



Board Caucus Meeting

Tuesday, February 7, 2023, 10:00 am

This meeting was held in a hybrid environment

Meeting Minutes

CAUCUS ATTENDEES

Chair David Postman
Member Ollie Garrett
Member Jim Vollendroff
Dustin Dickson, Executive Assistant

GUESTS

Marc Webster, Director of Legislative Relations
Toni Hood, Deputy Director
Rachel Swanner, Chief Financial Officer
Kathy Hoffman, PhD, Policy and Rules Manager

At 10:00 am, Dustin Dickson announced that the meeting lobbies were open, and the recording had begun.

At 10:00 am, Chair Postman convened the meeting

2023 LEGISLATIVE SESSION UPDATE

Marc Webster, Director of Legislative Relations

Marc Webster: Good morning, Chair Postman, and Members Garrett, and Vollendroff. Our Social Equity Bill as we talked about last week is in a good state in the Senate. And, thus, I was pretty happy to see that it has been dropped in the House, aligning with the Substitute version in the Senate. So I think, in general, I think there is some skepticism when our Agency Request bills come out in a different form. But I think in this case I certainly understand and support the idea of kind of skipping ahead to a version that has already been vetted a bit and is in a form that many stakeholders in the LCB, of course, can support. So we are very happy to see that bill drop from Representative Entenman.

That process of stakeholder work and looking at amendment language is now underway on the THC Bill of our Senate Bill 5367 in the Senate. And in the House version, which also took a little while to be introduced and heard, will have a hearing today this afternoon in the House Regulated Substances and Gaming Committee. We have supplied a technical amendment on the Senate side after hearing from insiders like testing labs and even a chemist from another state agency that our definitions may not have been broad enough to regulate some of the new THC variants that have popped up. And so I think that is now included in the next version of 5367 that we will likely see later on this week.

There is some amendment language floating around delineating hemp consumables and hemp in food from the kind of hemp-derived products that we are trying to regulate. And of course this is all going on while the Federal Food and Drug Administration kind of threw its hands up and asked Congress for more

guidance around regulating hemp products like CBD and CBD in food. I think there is still a lot of work from stakeholders who want to see changes to the THC threshold in the bill, which is 1 mg per serving and 3 mg per package. Under that, it would not be regulated by the LCB; above that, it would be. But that hasn't changed as of yet. I think there are a lot of folks in the hemp industry who want those thresholds moved up. And of course, many in the 502 market who would like those numbers to move down.

Senator Saldaña's Adult Entertainment Bill that among other provisions around dancer safety would direct the Board to allow alcohol to be served in adult entertainment nightclubs was heard yesterday in the Senate. And then the bill proposing to extend the House Bill 1480 temporary privileges, allowing alcohol delivery from restaurants, continues to attract debate and work. Representative Reeves convened stakeholders and the LCB, like Justin Nordhorn, to figure out what it would look like under a scenario in which the bill has passed. She completely understands that the Board is opposed, and that the Governor's office is strongly opposed but appreciates the work working through the technical side with some of the stakeholders there.

Our Subpoena Authority Bill has passed to Senate rules with the amendment that adds a comma, hard to imagine a smaller change, so we are hoping that a bill that small and with no fiscal note will move quickly. And that's all I've got for today. More to come, certainly, in the coming weeks.

Chair Postman: Questions for Marc?

Ollie Garrett: No questions. And Marc, thank you. You have taken a lot of time, one-on-ones, so I really appreciate working with you this Session.

Marc Webster: Thank you, I've enjoyed working with the Board, as well. Thank you, Ollie.

Chair Postman: Marc, I just had one question/comment about the Social Equity Bill, the new version that's out there, and you and I have talked about this a little bit, which is the line about who has the authority to increase licenses both in social equity realm and in the existing market. Do I understand right that the current version gives only the Legislature the authority to do any additional social equity licenses after this bill, but the Agency has administrative authority to do for non-social equity?

Marc Webster: Certainly, I think the changes in the bill are targeted around social equity. I've got to be honest; I think there is still kind of an open question, and I would defer to some of the lawyers on exactly where the authority resides, especially for the non-social equity program.

