana. Tell us a little bit about that, Josh.

Josh Bolender: Yeah, this was another fun panel to be a part of, and we call what other states call minor decoy operations, or stings, compliance checks. And so we started out by talking about compliance checks. And I explained how LCB organizes and conducts their compliance checks, and how we check each and every cannabis retailer and tribal store twice every year, to make sure that minors don't have access to cannabis in Washington State. And we talked about some learning processes that we've undergone recently about best practices with these compliance checks. Things such as not using the area officers, the insight officer with the minor that's conducting or attempting to purchase under age, because obviously staff or licensees might recognize that area officer and it might foil the check. And we also talked about not having officers badge their way into the store if they're the inside officer, or not conducting compliance checks at nine in the morning. Because that's not when an underage person realistically would be attempting to purchase. So we talked about some of those, some hiccups, you know, that we've had and some corrections that we've made. And we've talked about other challenges such as armed robberies, you know, and the safety issues that those have caused. And then general challenges with the pandemic, you know, we had to hit the pause button for a while and conducting these compliance checks. And then after, we resumed conducting these compliance checks, masking even created an issue because for a while all customers were required to wear masks, but then only state employees were required to wear masks into the stores. And so, you know, that kind of tipped our hand a little bit on some of these compliance checks. We spoke to that not in all areas, in Seattle, maybe not. But if you went out to Forks, definitely, or Eastern Washington. So anyway, we talked through that. Then we talked about staffing challenges that we've had, and again, not all states have commissioned law enforcement doing this work. Some states do like Colorado and Oregon and others. And it seemed that the states that had the most difficulty staffing were the ones with commission law enforcement. One of my takeaways from



that is that no state seemed to have as difficult of a time staffing their enforcement positions as Washington. And I don't know exactly why that is, I don't know if it has to do with salaries or just general interest in getting into law enforcement or what that might be. But we definitely seem to have one of the hardest times staffing our enforcement positions, the commissioned enforcement positions, of any state, and I think maybe a lot of that could have something to do with other law enforcement agencies competing for those officers. So we talked about some recruitment videos that we've made recently and billboards that are being put up around the state to help increase our candidate pools for our officer positions. Then, we talked about how we deal with those staffing issues or vacancies, so we talked about last year doing one compliance check instead of two for the year, we talked about having to fill some of those gaps with overtime. We've talked about having our supervisors having to go out and conduct fieldwork. And really thinking hard about how we staffed in terms of geography. We talked about those sorts of things. And then we finished the panel discussion with talking about pesticides, lab integrity, and then some human trafficking or shadows of human trafficking that a number of states are seeing. And so I talked at length about pesticide enforcement, because quite frankly, I think that Washington state has one of the more robust pesticide enforcement programs, I think that we've been doing it longer and better than many other states and Penny spoke to the challenges that many states have with finding a lab to test their product and help facilitate pesticide investigations. And we've been working with WSDA now for a number of years in partnership for those investigations. I was inundated by questions after the panel on how best to perform pesticide investigations and what we're doing, what we've learned and lots of requests for our protocol, and even our WACs in that area. So after that, I spoke about some of the lab integrity issues that we've had, some of the investigations that we've done, such as with Praxis, and dealing with some laboratory fraud, you know, unfortunately, that we've encountered, and then I spoke briefly about some shadows of human trafficking that we've seen in Washington State. Most of that has involved illicit growing, but we've even seen a little bit of it with our licensed grows, you know, and we go in and ask an employee for their ID and they say, oh, sorry, I don't have it, the licensee has it, you know that that's suggestive that there could be human trafficking going on there. While we're unable to prove that we have definitive human trafficking, there are definitely shadows of that. And it wasn't just in Washington State, other states spoke about that as well. Oregon has seen a lot of signs of it, too. So it was a nice experience to be on both of the panels and I ended up making a lot of valuable contacts with other enforcement folks from other states. And I was able to provide a lot of information to states that are just starting to set up their programs such as Missouri or Maryland. It was a good experience, and I was happy to be part of it.

Rick Garza: Thank you, Josh. Anything anyone else that would like to share on the information that Josh provided in the panels he was on? So I'm going to start with the folks that were here. If you'd like to share anything that you got? I'll start with Jonathan over there next to me.

