



Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board Meeting

Wednesday, April 12, 2023, 10:00 am
This meeting was held in a hybrid environment

Meeting Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair David Postman called the regular meeting of the Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board to order at 10:00 am on Wednesday, April 12, 2023. Member Ollie Garrett and Member Jim Vollendroff were also present.

2. UPDATES

2A - PESTICIDE UPDATE

Chandra Wax, Director of Enforcement and Education

Thank you, Chair Postman. Good morning, Board Chair, Board Members. I'm here today to provide a situation update reference DDE contaminants found in cannabis from several licensee locations in an area in eastern Washington. As you know, LCB conducts two types of tests on cannabis; quality control tests collected by licensees and submitted to state-certified labs and random samples collected by LCB staff and submitted to WSDA labs. Quality control tests evaluate cannabis for 59 pesticides listed in WAC 314-55-108, and WSDA labs test random samples for 243 pesticides. On March 1, 2023, the LCB received four results for random pesticide tests showing levels of DDE in cannabis foliage from the WSDA lab. WAC sets the actual limit for 59 of those 243 pesticides and establishes action limits for unspecified pesticides including DDE at 0.1 ppm (ppm).

The test results we received were above action limits at 0.17 ppm, 0.19 ppm, and 0.23 ppm. Staff recalled previous test results positive for DDE and reviewed them for a connection. Those test results received in January of 2023 had been referred to officers for investigation and reflected DDE levels above action limits at 0.15 ppm, 0.18 ppm, and 0.23 ppm. Further research into tests conducted in the immediate surrounding area identified two September 2022 samples with DDE results above that action limit, and both were at 0.14 ppm. While we were conducting this research and looking into these tests, it should also be noted that other test results came back from this area during the same time period containing DDE at less than action limits, specifically 0.079 ppm, 0.009 ppm, 0.036 ppm, 0.066 ppm, and 0.077 ppm, and one test had no evidence of DDE.

LCB consulted the Department of Ecology of cleanup locations in the region. We requested and received historic results with DDE detections from the WSDA lab looking at any DDE detections we received over the past few years. Eight of the nine additional detections of DDE were traced back to the same area that we have identified. That area is defined as a 5-mile stretch of land along the south end of the Okanogan River, just north of Lake Pateros. These pesticide samples were collected between 2019 and 2021 and include cannabis foliage and concentrate. Three of those results were below action limits, and five were above action limits. In both of those sample situations in 2020 and 2021, like what we just did last week, an admin hold was placed, and a licensee-initiated recall was conducted.

On April 5, 2023, so Wednesday of last week, we received a toxicologist report calculating the risk threshold for DDE, DDD, and DDT at the reported 0.1 ppm action with accumulative cancer risk in excess of one excess cancer case in a population of 100,000 individuals. On April 5 and 6, I worked with LCB staff, the Department of Ecology, the Department of Agriculture, and other advisors to develop a plan considering public health and safety, communication with our licensees, consistency with rule and past incidents, and the overall well-being of the industry. The plan included taking the standard action for pesticide failure to protect consumers to include placing admin holds, requesting a licensee-initiated recall, and requesting product distribution records. The plan identified steps to notify nearby licensees of the potential pattern identified by a review of data, as well as request distribution records, and soil, water, and product testing of each licensee in the identified area.

Finally, the plan identified the rules and policy teams' intent to develop an emergency rule and initiate long-term rulemaking to work with the industry and subject matter experts to address future concerns about DDE, DDD, and DDT in cannabis products. On April 6th, last Thursday, an LCB Captain called each of the five licensed locations with 2023 samples revealing DDE levels to inform them of the test results, admin hold, and request for a licensee initiated-recall personally. Upon conclusion of each of those phone calls, I sent an email to each licensee informing them of the same. In addition, an email was sent to the 13 other licensees in the area to let them know about the recent DDE findings and the intent to conduct product testing and soil and water testing with Ecology. After we contacted the 18 impacted licensees on April 6th, the LCB Communications team made sure a detailed message was shared with licensees, legislators, officials from the Okanogan area, local public officials, and stakeholders.

Between April 6th and April 10th we located and purchased on-shelf product from the 18 licensees and delivered the product to the WSDA lab for testing. Lab results from these tests are expected within 7 to 14 days. In addition, LCB staff were setting up four meetings that will happen over the next few days: one with our state-certified labs, one with impacted licensees, one with our trade associations, and one with partner agencies. On April 11, yesterday, LCB staff visited each of the licensed locations in the impacted area to conduct product testing. Samples were collected at 7 of the 18 locations. The other 11 locations didn't have any material on site. WSDA estimates expedited test results for these products to return within 7 to 14 days. LCB was accompanied by Ecology yesterday to collect soil and water samples at all 18

locations. Test results for water will be returned in 7 to 14 days, and the tests for soil will be returned in approximately 30 days.

While on site yesterday, staff was able to confirm recalls conducted from four of the five licensees with samples testing over action limits for DDE in 2022 and 2023. We will focus our efforts in the coming days on ensuring the contaminated products are properly recalled. At the same time, the Board will consider emergency rules and long-term rules to consider how the industry can safely move forward with the information from testing. We recognize the significant impact this has on licensees and the risk this poses to the public. We are acting responsibly, swiftly, and intentionally. Our goal is to ensure cannabis products are safe, and licensees and stakeholders are informed as updates are available.

Chair Postman: Okay. Great. Questions for the Director?

Member Garrett: So I was going to say thank you for the very detailed process. And I'm looking forward to seeing what comes of this once we get results back and meet with the people involved in this who are going to be impacted by this. So thank you.

Chair Postman: And even though we have postponed action on the emergency rules, you still obviously have existing authority for the testing that we need and administrative holds if necessary.

Chandra Wax: Yeah, the action -- yes. The action we've taken thus far is where we have confirmed DDE. We've placed holds so we can get a good idea of exactly where the DDE is and make sure that the cannabis products that our public is consuming are safe.

Chair Postman: And testing of products. You know, you've mentioned recalls earlier. Some effort here to try to find those. Do we know what is in the product that's on a shelf if there is anything?

Chandra Wax: We'll know in the next 7 to 14 days.

Chair Postman: That's in that category.

Chandra Wax: Mm-hmm.

Chair Postman: Okay. And the recalls, you said four or five of the impacted licenses. Correct?

Chandra Wax: Mm-hmm.

Chair Postman: What's the sense? The fifth? Is that a matter of time?

Chandra Wax: That's something we have a meeting today to work out.

Chair Postman: Okay, great.

Chandra Wax: Yeah.

Chair Postman: Okay, good. And these, again, are voluntary recalls where we've asked them to initiate.