Chair Postman: I would appreciate it if we could dig into it a little bit. When I first looked at the language, it didn't jump out at me, but the more I thought about it -- so the question I have, regardless of what it says today, what I would like for us to be aware of is to not endorse or set up a system where it's essentially easier to increase non-social equity licenses than it is social equity licenses. So if I'm a social equity applicant and I need to go to the Legislature and lobby the Legislature to increase the cap, that's a big chore. If it is non-social equity and they can just come to the Agency and ask for that, we're creating an uneven playing field to use the acting phrase. Does that make sense? So I just would appreciate sort of an eye on that. Ollie, do you have an idea what's going on?

Ollie Garrett: And I'm thinking I thought that right now all newly licensed are supposed to be social equity license for so many years.

Chair Postman: That's part of the question, though. Does this language mean that they are all that way? I just think we need to really get some clarity on that question.

Ollie Garrett: Yeah, because I was under the assumption that all newly licensed are social equity licensed for the next – I thought it was either five years or something like that.

Chair Postman: Well, that's what our bill said originally something like that.

Ollie Garrett: Right.

Chair Postman: But I don't – didn't – anyhow, I will have to look more carefully, too. But I would just -- if the folks who are smarter than me could look at that as well with that in mind. What would that system look like? Because I don't see that specific prohibition on increasing other license types. It seems like it sets up two channels.

Ollie Garrett: Yeah. Is somebody from Licensing on or in the room?

Chair Postman: I don't see, but I think we can get a -- I'll ask somebody to answer that question for us. And we'll probably have to ask the lawyers, too, for the view of that. But yeah, I think, okay. All right. Any other questions for Marc? Okay. Thank you, Marc. We'll let you get back to it.

NEW EMPLOYEE INTRODUCTION – RACHEL SWANNER, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
Toni Hood, Deputy Director

Toni Hood: Thank you, Chair Postman. Thank you, Member Garrett and Vollendroff. I'm excited to introduce Rachel Swanner, who is our new CFO. She comes to us from L&I, but she has also worked at DSHS and DCYS. And she is a Cougar. She got her undergraduate at WSU and went on to get her MBA. And she told me just for fun she got her CPA license recently. So it tells you a little bit about her personality since she did that. But she has only been here since the beginning of the month, but we're very excited she has jumped in and met a lot of people, and I will let her say "Hello."

Rachel Swanner: All right. Thank you so much. Thank you for giving me a chance. I'm really excited to be here. I heard amazing things about this Agency, and it's a really good opportunity. Like Toni said, I'm already digging in and trying to get to know the people and the business. So I'm really excited for the future.

Chair Postman: Great. Well, welcome. We're excited to have you. And yeah, when I heard that you initially told us that about that the CPA was just kind of a hobby for fun, that tells us what we're looking for in a CFO.

Rachel Swanner: Yeah, I love accounting. I'm an accounting nerd. So even if you have questions outside of just the business here, I may have an answer.

Chair Postman: Oh, good. Thank you.

Toni Hood: Thank you.

Rachel Swanner: Thank you, guys.

Chair Postman: And you'll get the chance at some point. But that's Ollie Garrett and Jim Vollendroff, obviously, on the screen there, too, and hopefully you'll have a chance to talk and get to know each other. Next, we'll get an update on the Cannabinoid Science Workgroup from Dr. Kathy Hoffman.

CANNABINOID SCIENCE WORKGROUP UPDATE

Kathy Hoffman, PhD, Policy and Rules Manager

Kathy Hoffman: Thank you. Good morning, Chair Postman. Good morning, Board Members Garrett, and Vollendroff. I wanted to give you an update on what was going on with the Cannabinoid Science Workgroup, and then hopefully have a bit of discussion on helping the workgroup scope their pathway forward in terms of what we are asking them to look into. So just to give a brief background, our first meeting was on December 1, 2022, and the purpose of that meeting was to sort of set the foundation for the group, let them introduce themselves to one another, and then share their research interest related to cannabinoids with the rest of the group. And then we went through the charter to see if there were any questions or concerns, and then we moved forward.

So in between the time that we met on December 1st and when we met last week on February 1st, we had taken all of their research interests and separated them into buckets because they very clearly went into three different research buckets. The first had to do with cannabinoids and their effect on the body. Second had to do with cannabinoids in DUI. And then the third had to do with the regulation of cannabinoids. And that was, I think, Dustin -- I believe that we shared these documents with the Board. Correct? Okay. So for the second meeting that we had last week, using that bucketing of their research interests, asked them to take a look at where they might want to start doing their work based on what the purpose statement was in the workgroup charter. And the workgroup had -- I would say there was some difficulty in self-selecting from those groups. They wanted to know more from us about the direction that they would like them to go in the work of the Cannabinoid Science Workgroup.