Jonathan Pitel: Oh, I was hoping to go last. I think everybody's covered very clearly all the substantive issues that were covered. And I think one of the things was really apparent for me going into my second CANNRA meeting is the level of expertise that Washington has and LCB has, and you can take for granted working closely with the LCB staff, that level of expertise. And then you see it relative to every other state, no matter how mature their industries and the regulatory authorities are, and it's, oh, these are the reasons that these are the people called to speak on panels. I just want to praise the members of staff who were involved and who were there, and just think it was illustrative of the expertise that LCB staff have. I was very happy to attend.

Rick Garza: Thanks, John. Mary.

Mary Segawa: Okay. Of course, my focus was on the education piece and the public health piece more-so, so I'll hit some of those. I think some of the things that have already been covered are things that also resonated for me. I think having the chance to view some of the panels that talked about their education campaigns, in particular on responsible consumption and seeing, getting a flavor of who's doing what so that additional follow up can be done with those states and stealing some of their information because as Brian knows, we need to do some major updating of our education information. The Delta-8 issues which Kathy talked about that synthetic cannabinoid, seeing what others are doing with that, but I think, you know, one of the things we've seen in the past week or so, is people are looking for more information on, who's done what kinds of information sheets. And it's great to know where all these different resources are that we can pull from to create those, because I'm using information from presentations working with some of our partner agencies on a fact sheet right now for this synthetic cannabinoid piece. So that was really helpful. And listening to others analyze their campaigns, how they did their testing of messages and what was working, what wasn't working. The other thing, one of the presentations went into depth on on-site consumption in the states who allowed on-site consumption. And I think what struck me with that was the difficulty of doing that in a safe way, and in ways that are affordable for a licensee. When you start talking about figuring in the smoking laws that we have, how do you build that safe working environment for the employees in those areas? What kind of ventilation systems do you need, when that smoke goes out of the room into the neighborhood how is that mitigated? Other issues were the potential for illegal distribution of products and then when somebody's ready to leave, do they get to take the product with them or is it disposed of? So those were issues that it was no surprise that even the handful of states that allow on-site consumption have very few takers. I think Alaska has three, only three licensees that have gotten the approval for on-site consumption. Having Canada there and listening to them, one of the things that I was doing between my two stints here, was doing an analysis of what was happening in other states and had started to do that work on Canada, and so seeing kind of how that is all coming together and the federal regulations versus what's happening in the different provinces, because you might expect that the provinces would be very similar, and that's not necessarily the case, especially with packaging or labeling requirements.

David Postman: I thought that was a national law on packaging.

Mary Segawa: No.

David Postman: Okay.

Mary Segawa: Yeah. I think it's Quebec, that has the very strict brown packaging. Their assessment is that it hasn't reduced the retail sales or anything when they compare, so

David Postman: Has it reduced overuse or abuse of minors for X, do they have any evidence that it is better?

Mary Segawa: You know, I don't know. That's the other thing is they do have the setup to monitor health impacts. And so I think that's going to be interesting to watch. And then, the other thing that I was a bit intrigued with, especially given the frequency sometimes of requests for our data, are the dashboards, public facing dashboards that different states use to make a lot of data just readily available for the public. So I think those were the main things that stood out for me, you

know, getting that sense of what's happening in other states, allowing more targeted, so to speak, follow up. Because if a state is doing an education campaign that looks good, you can go directly to that state instead of putting out a broad, who's doing what, so I think that's also really helpful.

Rick Garza: You know, there was something you said, Mary, about consumption lounges. And Kathy and I were on a call yesterday, and weekly, kind of the same interesting fact there, that very few states, though they may have passed laws to allow for public consumption, it's pretty difficult to put it into place for a number of reasons. I'll kind of let you jump in Kathy.