Chandra Wax: We have asked them to initiate a recall. Right. And so if that didn't happen, I would need to bring to the Board -- my understanding is I would need to bring to the Board a request for a Board-initiated recall.

Chair Postman: Okay. All right. Just checking. Other questions from the Board at this point?

Member Vollendroff: No questions. But again, thank you for the information and the transparency in what we're doing here. I think it is really important, so thank you.

Chandra Wax: Thank you.

2B - SOCIAL EQUITY UPDATE

Becky Smith, Director of Licensing and Regulation

Becky Smith: Good morning, Chair Postman, Board Members Garrett, and Vollendroff. Thank you for giving me a few minutes to provide you with an update around social equity. We have had a few questions come in, so I wanted to address some questions as well. But first, I want to start with Business Licensing Services has informed us that they have received a handful of new applications each week, since we extended the window for social equity applications, so we're not getting hundreds and hundreds of applications. They really have just received a handful each week since that application window was extended. I also want to share that our third-party vendor, Ponder Diversity Group, who will be reviewing and scoring the applications, has finalized our application process with a video that provides guidance about how to complete the application.

I will share that my staff have been very involved in testing that application, reviewing it, making changes to it. The video will be very helpful to help folks just review that process and guide them through the process.

And then regarding questions, we have received a few questions about the number of people who can be on an application. I just want to mention there is no limit to the number of people who can be on an entity. However, 51% of the business must be owned by a person or persons who meet the social equity qualifications. When scoring the application, no matter how many people are on the application, they will only be able to receive 310 points. So people can get double the points for DIA area. People can get double the points for a felony or an arrest. They can only receive a maximum of 310 points.

Chair Postman: Can I ask you a question?

Becky Smith: Sure.

Chair Postman: So what you're saying is you can't exceed the allowable maximum there, but you can team up to reach that level.

Becky Smith: You can, but you can't get double the points for anything.

Chair Postman: Right, right. But if one person has one piece, another person has another piece, those both could be scored?

Becky Smith: Correct.

Chair Postman: All right. Thank you.

Becky Smith: And then just a reminder because we keep receiving this question as well, is that a person may only apply once, one time through Business Licensing Services. If they go into Business Licensing Services and they make changes, that will be their second application. Only the first application will be scored. So again, only the first application will be scored. And then we really encourage everyone to review the social equity checklist. It's very helpful. It provides really clear information about how to prepare for the application, continuing with how to prepare for the application. It provides links to training videos, helpful tips to understanding the process, and this hasn't changed since it was uploaded in late fall. We do continue to update the FAQs. For the FAQs that are most asked FAQs, they'll rise to the top because we want to make sure that everybody is receiving the same information.

I really encourage people to check out that website. Again, whenever a question is submitted to the portal, you know that our staff respond quickly. They want to make sure that information is shared because usually people have the same question. So that's all for my updates. Again, I thank you that we have a couple of more weeks for the application window to close. And, again, Ponder is ready to start processing those applications once the window closes. So, thank you.

3. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

ACTION ITEM 3A - Threshold Decision Delegation of Authority Regarding Tobacco and Vapor to Enforcement and Education

Chandra Wax, Director of Enforcement and Education

Chandra Wax: (HANDOUT 3A) Currently in the Agency, the Board has delegated authority to make decisions on license application denials for Cannabis and Liquor to the Division Directors, and Tobacco Tax and Vapor authority still remains with the Board. So I'm asking that the

decision-making authority be delegated to me to make that decision so that we would only bring any high-profile or serious denials to the Board for action.

Chair Postman: Okay. Any questions for the Director on this issue?

Member Vollendroff: No.

Chair Postman: If not, then I'll entertain a motion to Approve the Delegation of Authority regarding Tobacco and Vapor to Enforcement and Education.

Member Garrett made a motion to approve the delegation of authority. Member Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. RULEMAKING TIMELINES – ALL INDUSTRIES

Kathy Hoffman, PhD, Policy and Rules Manager

Kathy Hoffman: Thank you very much, Chair Postman. Good morning to you, and to Board Members Garrett and Vollendroff. I'll go ahead and start with Cannabis Rules in Progress right now. Starting with the Cannabis Advertising Project, Cassidy is working that project. We do have draft conceptual rules that we are reviewing internally. That will happen in the next couple of weeks. We have kind of slowed the pace down on that project a bit, given that we have legislation currently in play that affects those rules. So that's Senate Bill 5363 that concerns the size of signs and whether or not local jurisdictions can make decisions about the size of signs on retail premises. So that project remains on track, and we hope to have a CR 102 to you by early August, with the CR 103 by early September.

With respect to the minors on production facilities for cannabis facilities, we do intend to bring a CR 101 to you at some point in May. At this point, it looks like May 10th, so we can begin that project. But I do want to emphasize that the start date on that may be impacted by whatever legislation that we need to implement as a result of the current session. Quite a bit of rulemaking may come from the current Legislative Session. So we're keeping an eye on that and hope to bring it forward soon. But it might be adjusted based on legislative activity.

And then with respect to Cannabis sampling, we did have our focus group on March 22. We do have some draft conceptual rules that we're starting to take a look at today. And at this point, Jeff plans on bringing the CR 102 to you, so a proposal in early June with a CR 103, towards the middle of August. Just want to check in on Emergency Rules concerning social equity application window. The need for those rules expires on April 28th at 5 p.m. So we will bring a withdrawal to you at the next planned Board Meeting after that. So that would be May 10th. So that's it on Cannabis rules. Any questions I can answer there?

Member Vollendroff: I'm good. Thank you.

Kathy Hoffman: Okay, very good. So I'm moving into Alcohol Rules. With respect to the Class 13 Privilege Review, of course, the Board approved that CR 101 in March. We are on track to bring a 102 to you, so proposed rules toward middle or end of June with a CR 103 in early August. So work has just begun on that particular rule set with respect to private club memberships, and that's the CR 101 that the Board approved the last Board meeting, and that was triggered by a rule petition. We do plan on bringing the CR 102 to you on May 24th, with a CR 103 in mid-July.

And then finally, with respect to general rulemaking projects, the Cloud Storage Project keeps moving forward. Daniel's working on a survey that he'll be releasing later on this week, and then we'll be able to determine our next steps in that project moving forward. But under the current timeline, we would have a 102 to you by the end of June, with possible rules being presented proposed rules for adoption on August 30 of this year. And we do have active rule petitions. We're going to speak to two of them today. There's a third active rule petition that's asking the Board to change a statute by way of rulemaking. I will be bringing our response to that petition to the Board on April 26th, so that's the next regularly scheduled Board meeting. Happy to answer any questions, if any, although we did discuss this yesterday.