The other thing that happened during the course of the meeting was trying to define the term cannabinoid, and I think it's fair to say that defining cannabinoid at least to this group so far is a very contextual exercise. You can define cannabinoid legally. You can use it as a marketing term. And then there are also scientific terms. So a really broad range of responses there, so we didn't come away with a solid definition or even a working definition of cannabinoid. So I bring this to you today to offer a couple ways that we can go with this and then reach out to you for any direction that you would specifically like to take with this group. And the one thing that I was thinking of was starting with structure or function with cannabinoids. And I know this is something the Agency has grappled with, turn everybody back to our policy statement that we issued in mid-2021 trying to figure out how we apply structure or function as it is described in statute at this point on cannabis packaging and labeling. And that is medically compliant cannabis.

And there are implications for how cannabinoids are described within that structure or function state. So I think this would be a really good place for the workgroup to start a dialogue because it does have implications for how cannabinoids impact the body so and so forth. Go ahead.

Chair Postman: Back up a tiny bit.

Kathy Hoffman: Sure.

Chair Postman: Just give us that definition of structure and function. What are we talking about there?

Kathy Hoffman: Structure of function is not defined.

Chair Postman: Yes.

Kathy Hoffman: That's the challenge.

Chair Postman: But it meant something in our policy statement.

Kathy Hoffman: It did.

Chair Postman: In layperson terms.

Kathy Hoffman: Yeah.

Chair Postman: What are we talking about?

Kathy Hoffman: It defines the medically compliant cannabis product structure or function claims to the extent possible, meaning that the statement is not meant to address a disease or help with a diagnosis. It just says, for example, this product will help with stomach upset.

Chair Postman: Right.

Kathy Hoffman: I think that's the most basic example I can provide.

Chair Postman: Right. And that's the function. Right? So what we're trying to get at there is to regulate what people claim these products can do.

Kathy Hoffman: Right.

Chair Postman: That would be the function part of it. Right?

Kathy Hoffman: Exactly.

Chair Postman: So they could maybe say helps you relax might be okay but deals with diagnosed anxiety you could not say.

Kathy Hoffman: You could not say that.

Chair Postman: Right.

Kathy Hoffman: And we are the only state that allows even medically-compliant product manufacturers to make a structure or function claim. And then on top of this, we have already seen that in Senator Schumer's bill kind of kicking that over to the FDA structure or function on the cannabis side. So we could be doing some of the pre-work that could help inform the legalization efforts in the future. And it does cross over the disciplines that are represented on the Cannabinoid Science Work Group.

Chair Postman: And this is what the FDA does today outside of this world. Right?

Kathy Hoffman: Yes.

Chair Postman: That's the Agency in the US that does those things the state doesn't normally regulate that.

Kathy Hoffman: Right.

Chair Postman: But we do in this case because nobody else is.

Kathy Hoffman: That's right. With products that are termed nutraceuticals, that sort of thing.

Chair Postman: Nutraceuticals.

Kathy Hoffman: Nutraceuticals, yes.

Chair Postman: Okay. Thank you.

Kathy Hoffman: Yes. So that was one suggestion I had. And I think that something that the Cannabinoid Science Workgroup was looking at is, what can we start working on as sort of a short-term concern? And what can we start working on as sort of a long-term concern? And I think the structure of function claims fits both of those questions. The other thing that they thought about in terms of short-term was taking a look at hemp-derived cannabinoids. I know that's been a topic of discussion for many of us for a while. And then harmonizing testing standards might be a longer-term, issue that they could talk about.

Somebody brought up the future of interstate commerce. I don't know that that's... I think that might be a little premature at this point. But one topic that continues to come up is consistent product labeling, and that is why I think this structure function discussion might be very useful in a number of ways. But I just wanted to turn it over to the Board for some discussion and see if there were any interest areas that you would like to recommend that I can take to the Cannabinoid Science Work Group.

Chair Postman: Jim, I'll go to you first. You were going to sit in on these meetings for us.

Jim Vollendroff: Yeah. And was able to sit in on both the first two meetings, and part of the first one and the entire second one. And first of all, thank you, Kathy, for leading that group. I thought it was a really good meeting. People are really engaged, and Kathy already said this, but what I heard was, "What do you need?" Meaning LCB and the Board, what are your priorities? And Kathy identified that. I think that identifying -- and Kathy, remind me, this is a short-term group -- what's the duration of this group? Is it one year that people agreed to participate?