Kathy Hoffman: Yeah, I'm looking at my notes from that. And my first note, and I think somebody on the panel talked about it, they said just overall the outlook is pretty bleak because the business model is not viable. To add what Mary provided, first of all the licensing fees are extremely high. I mean, I think in, let's see, I'm looking at Nevada, they have one lounge open, just one. And it's connected to social equity, they had 65 applicants apply. 65 could have applied 20 did and only one opened. And the licensing fee for that was \$100,000. So it's very expensive. The other thing is, there's just this incredible pushback from local government on this, it's one of the reasons it's really hard to open these, right? Because to Mary's point, there are a multitude of concerns that include secondhand smoke and air quality, worker safety, fire risk, just the aroma of you know, cannabis in community ventilation systems. In Colorado, I'm sorry, in Nevada, they were talking about putting restrictions that no gaming could happen in these places, right? Because in Nevada, that's something that they deal with all the time. Also putting regulations in place that say that all consumption has to cease when law enforcement comes into or on the facility. So that was a concern for local government as well. And then the other decision, that comes into this is whether or not alcohol or tobacco will also be served in these facilities and what that means in terms of enforcement, in terms of public health risk, and those sorts of things. So I thought it was a really interesting conversation and also to Mary's point, you know, how do you deter overconsumption? Is that you give somebody a doggie bag at the door? And then how do they get home if they have over consumed? So there were just all of these variables, I think that played into this. The other thing I just want to mention is one of the states talked about this tasting room concept, and how that really played out in practice. And to quote them, it was largely a failure. So I think overall, they're just Michigan has two, Alaska, I think Maryland had either two or three, Nevada had one and that was it. It's just not as viable a model.

Justin Nordhorn: Rick, I would throw in a couple other observations from that particular panel, because we heard a lot that it's not profitable. You know, and a lot of barriers, and I think that most of those programs are fairly young. Not to champion for the program, but I think that we have so much interest in the state that we have to be looking at what this potential would be here. You know, I won't rehash all of the risks and barriers around the secondhand smoke issues. But they also talked about, should there be lower purchasing limits, special packaging limits, low dose options in these types of places for some of the other risk mitigation variables. But one of the things that I didn't grasp in some of those, is opportunities for them to make money. It sounds like, okay, you have a consumption lounge. And that's all it is, there's nothing else in there and so if it's that sterile, I can see why they're not going to make any money. Whereas if you're coupling it with other business type of models or practices, and I'm not, like I said, I'm not advocating this, but if you had another activity, you know, bowling, for example, maybe people would be more interested in going into a place, you know, obviously, we wouldn't want to see any alcohol and cannabis together, but you didn't hear about any of those ancillary activities. The thing that I think is important to call out in this conversation is the fact that our tribal partners are very interested in looking at this as an option. And so recognizing what some of those risks and barriers are, so we

could present that as an educational piece to them in this vein, I think will be helpful as they explore this. Because they may have opportunities that state licensees don't have when it comes to the Clean Indoor Air Act. There may be some interest and push and I wanted to make sure that that was on folks' radars as well.

Member Vollendroff: Well, I also am not advocating for this necessarily, but one thing to think about is these are all industry people. So this is all the industry or excuse me, regulators, these are regulators, and these are all the perspective of regulators. It would be a different conversation; I suspect if you had industry folks there talking about how this might work.

Rick Garza: I think it's a really important point, Justin and Jim, that it's almost like, it's the difference between legislating something. Right? It sounds like public consumption lounges sound good. And then you have law enforcement concerned, you have I mean, look at all the barriers that are created. You're right. Local governments, I think in most of these jurisdictions have veto power, they could say no up front, that was a way to get it passed, I think through the state, was to give the locals the power, and then no commingling. To your point, it's rather sterile, it's the only thing you're going to, if you're not going to commingle alcohol and cannabis, which people do and have for a long time. And then the high cost of entering with respect to fees that they impose. So it's almost like, we'll allow you to do it but we're going to put all these barriers in place for you to do it. And it seemed like, I gained that the from the panel that, wow, it hasn't been successful, and nobody's been able to do it. Because you haven't figured out a way to do it that the public's comfortable with is what I come down to at the end of the day. But I thought it was really interesting to hear. When you're just in the state like we are, we get to hear everybody tell us what's missing, right? And what we're not doing that other states are allowed to do. And then you come away from a panel like that going, well, it's really not at this point, not really viable.

Member Vollendroff: Yeah.

Mary Segawa: I think one of the other things, when the talk about how you make money and some, you have to buy the product at that site, and that's the product you use inside where others you can bring your own product in. And so that's going to make a difference. I happened to be in Colorado on vacation when they were having a big discussion on this. And I went and sat in on it. Fascinating discussion and part of it, and I think they allow this now, was the mobile cannabis consumption, tour busses and the restrictions on if you have a county that has a ban, and that bus has to go through that county, can they? It just it was fascinating discussion. Those are, again to hear your topic on what communities will allow, so interesting.