5. CANNABIS RELATED RULEMAKING

ACTION ITEM 5A – Board Adoption of Emergency Rules (CR 103E) Regarding New Section WAC 314-55-580 – Production of Cannabis in Areas Affected by DDT and its Breakdown Derivatives, and Amended Section WAC 314-55-108 Regarding Pesticide Action Levels

Kathy Hoffman, PhD, Policy and Rules Manager

Chair Postman: (HANDOUT 5A) We are still sort of moving around here a little bit. But let's move to Action Item A, the Discussion of the Board Adoption of Emergency Rules. Stay with us for a second, Kathy, and for my fellow Board Members, too. I would propose that we're not ready to adopt this today. So rather than have Dr. Hoffman go through this now, I think it needs another look by all of us as well as key staff. There are questions I think about both the areas that we're talking about, the extent of what the emergency rules do. We're still waiting on soil testing. So there are a lot of things in the air. And I'll pause there because this I know. If not, of course, talk to my fellow Board Members about this. And I don't know that we have to actually vote on a postponement, but we certainly should have a consensus if there is one. If there is not, happy to discuss that, but I would look to my fellow Board Members here for comments or concerns about putting this off.

Member Garrett: This is Ollie, and I think we should. I think seeing the impact that it would have on businesses and with all of the comments we're getting in that we really do need to pause and take a look at everything before we make this decision. So I agree.

Chair Postman: Good.

Member Vollendroff: And this is Jim. I, one, appreciate all of the comments that have been sent in. I have read every single one of them, and I concur. I think it gives us reason to just sit back and think about some of the questions that were brought up and give us a little bit more time to think about the final decision. So I concur.

Chair Postman: Okay. Then let's do that. And we will have some follow-up conversations, of course, about any individual questions Board Members have about this and what we do about that. We also have some meetings coming up with licensees in the impacted area. This will give us an opportunity to hear from them more directly. We are also waiting on soil testing and other things. So I think that it just behooves us to hit pause on that. So I'm going to take that as consensus to do that, and we'll just move that.

6. GENERAL RULEMAKING

ACTION ITEM 6A – Rules Petition Review and Consideration Requesting Addition of Global Entry Cards to the List of Approved Identification

Kathy Hoffman: (HANDOUT 6A) Thank you, Chair Postman. And, again, thanks for the opportunity to meet with the Board today to go over this request for a petition for adoption of the amended rule. And we discussed this in Caucus week before last, I believe, in more detail, but just for a brief overview, this was a petition received on February 27th that asked the Board to consider amending WAC 314-11-025 to add Global Entry Cards as one of the acceptable forms of ID for alcohol products. And so the issue before the Board today to consider is whether we should initiate rulemaking to consider amending that specific WAC to add Global Entry Cards to the list of acceptable forms of ID. The Board does have the statutory authority to engage in this rulemaking, and I think we spoke about that last week. Briefly rule background. Original rules describing acceptable forms of ID were originally promulgated or put into effect in March of 2001, and they've been changed since that time to add passport cards and Nexus Cards in 2018 and then Tribal Identification Cards were added to that list in late 2019.

There is a little bit of a difference between Global Entry Cards and Nexus Cards. I go into that in the analysis that I provided you. And we've discussed that already, so I won't go into that here with respect to divisional, interagency, and intergovernmental impacts. Licensing has noted that they don't see that there's going to be significant impact to their division if the Board contemplates rulemaking in this space. Enforcement and Education offered that it would also -- they are supportive of the change as well. It wouldn't impact their operations. Although they do know that there's a risk in approving more options for acceptable forms of ID. It does add a little more responsibility to a clerk or bartender who might actually accept a counterfeit or fraudulent form of ID in this space. There was no feedback from Finance or IT because, clearly, this doesn't impact those divisions.

Public Health and Prevention shared many of the concerns that Enforcement did, but that was the extent of their concern. In terms of interagency impact, there is really no impact to the Department of Health, Labor, and Industries with respect to intergovernmental impact. Tribes will begin utilizing similar cards in coming years. So this change poses no concern to them at this point. There is a bit of DEIB social equity impact to consider. Now, this does broaden the type of ID that we accept, so that, I think, contemplates sort of DEIB in social equity landscape. So any questions there before I move into options?

Member Vollendroff: I do have just one question.

Kathy Hoffman: Please.

Member Vollendroff: I just want to make sure I heard the concerns about potential fraud or fake IDs, if you will. I just want to make sure there's no other additional risk aside from what we would normally get with driver's license or other forms of acceptable ID that I'm missing.

Kathy Hoffman: I don't think there are, Board Member Vollendroff. I think it's the same sort of risks that we assume when we're contemplating the forms of ID that we already accept, if that makes sense.

Member Vollendroff: Great. Thank you. Yeah.

Kathy Hoffman: You're welcome. Thank you. So three options for the Board to consider and, of course, these are consistent with statute. The first is to deny the petition at this point. It may unintentionally -- in our risk, there is that it may unintentionally exclude a type of acceptable form of ID that's already identified in rule, and that's clearly the Global ID Card because it's so related to the Nexus Card. The second benefit, I would say, is to maintain current alignment with tobacco and vapor law pertaining to acceptable forms of ID. And I'll talk about where there's a bit of a gap there in a moment, so that's option one. Option two is to deny the petition and offer an alternative approach. And there is some risk in just issuing guidance. There really -- guidance can be sort of salient, I guess, is a fair way to say it. And it doesn't really provide the sort of regulatory predictability that certainly our licensees are interested in having in this space.

And it also may allow a particular activity to occur before it's expressed in rule. So that's an instance where we might issue an interpreter or policy statement that sort of almost acts as a stopgap until we can get to rulemaking. So that's one option. That's the second option. And the final is to accept the rule petition. And there's always a risk when we accept a rule petition that the request may not ultimately become rule. Additionally, if accepted, making this change in Alcohol rules may set different standards for Alcohol and Cannabis and Tobacco and Vapor product rules. And that's because forms of ID are discussed in Vapor and Tobacco from a statutory stance. Right? Those standards are set in statute, whereas for Cannabis and Alcohol, they are not. So we'll have to do some adjustment there to bring alignment to those rules.

And then a benefit of going into rulemaking at this point is because it adds an additional option to the existing list of acceptable forms of ID that recognizes both US and international citizens beyond what we do right now. So, I will stop there. And I'm happy to answer any questions.

Chair Postman: Any further questions, we'll let you know. Somebody have a motion?