Kathy Hoffman: It is. It's one year, and then it's every other month that there could be subgroups, sub-meetings in between.

Jim Vollendroff: Okay.

Kathy Hoffman: So we're not restricted just to the every other month case.

Jim Vollendroff: Okay. And so part of the conversation, David and Ollie, was related to what we need immediately. What's the long-term? And then how does this fit into some desire within the LCB to do more research or be more involved in the research area? And so I think that there are multiple opportunities. One area that I'm super interested in when I look at the bucket of categories, body, DUI, regulation is I'm super interested in the DUI stuff, personally, and I didn't hear as much of that discussed. And I think

where it fits into relevant conversation right now is that on the alcohol side, there is a lot of conversation about reducing the blood alcohol concentration from .08 to .05, but I haven't heard it. Maybe there are conversations that I'm not a part of. I haven't heard anything about cannabis and its impact on some of the driving fatalities and things like that. So I'm just curious if that is an area where we might want to look at since we are doing it on the alcohol side. Other than that, I think that the group was certainly eager to help us once we identify where we want them to lean in.

Chair Postman: Good. We have that in some conversations, but most of those conversations have been how difficult, almost impossible it is today to go down that road because there isn't reliable science or a method for doing it. And when I Google around on this, there are different emerging things that are coming up. But last I really looked at it, that is what I saw it was that. And we had somebody in one of our presentations -- I can't remember what it was a while ago -- there was some talk about what it would take to be able to get a reliable -- because you need a road test. Right?

Jim Vollendroff: Right.

Chair Postman: Maybe something that the police can administer at the side of the road. And I don't think that exists in the same form that it does for alcohol.

Kathy Hoffman: Agreed, if I may. And the other thing that I wanted to point out, that was a discussion we had with our law enforcement panel when we were trying to define what is and is not impairing. And so I think that's another thing when we think about cannabinoid science. Our Agency is already engaged, and actually, Dr. Shara reminded me of this. It's some really robust discussions about cannabinoid science. In fact, five of them that are recorded are up on our webpage, and the DUI discussion was one of them about how challenging that is to move forward in that space.

Chair Postman: I think that is something we could use all -- and the conversations around what has happened with traffic accidents and mixed drug use, mixed alcohol/drug use for traffic stops and things of that sort. And one thing that I wonder about is the more short-term, like Marc Webster this morning was talking about the THC Bill, and that there is going to be a new version with changing some of those definitions because some of our partner agencies said that it was too narrow. So just if we played this back, if next year we're getting ready for the Session and we have a draft bill like that, could we just send it to this group and say, "Tell us what you think." Because then you have a group of scientists and other researchers who are able to look at it for that kind of feedback that maybe we catch some of those things as they go out there. So it's not a long-term research-dependent thing. It's just lend us your smarts to --

Kathy Hoffman: Yeah, almost in a consultative capacity.

Chair Postman: Exactly.

Kathy Hoffman: The other thing if I may switch really quickly. The other thing I think that came out -- and Member Vollendroff, tell me if you -- this was your observation, as well, but I think there is a gap between scientific understanding of cannabinoids and how to express that, and then how that same thinking is expressed in statute for regulation. Because there is a tendency to get on the scientific side very proscriptive with chemical compound equations and those sorts of things. And then trying to put that into statute or regulation can become very complicated very quickly. So I think this group could kind of help us close that gap or at least diminish it some than there already is right now. I think some of true effect scientific literature I look at, it is really hard to interpret some of those findings I would say.

Chair Postman: And then the other thing I would look for often -- and you and I were talking about this a little bit -- but the interplay between our policy operation and research science. It's kind of a blurred line right now, and you do a lot of that on your own anyhow, but to me, the most valuable service they can provide is helping you and Policy get what you need. And either that is emerging things that might come before them and they could say hey, I just read about this new thing, and what do you think about this? This would be super valuable. Or you are going to them and saying, we got a petition, or we have this, or we had a Board question, and we're going of the look at this question of whatever it is and have that consultive body there but in more kind of practicable, real terms, where it's working in conjunction with you and your team about what you really need in this thing.

Kathy Hoffman: Okay. And thank you for this conversation. I think it's going to be helpful for them. It is certainly helpful for me to kind of chart that course forward with this because we have a lot of great people in the group. A lot of great collective knowledge.