David Postman: The putting \$100,000 licensing fee on anything pretty much makes it not viable except for maybe a major corporation.

Mary Segawa: You also look at other states licensing fees overall. There are so many numbers so much higher than ours.

David Postman: New York's really high, I think.

Rick Garza: Yeah. We make up for it with taxes.

Justin Nordhorn: I'm sure most folks are aware, but I think for general awareness, some of the concepts around the social consuming that we've heard in this state have an interest with

weddings, special occasion type of events, bed and breakfast type of things. You know, those are a little less open, in a broad sense, usually more kind of an invited type of thing, maybe not a special occasion. But I can see that being the point of interest first before a full-on lounge, because there are so many issues with that. And we've heard that, and I think locals, I had in my notes that not only local control, but when you get into the historic areas, what are they going to do to buildings and what does that look like? There's going to be a lot of barriers to allowing businesses to enter those particular areas. Plus, having to rectify other state law on open consumption, because it's not only consuming in public, but it's public view. So can you have any type of windows on the business and those types of things? I mean, there's a lot of different issues, I think, that are still out there to be explored. But we may see some of those private type of interest to get permits or something along those lines presented to us.

Rick Garza: Josh did you want to add?

Josh Bolender: I had a few one-on-one conversations after the presentation with folks from states where they have some legal consumption sites and another concern was that these businesses sometimes attract other types of criminal activity to that area, whether it be gang activity or what have you. And then there was also a general concern about synergistic effects of intoxication, combining alcohol with cannabis and other drugs and the public safety impacts that that might have.

Rick Garza: Anyone else? Jim.

Member Vollendroff: First of all, going back to something John said earlier, I'd like to thank the staff who participated in presentations themselves, I thought they were really good. And I think it's also good for us to lean in where we can I think the more we lean in, the more we shape the national conversation and policy and all of those kinds of things. So thanks for staff for doing that. I don't have anything to add to the presentations but the ones that I was able to go to were really good. But following the conference, I met with Jillian on an individual basis. And I met with her because I was struck by several things. And I'll start by saying, first of all, I am a big proponent of us participating in national conferences when we can, and I think it was great to see as many LCB people there as I saw there. And you know, sometimes that can come into question when you're sending a whole bunch of staff to a national conference. It's in Florida, and it's December, I mean, so we have got to be aware of those kinds of things. Having said that, however, when, Rick, you mentioned there were 11 subcommittees, I think there's now 15 subcommittees, so the subcommittee list keeps getting larger. And when I look at this subcommittee list and think about us being at the conference, and who was there, and who participates in these things, I think there's multiple opportunities for us to get even more involved in some of these subcommittees. And frankly, I'd love to go through an exercise where we're like, okay, who's on the licensing one, who's on the compliance one, who's on the packaging one, who's on the social and economic equity medical one, etc., and see how we can make sure that we are actively involved, in many ways, I know, Kathy, and Justin, and Josh, and other people are already doing that. But it would be great to do that even more. I also got signed up for base camp. Now I'm trying to figure out how to manage that without getting overwhelmed with the number of e-mails that I have been getting, but of the ones that I've had the opportunity to dig into and look at, there's just some great conversations happening, and I think that we have, again, multiple opportunities to do that. I guess that's it, I really thought it was great. And look for us to get involved, continue to stay involved in that.

Rick Garza: Thanks, Jim. Brian?