Member Vollendroff made a motion to initiate rulemaking to add Global Entry Cards to the list of approved identifications. Member Garrett seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. ALCOHOL RELATED RULEMAKING

ACTION ITEM 7A – Rules Petition Review and Consideration Requesting Allowance of Wine Lockers in Restaurants

Jeff Kildahl, Policy and Rules Coordinator

Jeff Kildahl: (HANDOUT 7A) Thank you, Chair Postman. Good morning, Board Members Garrett, and Vollendroff. Thank you for this opportunity to present a request for the creation of a new administrative rule. This morning, I'm presenting the Agency's response to a petition for rulemaking received on February 23, 2023, from Rachel Escalle of NGMA Group. The petition requests creation of a new rule section entitled 314-WAC to allow restaurants to offer secure wine lockers so that customers can purchase wine in advance of consumption and keep the wine they have purchased in storage lockers at the licensed restaurant premises. The issue before the Board with this petition is consideration of whether the Board should initiate the rulemaking process to consider creating a new rule allowing restaurant licensees to store bottled wine owned by individual patrons in secure lockers on the restaurant premises for later on-premises consumption.

Under the requested rule, installing a wine locker would function to allow a restaurant to offer a service to securely store wine already purchased by patrons at the restaurant for future consumption. As noted by the petitioner in previous contact with the Agency, the locker service would only be available for privately owned wine that was originally purchased from the restaurant licensee. The petition and attached letter specify that wine locker storage would be for wine only with no other spirits or other items stored there. And it notes that the privately owned stored wine could only be served to the patron by the MAST-certified restaurant employees that are accustomed to following usual line service practices. By way of analysis, we see that the Board has statutory authority under RCW 66.24.320 to issue the wine restaurant license. And this is the license that allows the restaurant to sell wine at retail for on-premises consumption usually with a meal.

Also related to wine sales RCW 66.24.400(2) creates a separate license endorsement that allows restaurant licensees to sell bottled wine to their patrons for later off-premises consumption. Under these two scenarios, wine sold by a restaurant licensee is either sold for

immediate consumption with a meal, or in the case of a restaurant licensee with the endorsement, the wine may be also sold to patrons for consumption away from the premises. In reviewing 66.24.320 and 66.24.400, neither clearly allow a restaurant licensee to offer wine locker storage services to their patrons nor do they directly prohibit a restaurant from offering a wine locker service. Additionally, neither at 66.24.400 rules in existing rules in WAC section 314.11.065 specifically restrict the length of time that that wine may be held on the restaurant licensees' premises before it is consumed or removed. So there are several impacts with wine lockers that were identified by the Agency divisions.

The Licensing division reports that some licensed retailers are allowed to recork wine that was purchased with a meal, and some are authorized by rules in WAC 314.11.065 to allow their customers to bring their own wine with them to the premises for consumption with their meal, but the licensee is not permitted to store the wine that is owned by the customer. The Enforcement and Education Division identifies very little risk or impact for public safety to this activity as proposed by the petitioner. But the Division recommends safeguards to only allow licensees or the employees to hold the keys to the wine locker to make sure that the storage service would only be for wine and not for spirits. A wine locker endorsement could be revoked or modified if there are problems that arise. The licensee could be or would be accountable for any violations related to the lockers. And there would need to be a consideration of whether product quantity discounts could be offered here because of the capacity for storage of the unused wine.

From the perspective of Public Health and Prevention, these parameters should be considered to look at what other extra benefits might be offered to those who purchase a wine locker. We should be looking at those potential benefits and potential harms that could arise. And also from Public Health and Prevention, we have the question that whilst servers should ensure that over-service doesn't occur, it may be more difficult to prevent someone from consuming wine that they have already purchased and stored on the premises. And one more perspective from social equity, there appears to be significant social equity concerns surrounding wine lockers.

The request to allow wine locker storage could be seen as an expansion of Liquor rule privileges to benefit only the restaurant patrons who have the means to expand their options for consumption at the restaurant. Restaurant licensees are already permitted in WAC 314.11.065(1)(b) to allow their patrons to bring bottled wine they already own with them to the restaurant. But this privilege most likely benefits only a small percentage of overall restaurant customers. So I'll stop at this point and ask if there are any questions so far before I proceed to potential options for this petition.

Chair Postman: Yeah. Thanks. And we may be aware of the options. I'm not sure we'll have to go on. Any questions from the Board on this? Do we want to just discuss before we ask Jeff to go any further, whether this is something anyone is inclined to do? My suggestion would be that we don't accept this. I just can't see that it reaches the level of priority for our rules team right now given what's on the agenda, and more to come. But I have no objection to it as a thing, but it's just hard to have it rise to that level.

Member Vollendroff: I'm of the same opinion. I mean, I'm not necessarily opposed to it. But I also look at the workload and the significant requests that are before us. And I don't know if we can say we're tabling it and maybe consider it later or whatever. I did have one question, Jeff, and I don't know if you answered this, but I was thinking as you were talking about the potential for disputes. "I have my wine there. It's in storage at a restaurant. And I think that somebody's been drinking my beverage," and if that's been thought about or concerned. But, anyway, I thought about that. But I concur, David, I am less likely to recommend that we take this on at this point.

Member Garrett: And this is Ollie. I agree.

Chair Postman: Okay. Then why don't we just jump to that? And I would entertain a motion to decline the rules petition that would have allowed wine lockers in restaurants.

Member Garrett made a motion to deny the petition. Member Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

8. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Postman invited citizens to address the Board regarding any issues related to LCB business.

Jim MacRae: Good morning, Chair Postman, Board, staff, and attendees within the room and online. Thank you very much for doing what you've done today. I submitted my testimony earlier in writing. I don't really have much to add to that. So I'm going to go on a slightly different tangent today. This is very likely the last time I will address the group as a group in the context of a Board meeting. So it's been a nice seven years of doing that, but I think I'm done with this. Today was a very good meeting, and I want to thank you for making a couple of the actions you did today. One was considering taking things out of order, but also not acting in what I clearly believe to be prematurely on a rule and emergency rule that was arguably not really meeting an emergent issue. I would very much like, if possible, to get a copy or two, if you could make available a copy of the toxicity report that Chief Wax mentioned, as being the instigator of doing these things between the fifth and the sixth of April. I thought that was very important. If you do that urgently, that would be great.

If it's up online, I'll get it if it's available. I'd like to know also, if she can speak to it, or if anybody can. Was that something that the LCB solicited? Or is it just something that was out there that was grabbed, and somebody said, "Ooh, ooh, DDD is bad stuff." Thank you, as well, for reaffirming my faith in this emerging new Board. I think you're all confirmed now. If not, I hope you are soon. I had lost faith in the Board, to be frank, and that was the old Board. I had felt good about the Board since you joined it, Chair Postman, and I have really felt better as things have progressed beyond that. And I'm so glad to see Ollie back for another term. I think she's

done some good stuff and you all will do your jobs. Today, you showed me that you are willing to question. You are willing to -- you're not a rubber stamp. And so thank you so much for that.