Jim Vollendroff: Kathy, and David, your comments are super helpful and right on track with what I also heard in that meeting. And that was kind of the chicken and the egg conversation. Like we're trying to make policy decisions, but, yet there is no research or science around what we're trying to make. And so there was this conversation about, how do we do that? And how can we make policy recommendations when the science and the research isn't there? But the reality -- and Gillian, I thought, did a really nice job of helping people understand. The reality is we are in an environment where we are making decisions. We are forced to make decisions with the available data and information that we have, and so part of the gap is identifying where we need more while we are still making policy decisions. So it was a really helpful conversation from that regard.

Chair Postman: And the only thing I would say is, I see this group largely separate from the conversation that we have had about our own research capabilities. This would not supplant what we want to do. I can imagine that if we had the research team that we think should and hopefully we will, they would be connected with this panel, as well.

Chair Postman: But this panel still is a very valuable service for us. We would not replace them, and they would not replace what we're hoping to do. I can see both playing important roles for us. And some of it is just as you were saying on function and structure, just to your point, definitions don't even exist for so much of the nomenclature that we all have started to use around these things. I don't know how easy it is to do that. It must not be easy, or we would have it.

Kathy Hoffman: Right.

Chair Postman: We ran into this last year with our THC Bill. What does impairment mean? And so if we could come out -- if there is even any progress to be made of agreed-upon language around these things that the industry uses and the regulators and the science and the prevention community use, that would be a huge step. Right?

Kathy Hoffman: Agreed. And I think to Member Vollendroff's point, it's bringing "yes/no" thinking into "yes/and..." thinking because that is very much what this is, is trying to bring scientific thinking, which is not always abstract, into an area of policy that is extremely abstract. And trying to find the alignment where we can there.

Chair Postman: Yeah. And I know that sometimes it's hard for scientists to say, "okay, yes, we can all agree on that definition" because it depends on so much.

Kathy Hoffman: Sure.

Chair Postman: But for what we do, we need that.

Kathy Hoffman: We do.

Chair Postman: And if we enter an agreement with what the industry's definition is and what prevention and public health's definition, that seems like it would be a huge step.

Kathy Hoffman: All right. Well, thank you very much for that. I've got some things I can take back to the group, and I appreciate it.

BOARD MEMBER AND EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT REPORTS

Chair Postman: Okay. So now we are to Board Member and Executive Assistant Reports. I have one if I could start, which is just we went live today with the search for the new Director. It was posted on the website of the consulting company that we have hired, which I will talk about in a second. So here are the updates. It's known that LCB has retained Karras Consulting, which is an Olympia-based recruiting firm to help us with this recruitment for Rick's replacement. They have been talking with us about what that job description looks like and how to describe the Agency and things of that sort. And just this morning or last night, they posted that announcement on their website. And first of all, for any job seeker out there, everything is going to be funneled through them. That's the place to go, and that is karrasconsulting.net. That's K-A-R-R-A-S CONSULTING, all one word, dot net. And you'll see that there is a button there to view open positions, and you'll see the LCB announcement.

And I think that they have done a nice job capturing some of the things we have all talked about in that. And we don't have a timeline. The timeline is that we need somebody by July 1, when Rick retires. But like this recruitment is open. I don't think there is a cutoff. I should look before I say that. But anyhow, my point is if somebody is interested, they should go and look at it. Also, just anybody who is listening and obviously cares about the LCB, so spread the word to somebody who you might know who might be interested or organizations that are in the alcohol or cannabis industry regulation and just sort of help us spread the word and get it out there.

And I am looking to see if they did set any kind of -- okay. So they said applications no later than March 15th. So they would like to do that. And you will see it talks about the Agency and even what a great state Washington state is in case there is somebody from outside the state who is interested. So I wanted to share that. And I think that is the only update on the search that we have at this point. You guys have any questions or concerns about where we are going so far? Jim or Ollie.

Ollie Garrett: It is a national search. Right?

Chair Postman: Yeah. And they have produced a plan for advertising. They do both paid advertising and free wherever they are able to get it with different organizations and websites and things of that sort. And I'll make sure that you all see all those details. Also, it will be on the statecareers.wa.gov site, but you won't be able to apply through the state. You will be directed to Karras Consulting, just to make sure that everybody is seen by the recruiters, and they do it. But yeah, it's absolutely national.