Brian Smith: I thank you for the opportunity to be able to go to that I did find it very valuable for all the reasons that everybody said here. I was present at that first one in our building with just the four states, which was very informal then, it was PowerPoint stuff sitting around a room just like this pretty much. To this, which was a full ballroom that was pretty much packed to the gills. I mean, Jillian called that off right off the bat, we're going to need a bigger room now. And Rick said to it at the start, you know how we started like this, but just that short amount of time, we've outgrown everything and all the states and people that were there. Jim actually gave me a nice segue to that. So if there was one sort of undercurrent or channel that I picked up on, which was expanding the role of communication with CANNRA, the organization itself is maturing, and it's just a couple of years old, few years old. And there's a growing need to be able to have people that can help shape, you know, the conversation we're doing, it's talking with the media, it's helping develop, you know, coordinating with other states to be able to develop these materials. I sat in on one of the breakout sessions that was led by Colorado, and New York, Becky was there, Mary was in the room too, talking about their campaigns and what their struggles were. At that time, we had just done some advertising on the social equity stuff and various publications in Washington and hope to do a social media type of campaign. What I didn't realize was that was exactly right at that time when we were doing that, anything you put in that has the word cannabis, marijuana, all that stuff, it's instantly going to get you booted off all of the social media stuff. And so although these other states have already tried that ahead of us, they couldn't get anything going with that, like, well, it's going to save me some time trying to fight that whole thing. But they came back, and they had what they call the table topic, which was over lunch, I got up out of where I was sitting with our folks and went over and sat down with the other group and volunteered to be part of that committee. They had changed. They were focused in these early years kind of on public education. Mary as you know has been part of that. I saw Kathy Hoffman get on the meeting early this morning, but she did stick around. So she's probably had a role. But the CANNRA's leadership committee had added at that meeting a piece of their strategic plan to expand communications, change that subcommittee from public education, to public education, communications, and stakeholder engagement. We are of course involved in all of those things here. They were well aware of Washington and some of the stuff that we've done, and I offered up what I could bring to that. One of the things that Jillian said, we met this morning, actually, and Jillian had said that she'd like this committee to develop a communication plan for CANNRA. And I know that's something that I can contribute to, to that organization. And I see myself actually getting involved in providing some leadership early on, I think with that as it kind of grows, growing pains, right, with an organization, but it's at the right time, I think we're coming in right at the right time with that. They're calling it, you know, communications 2.0 kind of thing with that group, but it's led by Colorado and New York. But I'll be involved with that going forward as will Mary and Kathy to some degree. They were looking for speakers to come up both within the agency and out. And Chris had some good ideas, but I thought of Kathy right off the bat, it was good to let you know, Kathy, I'm going to volunteer you to lead a little session on stakeholder engagement, because she's going to be talking about that tomorrow, so she's already got the slides ready. All the work that we've done there, and yeah, so it was it was very valuable. Just an indirect thing, I was at an overflow hotel with John and Tani and Kathy, and so it's good to be able to spend some time and get to know those guys, you know, a good couple of days with them. I don't know if it's mutual or not, but I enjoyed it, getting to know them and I think it'll pay off over time. So that's a key thing.

Jim Vollendroff: One other thing that I learned when I talked to Jillian, I think it was also mentioned, we have a statewide membership in CANNRA. And what I learned and maybe help me if I've got this wrong, is that what that means is our partners in DOH, our partners at DVHR, our partners at other state agencies have access to participate in some of these subcommittees. And I think that there, from my conversation with Jillian, I think there's more opportunities for us to engage DOH and others in some of these subcommittees so that it's, you know, a statewide response to some of the issues that cross, the policy issues that cross our state agencies. We should think about that.

Rick Garza: Yeah. And so we did that several years ago, where we met with our partners from the agencies, let them know that because we do a statewide membership, which means any government agency, even a city or county, like the city of Seattle, could join as an associate member of CANNRA, that you can because of the payment that we make, we did that purposely for statewide, to allow DOA, to allow the Department of Agriculture and others to be part of, and many are, there are several that are, it could always be more. To your point, I appreciate the fact that, Jim, that you said; these meetings are important. I've been stressing that for a couple of years. And I'll just use it as an example. I thought about Brian, because I was thinking, Brian, I need you to hear what goes on in these meetings as a person that's our communications director. So maybe it was just a month or two before the meeting I called Brian and said Brian, I want you to go to this meeting, I think you could gain something from that. And that's why we brought as many people as we did, Jim, because I wanted people to see this meeting is probably the most valuable meeting as cannabis regulators that we can be a part of, because it's incredible. And Jonathan kind of said it. You know, we're one of the first states, people look to us. And if we're not there, if we're not involved in these committees, they wonder why not? Because frankly, Colorado and Oregon, I think we're more involved than Colorado, I'll be honest. Oregon's really involved in many of the committees, and they play a really strong leadership role. And we can too. So I appreciate, you know, the fact that you said that, Jim, because I think we have a lot to offer. And all the folks that were there, I mean, these are the folks that do the work every day, all the other states are looking to us to say, tell me how it's working. So you talked about maturity. And that's what's happened with CANNRA. We used to meet, and we would literally just talk about how do you set up your licensing structure? How do you do enforcement? What's your organization look like? Now, it's really getting into what are the challenges and issues that you're having as an agency regulating this industry. And we all find just as we do in that alcohol space within CSLA and NAPCA, that we're always having the same issues, because these are national companies, and many of the industry, and cannabis has multiple licenses around the country. Saying I appreciate what you said, Jim, because I think we could learn more from that interaction. Many of the states that have followed us have learned from us, and they put in practices that deal with some of the issues and challenges that we had originally. So they've kind of perfected it, I think of New York as one of those states, because they spent a lot of time looking at how the other states put their systems in place. I'll stop there so that I can give Becky a chance to jump in.