I really do hope I get an opportunity to speak to each of you probably individually, given the way the rules work but over the phone or something or even in person over maybe a beer or a wine, if someone's not stolen all your wine, Jim. I am the other Jim that worries about that happening, possibly irrationally. There are three topics I do want to talk to you each about. Not today. Right? But just if I can. One is transparency in the Sunshine Act and as that relates to the public records function within the Agency. Chair Postman, I would love to speak with you about that. Another one is, and it's a learning I took from the Garza thing where I made the mistake of interpreting salary data as salary data. And from that I've got some evidence as something that I have a question on, which I'd like an answer to before I start spouting off on my blog about it. And it's probably best with either Ollie or Chair Postman, but it relates to a pretty strong suggestion of ethnic bias in hiring and positioning practices within your Agency.

It's very strong evidence, but it's limited. It's like one really stunning case, and it could be explainable, and I just can't see how it'd be explainable. I'd like to talk to somebody about that. And then the final one is really the risk-benefit balance in the Agency between prevention and medicinality. And, Jim, if I could talk -- or Board Member Vollendroff if I could talk to you at some point about that, I would really much like to. You guys are on the right track. Keep it up. It's an important job. I know it's been nice working with you these years. Bye.

Christopher King: Oh, great because I'm here, I'm definitely here. All right? And I know a lot of times Sami Saad complains that that happens to him when he signs up and then you guys don't call on him. But yeah, so anyway, guys. Yeah. Wonderful. Great to see you. Great to see you. I want to talk today about solidarity and what that means. Okay? Because the other day I got some people who I used to work with telling me I'm crazy and this and that and the other and I'm an attention hound and all this, that, and the other, and I responded. I said, "Wait a minute. Let's talk about solidarity and who the real civil rights leaders who -- what have people done?" Like the Seattle Mayor, Bruce Harrell, he touts himself as a civil rights attorney. I don't know if he's ever won a civil rights jury trial for people. I have, white and black. All right? So I mean, I talked about results and reality. Okay? And in reality, I'm going to refer you to an old story, Jerry Doyle.

Jerry Doyle was a client of mine back in the late 90s in Columbus, Ohio. See the title there? You Can Fight City Hall. That's not true so much anymore. But back in that day when we still had real alternative press covering things, they would cover my cases. Jerry Doyle was a person who really angered the establishment. He's an original pamphleteer, and he would go out and get a newsletter. And he worked at a senior home where abuse was happening. And he criticized the government because the city council would pay for the Ku Klux Klan to march in and pay for that, and he didn't like it. So it's his constitutional right to come before them every Board meeting and say the same exact thing if he wants to about that. But they cut him off and did not let him speak, so I sued the heck out of the city, and they made it go away. Okay? Because the government has a certain solidarity that you guys enjoy, too. All right?

It's in your media contacts. It's in your judicial contacts. It's all there. And basically, the government, the federal court found a way to make it go away and say that his rights weren't violated. But then naturally after that, they never did that again. They would call him to speak because I sued him. All right? I remember when my girlfriend even made City Council cookies one time, and we got that on video. It was a hoot. Anyway, here's the deal. Our solidarity as people will not be compromised. We may have some infighting here and there, and that happens. Some of us may go by the wayside. I don't know. That happens. And I'm not going to name names. But what I will say is this, I knew that I would fall on a sword for Jerry Doyle, and nothing was going to back me off of my position. In this instance, we've seen people like Peter Manning back up their positions, start bad-talking me and this and that and the other. I'm not having it at all. All right?

Because the bottom line is I got solidarity beyond BMWs, by the way, with Peter's lawyer, and we both know that the way that this so-called Social Equity Program is set up, it's set up for another round of abuse where white folks are going to come in and find a way to capitalize. I just -- we just know it. All right there -- we just know this. All right? We talked about it. All right? So we have that kind of solidarity, the same way that you have solidarity with the media, knowing that only certain people are going to get on your so-called social equity stories. All right? They're not going to contact us. When they contact Aaron Barfield or me, they disappear. Poof! You know? And I look back and, I mean, I work for daily wages [audio cuts out] weekly. And Chair Postman, you know. You were a daily journalist at the Seattle Times. They no longer cover our stories. Listen, that's an implicit solidarity that you guys have. All right? And I'm telling you that there are enough of us out here who are here to tell the truth. And it's like this again, Hawken School, Professor Pickering. What is truth? What is worth knowing? And how do we go about making value judgments? Okay? In those three things, I am fully confident in everything that I do that everything and everybody around me, we are confident in that, and history will reflect...

Dustin Dickson: Christopher, that's your time.

Christopher King: Very good. Thank you. Goodbye

Burl Bryson: Okay. All right. I'll get my camera on here as well. So thank you very much for the Board. I appreciate the time to address these issues today. Thank you for making the decision that you did to wait a minute and gather information, meet with the stakeholders, and also to observe the science on these issues. I'm very interested in seeing the [indistinct] that we do have for the positive tests that Ms. Wax talked about earlier. Hopefully, those will be made to the public any information that needs to be redacted as far as farms. That's fine, but this information should be made available to the industry. So I also want to encourage the Board to prioritize testing with the WSDA. This is a really timely issue. So I know that there was a piece of equipment that went down last year, and resources were diverted towards testing hops versus testing cannabis, which resulted in a backlog, which is why we're only now being notified

about results that were from last year's crop in August and September when those samples were taken.

So my understanding is that the equipment is back online. The dedicated FTEs that are there to test cannabis are doing that again to the extent possible. Any additional resources or monies to the WSDA to get them to prioritize this cannabis testing now versus other products when you know, obviously, cannabis funds were diverted for testing other products. Let's have the priority be getting these products tested as soon as possible for public health reasons and also for the companies that are involved -- the licensees. I would also like to encourage that funds be made available for at least the two preeminent 502 labs confidence in Medicine Creek to be able to spin up a testing program as well. I understand that it will take some time and certainly some dollars for these private labs to get up to speed and testing. And I think those funds should be made available by the Board to allow these labs to get up to speed as quickly as possible for testing DDE and DDD.

The public should be aware, and I think all outdoor crops in the state should be tested for those as part of the 57 pesticides that are regularly tested. And all 502 labs should ultimately be online in order to be able to test for these chemicals, ensure the public that the product that they're consuming is safe and free of these chemicals. I would also like to encourage the Board to follow the science and to work with WSDA, Department of Ecology, and make good decisions as far as that is concerned and let the science rule, let the science dictate the actions that are taken. My understanding is that the FDA standard for inhalation of tobacco products containing DDE is set at 0.4 ppm. I also understand from the labs it's almost impossible to get a zero detect or any rules around zero detects are not laboratory possible. So I would encourage the Board to take on the federal standard unless there is persuasive scientific evidence that a different standard should be taken. I'd also like the Board to consider emergent resources to the affected licensees and to their employees. Certainly, in other industries that have undergone a similar sort of emergent situations where their employees are unable to work, or licensees are put at risk, there had been resources available to those licenses and to those employees to the extent that that is possible.