Jim Vollendroff: That's great. And David and Ollie, I have been really impressed with the involvement of the Board in terms of the job description. I hope to be involved, and I'm assuming we will be in the line of

questioning that is developed. And as I have been meeting with folks in the community, I was just down in Rochester meeting with an individual yesterday. I'm asking questions of people like, what are the qualities you are looking for in a director as somebody in the industry? And so just really encouraging people to give us questions. Give us things to think about. We have got our own opinions about what we are looking both as a Board, as an organization, and I'm really interested in what the industry is looking for in a director, as well. So appreciate the suggested lines of questioning that I'm getting and would encourage people to let us know what they are looking for in a new director from a lot of different perspectives.

Chair Postman: Yeah. In fact, that's a good reminder, and not just the industry, but all our stakeholders. And one of the things that we can do now is when you meet somebody like you did yesterday, and they have some insight or ideas, we should send those names to the Karras' because they're going to start reaching out to people to get that kind of information, Jim.

Jim Vollendroff: That's great.

Chair Postman: What are you looking for as a stakeholder? What questions would you ask? All those sorts of things. And they told me yesterday they're really looking for is a broad list of names, and so we'll be sending them key legislators, the Governor's Office, people in the industry that really want to make sure that prevention and public health are represented there. Tribal governments. Anybody who we deal with on a regular basis, we should just come up with the names of people who we think would be helpful and send it to the Karras'. And they will reach out to them as they build this search. Because even though the job description is out there and the recruitment notice, that's just the starting bang. Right?

Jim Vollendroff: Yeah.

Chair Postman: And now comes the much harder work. And so the more we can tell them about what the community at large wants but also what the three of us want. This is our hire, and we need to keep thinking about what the qualifications are, the values, the experience that we specifically want to see in that position to take us to this next phase of our history. So I've been trying to think about that myself. And Rick obviously is super engaged in this process, as well, in helping them understand the industry at large and will be super helpful, I think, with connecting us with potential national organizations, where applicants might be looking as well.

Jim Vollendroff: Right. Thank you.

Ollie Garrett: I have a one-on-one scheduled with them this afternoon, so I think they are probably scheduling one-on-ones with all of us.

Jim Vollendroff: Yeah.

Ollie Garrett: Yeah.

Chair Postman: Yeah, yeah. Rick, you wanted to say something? Hold on, Rick.

Rick Garza: I appreciate the discussion. I just wanted to add that I want to make sure, I think I sent it to Jim. Ollie, I know we're meeting this afternoon, and I'll make sure you see it, but Karras put together a recruitment timeline that breaks up into three phases, and I want to make sure from the discussion that you're having right now that we've captured that in that timeline. And it gives obviously the first phase we're almost at the end of because the announcement that has, in fact, gone out. So I'll make sure you

get a copy of that. I know, Jim, I sent it to you. And David, I know you've been in those discussions with us from the beginning but appreciate the discussion. Thanks.

Chair Postman: Yeah. And the Karras' are as open as we need them to be. So don't ever hesitate if you have ideas or questions about the search or applicants or anything else. Just ping them, and they'll get back to you on this. I think they'll be really helpful. Okay. Anything else to report today from Ollie or Jim?

Jim Vollendroff: I have just one quick thing that I didn't want to take Marc's time since it seemed like he was time limited. But I did want to just let you know -- and I'm assuming you guys have access to it -- so in the meeting with Rick last week around the Legislative Session, I didn't have access to the drive in which the weekly reports and the tracking that Marc had put together was available to me. So Dustin has been working on that. I don't know if I've actually got access to it yet or not, but I just wanted to make sure that you guys had access to it and just let you know that I did not up until now. And so it's in process if you haven't had access to it.

Chair Postman: Great. I get the reports, but I'm sure Dustin will make sure we can all get into that and do that. Thanks for that heads up. Yeah.

Jim Vollendroff: That's it.

Chair Postman: Okay. All right. Great. Thank you, all. Good to see you. And we'll adjourn the Board Caucus Meeting for February 7, 2023. And we'll see you for EMT next on our Agenda. Right? Tomorrow afternoon.

Meeting adjourned at 10:37 am.

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

*Complete meeting packets are available online: http://lcb.wa.gov/boardmeetings/board_meetings
For questions about agendas or meeting materials you may email gretchen.frost@lcb.wa.gov or call 360.664.1656*

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