Becky Smith: I think that I've been, of course involved early on and then kind of fell off. And, you know, it's easy to let Kathy and Justin, you take the lead on stuff, especially when we've been so busy. You know that it's easy to go, well let them do it because we got, you know, that like boots on the ground, you have got to get your stuff done. And it was, you know, going to that role I had to step back and say, this is important for us to be at the table, this is important for staff to hear that at some point, have the staff that are doing the work hear these conversations. Because it's okay, that I hear them, but it was great to bring Linda with me to hear those conversations as well, that I, you know, thought of as they were doing the presentations, I kept thinking Susan

would be great in this meeting, because she has so much, because she knows what it's like to do these label and product approvals and all the challenges and we can write policy to it, but the person that is actually doing the work could have really benefited from that. Also, the chemist piece, I have never really understood why we have a chemist, but then having sat in those meetings and been very clear about, oh, you don't need one, you need more than one. And these are the reasons why because that expertise, sits with those folks. I thought, well, somebody needs to be here that has that expertise as well or does that work. So, I thought that I want to be more involved, I think it's sometimes being able to go, okay, let's go through that list again, because we did at one point. We went through the list to see who could be involved in these meetings, because it doesn't always have to be me, doesn't always have to be, Linda, it can be some of our other staff. It could be Nickel, it could be other staff, even, you know, at a different level to hear some of these conversations, because I think it benefits as we start to think about, you know, who's going to be in these positions, five years from now, or you know that succession planning makes a difference for these. Also, too, we do have so much to contribute. And you forget that when you step away to do your everyday business and everyday work, and I just, it was a big reminder to me, and it's like, oh, wow, we have all these folks out there that we can learn from to change some of our regulations and some of our rules, but also, we have a lot to contribute still.

Linda Thompson: Good afternoon, everyone. I just, for me, it was overall just a great experience. It was my first one that I attended. So it gave me an opportunity to really understand what CANNRA was, what they do, the importance of being involved. Because in the beginning, when I started cannabis, I hit the ground running, I would receive all these notifications from base camp. Not really understanding everything. So yeah, it was a great opportunity. You know, I learned a lot. And then not to mention, Jillian was absolutely amazing. It probably was one of the best conferences that I've been to, like wildish, it was great. So I really appreciate the opportunity to be able to go and I look forward to, you know, hopefully attending the next one.

Rick Garza: I think that's everyone. Ollie I think had to get off.

David Postman: Yes, she did. She's gone.

Rick Garza: So she won't have an opportunity to share. I hope that that gives you and other staff that weren't present an opportunity to hear what happened there. And I appreciate Jim, the work that we can do to go back out not only to our staff, but to other agencies to see if they want to participate again. One thing I would say everyone was inundated with emails in base camp when we set up base camp over a year ago, and it turned people off. I'm just going to say it did because it was like, hey, I can't deal with that much email. So she has created a filter that I want to make sure that everyone's aware of so that you're not getting every email that comes in.

David Postman: I just had to stop all the emails, I don't know how I'd filter it.

Rick Garza: I'll look at that. But I believe Jillian did that because you know, everybody was going wow, this is like, and it just tells you how much of a resource it is when all the other states are going, I need some help, tell me what you know about this situation or that and depending upon what the issue is. So I'll talk with Jillian because I thought that we had fixed that. I don't get as many emails as I used to, I probably get 25% of what I used to get when we first put it together. But I just share, I think that turned off a lot of people because it was just too much.