Gene Hainey: Right. Good day, ladies and gentlemen. I am Gene Hainey representing Walden Cannabis. I don't have much to say to be honest, other than showing my support for my colleagues and concern for our customers. As good actors in this industry, we take public safety, compliancy, and regulation very seriously. This has been a challenging market, and we have endured and grown from a small company to one that gave me, personally, the competence to start a family. Please consider the lives impacted during this process. Transparency is a word that has been thrown around quite a bit during this discussion on emergency rulemaking. I cannot speak for the other affected licensees, but transparency is unequivocally not -- let me repeat -- unequivocally not a word I would use as to how this was handled with our license. This lack of transparency and for lack of a better word, sloppy approach has already damaged our business quite a bit. I implore you to take a more measured, transparent, and collaborative approach than the Enforcement and Education Division has thus far.

This is a chance for licensees and the LCB to work together in the interest of public safety and help build trust within the industry and community. Please allow us to take an active role in this. With this level of uncertainty that has been provided today, we cannot plan. Even though the administrative hold on our licenses for the test results are for test results that fall below EPA guidelines for tobacco. My family relies on the money I make. Unemployment benefits are three weeks out due to COVID. Me and my colleagues cannot afford that. This is already preordained because of the injudicious decision that has already happened. This was the direct result, contrary to the Board's statement here today, of a lack of transparency. Thank you for listening.

Sami Saad: Yes, sir. Thank you so, so much about that. I just wanted to say about two issues. One issue about those products. You guys should have test, randomly test every time because they are infecting people. You know? Like they have -- they use, they use stuff -- some people getting sick. And the problem is not the retailer, the problem is the grower. So suspending license from retailer have nothing got to do with that. The growers. The second issue. What is done for us as a pioneer? We started this first. I am one of those people. My community. And I just sent to -- yesterday, I sent the Justice for African American Forced out of Washington cannabis. That's a petition going online. And it's my pictures there. My community is there. Sherry McLean. Jennifer from the City of Seattle. All the social equity groups are there. We're just looking for fairness. We are not hating anyone.

The second, the third, the last thing I want to share -- I went to the Equity Summit, and Mr. Mendoza was there. I've been disrespected by Joyce and the people that have the event and physically attacked, and I report it to the police. I'm physically attacked there by a guy he -- they was -- went after their friend. They was hiring him, making himself as a security. I've been very disrespected. The whole community seen it. I don't know. I'm not an enemy. I have a license. My license been taken. You know, I start being in the canopy industry since day one. It's not fair. It's not fair. I am the only Muslim in there. I am African. I am not African-American. That's separating myself while African-American. We all black. But the black is a big community, and we have to recognize that. We have to recognize the people who started this first. It's not fair when I see -- I'm not myself as they.

I already applied like everybody else, and I think they're programming every single thing I'm telling you guys today. I have convicted felony with me on my license. And people live in a designated area. So I meet everything in that program and the previous owners. I want to see what's going to happen at the end. I fit the program exactly because I have a lawyer set it up exactly. I fit the program more than 100%. It's just not fair if we didn't get. Joyce and her brother, Mendoza he was speaking at the time, I respected him that was a pioneer. They are not a pioneer. We are the Pioneer before them. I've been disrespected by Joyce. Joyce told me this. Joyce, the one that own Holland farm. I said, Joyce. She said, "Sam, we can help you. Come over here. Don't tell those black people what's going on.

I said, "Joyce, this is about all of them." She said, "I don't care about those broke people. This is the ones you want to run for our City Councilor, Joyce. The same like Paula, what she did to

me. I'm not enemy with nobody. It was you guys. Much respect for you guys, but we have to correct this. And the second thing is, I'm encouraging you guys for the safety and the health of the people. You guys have to having those tests to all those shops, and the one that we punish those they own those farms. They are responsible because the seller they always selling product getting from them it should be being tested right, and that test is not right. All those tests is not right. So it needs to be educated. Much respect for all of you guys. I wish you guys the best. But you guys need to acknowledge us as a pioneer. Me, Kevin Shelton, Libby, and all of us. We apply like everybody else. We need to be acknowledged. I need to see 12 Green, and I apply by 12 Green, LLC.

Shayla Adams-Pfeiffer: Okay, thank you. I really appreciate tabling the pesticide emergency enforcement. And I can't tell you all of the emotions that I went through because it was the entire -- it was the entire company [audio cuts out] cannabis that went through all of these emotions together. We thought we were shut down. We were [audio cuts out] coming back and [audio cuts out] which is almost [audio cuts out], but all of the evidence that we have seen and you've provided us have shown the clinical that is showing up is [audio cuts out] --

Chair Postman: I'm afraid you cut out a little bit there, and now we can't hear you. It sounds like you may have a bad connection.

Dustin Dickson: She dropped.

Chair Postman: She dropped. Okay, I'm sorry. Well, if you see her pop up let me know. I can call on Terry Lane or Corey Bittner. There's Corey. Hey, Corey. You should be able to go ahead.

Corey Bittner: Good morning, everyone. I appreciate the time that we're being allowed to make a statement here. I am here today to express profound frustration and disappointment with the response by the LCB regarding this potential DDE contamination at our farm. I'm the Administrative Manager for Walden, and this investigation, which has been conducted in secret without the involvement of producer processors that are being targeted is built upon the series of scientific misunderstandings, the result of which is a proposed strongarm resolution that will ruin lives and close highly taxed businesses. I strongly believe that the way the LCB went about this investigation and the subsequent actions afterwards should tell people everything they need to know about the invalidity of the entire process. Let me start with reviewing the way that the LCB allowed potentially contaminated products to sit on shelves for months, if not years.

By their own admission, the LCB has known about this potential contamination for at least six months while the investigation was ongoing if not much longer by some reports. Instead of allowing farms to cooperate in removing these potentially harmful products from shelves and out of the hands of consumers, there is no information given to the producer processors at all until after the decision to shut our business was made. This left customers with potentially deadly products in their homes and in their bodies for months if not years. This is completely unacceptable for a public service entrusted to regulate cannabis and keep consumers safe.

Moreover, the sudden closure of our business without any warning has left our workers and their families in turmoil, wondering if they would still have a job to come back to.

Our livelihoods have been jeopardized by LCB's actions, and the reputation of our company is in tatters due to the LCB treating producer processors like villains instead of unaware citizens. Overall, the LCB's response has been unsatisfactory to put it mildly. I, along with my coworkers and colleagues, are still left with many unanswered questions. The way this investigation was conducted was not science-based and was flawed in its approach from the very start, only to be followed up by a potential ruling that has no foundation or merit to speak of. Despite a delay in a decision today, our farm still remains arbitrarily closed. We urge the LCB to conduct a thorough review of their investigation process and to involve us in these processes moving forward to ensure transparency and fairness.