Becky Smith: Yeah, I will say one more thing is that, you know, it's different from, I really enjoyed it just being regulators, because I spend so much time with the industry, when we do NCSLA, and some of those other conferences, that you don't actually get a chance to just spend time with that regulator to ask other questions. We made some really, Linda and I made some great contacts that we email, like the Nevada folks about their, you know, that we made some great contacts, not, you know, like Jason and folks, or Jason's gone now, but you know, that, it's good to know those people, but to really be able to reach across the country and get information or invite you know, that, hey, can we have a conversation about especially social equity these days. It's been great.

Rick Garza: Yeah, thanks for bringing that up. Because there's something that I missed that Justin and I have been a part of. So last year, for the first time, they created an external conference with the industry in a separate location, at a separate time, as an opportunity for us to at least engage with the industry, and hear from them, specifically the issues that are important to them. And that happens six months apart. We did it, it was close to the time we did it in June here. We did it in Seattle, because we didn't have enough space for more than two of us to go. Gretchen and others helped staff it. But if you remember, Justin, that was the meeting that we had before we came to Olympia. So I just want to share with you that there will be another external meeting that's being planned with the industry. And I think we're looking at inviting more people, again, like we have in the internal meeting, so that you can hear from the industry and their perspectives on issues that are before us. But I have a feeling we're never going to move toward them being part of it, because we gain too much when we're together. And then we can talk very candidly with one another. And in some of the alcohol conferences we're at, you see the lawyer that's representing the licensees that are that are there at the meeting and that can make it difficult sometimes to be candid about the issues that we have. And I know this is a public meeting, but it's the truth. But just want to share that external meeting can take the place of allowing the industry because I think the vast majority of the states do not want to change the format for the internal meeting, which is planned for June. I want to say in Anapolis, but we'll get more information now. So thanks.

David Postman: We'll see next year when the December conference is in North Dakota how many of you go to North Dakota. A couple of thoughts from me on this in general, I attended a lot of national conferences in the last 10 or 11 years. But you know, the industry should not be part of this and one of the reasons is, we deal with our industry here, we have a lot of opportunity to connect with them. I really don't like going to a conference and being, met by lobbyists there, it's an opportunity for them to corner you to talk about their thing. That's why too much of that goes on and I think anything we can do to keep that from infecting CANNRA would be a good thing, no offense to the industry. But if we're going to take time away from our job here and send people, I think part of the thing, and again, I think we are, you started this and we you know, the Washington is a leader in this and people look to us, and we should help other governments get ready to go. But for me, the most important thing if we got a team of people going is what you bring back to us. What have we got? We have got to be selfish about it as well. What questions do we have and you know, Becky as you were saying, if we know somebody we can call and go, tell us, because you know, we can read what the press is or press release, I'd say oh, this state's doing this, but you don't really know and you can't really compare what we know in great detail here to what we read about another state in some other form, whether it's from the industry from the media, or the PR of the agency itself. So we need to really get down there and that's just as we're providing that for people here. We'll go, let us tell you, where we missed that even. You can learn from us; we need that from them. And I think we've really just got to make sure we're always

getting that. And I'm glad there was staff at different levels there. And one thing that the National Governors Association does that I really like is that in addition to their annual meetings, where the governors and all that happen, they do staff trainings. There'll be a training for gubernatorial schedulers, because there is no other association that looks at that, there'll be one for Governor's Council. And it's not entirely the same here, but I would think about what can we do too on that front, maybe it is enforcement where we bring more than just, you know, one Captain there who can do it, or whether it's a customer service question, or it's a packaging and labeling conversation. The line workers, the people who are doing that work, we could get them in a room to talk because I'm sure, and I knew this when I was, in my other job, when all of a sudden you can talk to somebody who does the same job you do. You go, oh, God, you understand me, you know, there's just power in that alone. And, you know, there are not many people whose job it is deciding what can go on a cannabis label. And, you know, I'm glad that you're involved and all that, but let's send folks who are making those decisions sometimes too and let them talk to each other. Maybe it's not even a panel for the whole group.

Multiple voices: Right.