We implore the LCB to explore options that allow science to lead the way to a solution. We are committed to finding a resolution to this issue and to ensure the safety of our community and the continuation of our business filled with hard-working real people. Thank you for your attention and understanding. I sincerely hope for a considerate decision by the LCB that is based on reality and awareness rather than a thoughtless reaction to a non-Bayesian investigation. Thank you.

Ray March: All right. Good morning, Board Members and fellow supporters of the outdoor industry. I just want to say that the effect of this untimely decision as far as how the LCB is handling this is causing people to have to file for unemployment. And unemployment, for all the COVID things going on right now, it is uncertain on its own, too. So people have to pay their bills, and people have to take care of their families, feed their families, and they do this by being employed by these farms. And I want to support Walden Cannabis because they have helped me and my family personally by paying what needs to be paid and just allowing me to work daily in and out with good people and good intentions on trying to grow cannabis that is sun grown naturally, trying to feed the ground the best organic practices possible. And we're getting penalized for prior practices that have been promoted throughout history as far as before the DDT and all that was taken down and gotten rid of because they figured out what the damage it has done.

It was promoted -- widely promoted and used throughout many farms and orchards, not just for cannabis because cannabis was illegal at the time. But it's amazing that the ones who are trying to repair the damages and not use these chemicals are the ones being affected by it today. And I just hope that the LCB and farms that they are looking after, can work as a team and work alongside each other instead of against each other. It's uncalled for. You know? And it's surprising that they're not even taking into consideration the lives of the people that they're affecting with these untimely decisions. There needs to be more information, more transparency because it's just not going to work out. People are going to constantly look at the LCB as an enemy if they're not going to work alongside each other. And that's not what anybody wants.

Everybody wants to just get the job done the best way they can and just work together by just communicating and just being understanding and trying to follow the scientific guidelines on what has been used in the past as far as tobacco, and all the other crops that are out there. And I just want to thank the Board Members for taking the time to listen to us because these are our lives. You know? And it's just that it's going to affect a lot of people and just people that I love that are in this industry. And it's just full of loving people, people who want to take care of the land and take care of the people that are around them. And in order to do that, they need to work. They need to be able to pay what costs come up, and the only way to do that is to continue to allow us to do business. And I hope that we can figure something out because I'm currently on unemployment, and it's not something I planned for. You know?

And that's something that was out of nowhere, and it's not something I wanted to do, but it's something that I was forced to do. And I want to continue working and paying taxes like everybody else does. And just the industry alone has brought in a bunch of taxes as far as creating jobs and just helping the community. And I can express all day how Walden has helped the community, but that will take more than just four minutes. So I just want to thank Walden Cannabis for doing what they do and hope they fight and continue to fight for what they believe in in growing a great quality product. And thank you Board Members for your time. You guys take care of yourselves. And everybody out there, take care.

Ben Cottrell: Good morning from Okanagan. I'm hoping today to appeal to the Board's emotional and logical reason. I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed emergency ruling that seeks to lower the DDE threshold in cannabis products to 0.0. This decision lacks a solid foundation in scientific evidence and deviates significantly from the federal guidelines established by the EPA with regard to DDE. Moreover, the implementation of this ruling would have severe consequences on employment and the livelihoods of many individuals. As a team member of the facility of Walden Cannabis, I can attest complete compliance and transparency throughout the course of this investigation. Since the collection of the initial test samples, I have been in communication with the compliance consultants to inquire about the implications of these tests and their subsequent results on our company.

At no point during the discussion was it ever apparent to me or told to me that we would possibly potentially be shut down due to the DDE in our cannabis products. It is highly inappropriate for an Agency tasked with setting guidelines and ensuring public safety and health to conduct an investigation in such a discreet manner, which not only jeopardizes public health but also affects the livelihoods of numerous individuals and employees. The approach adopted by the Liquor and Cannabis Board in this matter has been unprofessional and devoid of scientific evidence provided by the EPA. I kindly request that you reconsider the proposed emergency rulings and take into account the potential consequences for both public health and the livelihood of those involved in this industry. Thank you for your time.

Milo Ackerman: My name is Milo Ackerman. I work at Walden, a small but closely-knit company of cannabis producers. However, this statement is done from my own perspective, and none of the views I display will be on behalf of the company but rather in the interest to save the family

that I found in this company. According to Dante F. Placido and Charles Seeley of the USDA ARS Western Regional Research Center, cannabis shows tremendous potential in removing harmful contaminants from the soil. Despite this amazing ability, cannabis plants are still displaying amounts far below limits set for tobacco by the EPA. If cannabis cleans the land, it seems counterintuitive to put laws in to stop it from being produced in areas that need to be cleansed. We can only benefit from the land having less and less of this as generations go on, especially when considering Walden, who uses beneficial insects as their pesticide.

Why would you financially devastate those who are doing the work that will even remove the need for this regulation at all in time? This farmland is necessary. If you shut it down, you will only be dealing with it later and in a different item, but that item will be far less easy to regulate. Furthermore, you sat on information for years. Who does that protect? How is that transparent? You'll also be putting 50 people in my company alone out of a job. That's already \$80,000 a month in unemployment payouts, none of which will make its way back in the economy because we will just be living to survive. Not to mention the thousands of dollars in investments and crops lost. The thousands of dollars of taxes that don't go back into the economy, destroying perfectly consumable cannabis. This will affect small businesses, real people, the greatest of all.

Very recently, we experienced what we thought was our last day together. I watched tears fall and turned my eyes in respect from long hugs while also indulging my own. I cannot describe to you the joy I had upon being able to come back in to work even after such a short time to see the wall behind me plastered with pictures of animals and children. These people are real, they are tangible. If you must take action, I beg of you to not ruin lives and dreams but to set the level reasonably. Let consumers be aware of the risks and make their own decisions as they always have. Sylvia Kay on Fair Trade Cannabis said the focus of Fair Trade Cannabis must be to empower small and traditional producers in the cannabis trade based on a number of first-order principles, market strategies, and public policies. Crucially, growers must be enabled to advocate for appropriate frameworks and interventions. This is what all of the growers are saying. Thank you.

Brian Sheehan: I apologize for any background noise. We are currently in a cow pasture. But I'm here today in support of Walden. Walden is what brought me to Washington State six years ago for the sole reason I left Illinois. I moved there and didn't know anybody, but I still found a family there. I know Walden is trying to do the best that they can in the most environmentally responsible way. Over the years, we did things the hard way when there was a much easier alternative. It wasn't the best way an easier alternative. Even throughout Walden, I joined the local fire department. And while there, Walden management encouraged me to leave work to respond to calls as needed. During the wildfires, we spent two weeks -- all of our employees -- doing fire relief efforts, and Walden paid us through those two weeks to do those relief efforts. There are multiple news articles written about it, and you can find it through a quick Google search.