David Postman: Let's get them on, you know, we did it, you know, a lot of it is frankly, remote, you can do a lot of it remote. And if you had a quarterly meeting of the labeling team, I bet they'd find that really valuable and to be able to share examples and talk about their challenges because nobody else understands what they're going through except for those folks. So I really look for how we could involve line staff as much as possible in all training opportunities, frankly. You know, the people at the leadership level have much more opportunity to do training and networking and those things, we really got to, I think put the effort into getting line staff those opportunities as much as possible. But I appreciate the reports. I think was something that you said, Jim, is that just in general, if people are going to conferences, make sure there's a sharing that comes back out of that, whether, you know, it doesn't have to be an EMT, every time maybe it's not of interest to the whole group, but your staff, your division, whether it's your management team, or the EMT, or whatever it is, just share it somehow, because it is helpful. I remember when I was a young person, starting in as a reporter, somebody said, you should go to a conference and if you come back with one good idea, it was worth it. Because we don't get time to think, right, it's really hard to just say to your boss, I'm thinking today, you know. We're doing. And so if we can take people out of that daily thing and get something and bring it back and have them become an evangelist for some new idea that makes it all worthwhile.

Jim Vollendroff: Just one thing to add to that. I've seen this happen, since I've come back, is to remember your colleagues that you can introduce to people that you've met at these conferences. It has happened multiple times in conversations with Kathy and Justin and other folks. Oh, Mary, did you get a chance to meet such and such? No, I didn't, oh, let me introduce you, because they do similar things, or you might have some interest in some of the things that they are interested in. So just remember to introduce your colleagues. Jillian is great at that already. She's like, introduced me to several people around the country that I've reached out to so just encourage you to do that as well.

---

## **ADDITIONAL TEAM UPDATES AND FINAL BOARD INQUIRIES**

David Postman: We're just about out of time, and we haven't done any team updates. And Marc, I don't want to put you on the spot. But I'm going to put you on the spot a little bit. Day three of the

legislative session. People are back in the building for the first time since the pandemic, give us your three-day report on what it looks like and how, I know we had a hearing yesterday.

Marc Webster: I think that's been the highlight so far of the very young session. Board Member Garrett, who I think has dropped off today, fantastic job kind of kicking off the presentation on our Social Equity Bill 5080 in the Senate committee, and thank you to Justin Nordhorn as well, who did very well in testimony, like really kind of set the tone right for that one. And we got a lot of positive feedback from the chair and the sponsor. So, I think that's in a good spot. Our THC bill should be dropped this week as well as the subpoena authority bill in the Senate. 99% sure who were there on the in the house, but we're getting there. So it's been so far so good. There's a lot of energy, in part, because there's so many new members, there are just, this is a huge freshman class in the legislature. And then again, those who were elected back in 2020, some of them have never been in person in these hearing rooms, kind of learning the ropes. So it's been good to do, it's been good to be back in person and see people having those conversations in the hall.

David Postman: Right.

Marc Webster: And also glad that we don't have committee today. So I can come here.

David Postman: Yes, that was good. With all those new members, there's an opportunity for us too to get out there to meet every one of them and tell them about the LCB.

Marc Webster: And so one of the things about that is that we have the opportunity to do two, kind of extensive work sessions with the House who has the most new members. So first one will be tomorrow, and Board Member Vollendroff will be participating in that one. And that's on the history of alcohol, tobacco, and vape regulation. And all the things we do as an agency, kind of an agency overview. We're the only thing on the agenda, we get the full time.

David Postman: House or Senate?

Marc Webster: This is House, this is House Regulated Substances in Gaming. And then we'll come back a week from that. So we're going to do tomorrow and then a week from tomorrow to do another work session on campus. The last one, still not sure if industry will speak at that one or if it's just going to be the LCB show, like tomorrow. So yeah, when we learn more, we'll let you know.

David Postman: I thought Senator Saldaña the sponsor on the bill yesterday did a really good job too, it was a good way to kick it off.

Marc Webster: It was difficult because they were trying to fit that hearing in before the State of the State, so it got cut in half. And so that, I think, maybe led to part of why Kaiser was doing a very good job of managing the time, managing the speakers to avoid it kind of going sideways because they had a time crunch. So given all of those challenges, both the Members like Kaiser and Saldaña, and then Ollie and Justin I think did exemplary.

David Postman: I watched the tape later in the day, but I could sense you all crossing stuff out as that was going on. They were saying, "well, not four minutes..." Then it was two, but it wasn't any one second more than two before Chair Kaiser was moving along. So yeah, I thought it was really good.

With nobody else having an update, Chair Postman adjourned the Executive Management Team meeting for January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

---

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.

Minutes approved this 15th day of January 2025



\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Vollendroff  
Board Chair



\_\_\_\_\_  
Ollie Garrett  
Board Member

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

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