All this is to say that I know Walden's management and team want to do the best thing. They want to work with the LCB to find what's right. I encourage you to keep listening to the people,

look at the science, look at what the federal government has outlined as far as tolerable levels, and just try to do the right thing. Think of the 10s and 10s of people just at Walden alone that they are staring down the barrel of unemployment right now, scrambling to figure out what's next. Walden specifically employs a lot of great people in a portion of the valley that doesn't have much else to offer people. They pay great wages, they go out of their way to help employees, and they're just really great people. And I encourage you to work with them to find a solution that works for Walden, the LCB, and the consumers. Thank you. That's all I've got.

Miles Boyd: All right. My name is Miles Boyd. I'm the Exec Manager for Walden Cannabis. I've worked here since 2020, when the pandemic ended my 10-year-long career as a chef. I came out of high school, right into culinary school, cooked my entire adult life. And when my career ended, I was devastated. I had no other usable skills to speak of. And after months of uncertainty and surviving on employment and trying to plan what career I wanted to try next, my cousin helped me get a job here at Walden Cannabis. It was the best decision I've ever made. It's a brand-new industry growing bigger every year, and I was so fortunate to get in sort of this new industry. And I'm always the type of person that missed the boat. It's also usually hard finding friends after 30, but everybody here is my friend. They made it so easy. They're friendly and they genuinely want to help you improve and learn. They care about the environment and renewable resources. They are people who are in no way responsible for the amount of scrutiny that they're facing right now.

These people will lose their jobs if this rule passes. We were given no time to prepare for this change. We were given even less time to prepare to defend ourselves. But you can see so many people still showed up to try. I read the rulemaking order. There's a lot to it, and there's a lot to be concerned about. Some of the facts aren't as straightforward as the general public would think when initially reading it. Like it states very strongly that DDT and its derivatives cause harmful damage to the nervous system, liver, and reproductive system, which isn't exactly what the study says. The study actually states that the only effect noted in workers exposed to DDT and other pesticides was an increase in activity in liver enzymes, no adverse effects on the blood, liver, heart, or central nervous system. Tobacco industry as well as vegetables, fruits, and things that have come out of Washington soil in the 50 years since DDE stopped being used, it all contains trace elements of DDE.

It's kind of a fact of life at this point. And I agree with my colleague, Gene Hainey, and also Mr. Burl Bryson. I think that we need to have another discussion about how many parts per million is a good amount, and I do not think that zero is that number. So even though DDE might be dangerous, something that we still don't technically know, it is a chemical that's been in the dirt for the last 50 years, one with a half-life of only about 200 days, which is 90 times past its expiration date. We're talking about parts per million or parts of parts per million, and I just don't think it's enough evidence to shut down a business, possibly an entire industry and lose thousands of people their jobs. And I wouldn't do it unless I was 100% sure there was a reason. And based on what's been put forth, I don't think the reason is strong enough. We're talking about arbitrary decimal points that in other industries will just be passed over or ignored. In the end, we're all adults who choose to take risks like this every day. Choosing to do things like

smoke cigarettes, eat grilled meat, drink alcohol, and is by itself as carcinogenic as to smoke like any plant is. We do these things knowing the risks, but we don't know the risks completely of what ingesting this chemical can actually do. Thank you.

Kinyon Case: First off, I wanted to take the time to thank you for having me and thank you for your utmost attention up front. My name is Kinyon Case. I'm the CEO of Perecan Farm, also known as Stone Age Joints. We are a processor located in Bellingham. Over the course of the past several years, we've had the pleasure of working with Walden as well as a handful of other farms in Okanogan County. Last Thursday's bulletin came as a complete shock not only to myself but to my co-workers, colleagues, friends, and family. The Washington State cannabis industry has long relied on products from the Okanogan area just as the United States has long relied on that area for agriculture such as apples and cattle. Although I initially planned for a longer comment, which included facts on DDE, its half-life, and its abundance throughout the State of Washington and the entire United States.

My belief is that my words would simply be a regurgitation of facts which you already know. And my hope here today is not that the LCB or that the WSDA will simply drop this issue, but they will provide a clear and equitable plan for these licensees to stay operating in some capacity. Ideally, a plan for remediation in somewhat lenient but periodically decreasing testing limit for DDE would be established based on the standards of other industries such as tobacco and not based on some arbitrary limit. While this administrative hold may cost my company a significant amount of money, it's a mere drop in the bucket compared to the potential loss of livelihood which our Okanogan partners may soon face. My intention with this statement is not to mount financial risks to those in public safety but to ask you to acknowledge this: If this issue is worth shutting licenses down, you are also admitting that the due diligence to grant licenses in this area was not performed by the LCB, the Department of Ecology, or the Washington State Department of Agriculture.

DDE and DDT in the soil is not new. In fact, it's ban predates my parent's births. DDE testing is available to the Department of Agriculture but not currently available at any cannabis testing labs. To my knowledge, there is no legally specified manner for a cannabis license to test their products with the Department of Agriculture. Whether you would like to call it a lack of due diligence, gross negligence, or a classic case of forgetfulness, the people who suffered the consequences of your decision are almost surely unaware that this would happen. Washington State agencies not only authorized them to grow in the first place but continually relicense them after receiving the information that they know now. As a result of this decision, hundreds of families around the state who have built their lives these facilities will be out of work abruptly. My company, who uses Walden's material for extraction only, will also begin layoffs pending the Board's decision.

Regardless of what the Board decides, irreparable damage has been caused to the reputations of the 18 affected licenses, and we are still today unclear of how to proceed. The LCB and the WSDA will likely receive backlash regardless of the next actions. Tens of thousands of consumers have already ingested the products which you have claimed as toxic from these

areas. Whether it be a branded product from one of these farms or an end product created by a third-party processor, I estimate that this reach is far greater than just the simple 18 licenses affected. The state has had since 1972 to rectify this issue. In several months since at least August 2022, when samples were taken, to notify licensees of the potential issue. But licensees were only notified that day that they were being shut down. My company, Stone Age, will survive this. I'm not here out of self-interest but because I think it's the right thing to do.

My request to you is that you work through this issue tactfully rather than take a nuclear approach to an issue, which has clearly not been an emergency for 50 years. Although our Okanagan partners have already suffered damages to their reputation, it's worth noting that the general public will continue to consume DDE through other sources, and the Washington State's residual pesticide problem is not isolated to DDE, cannabis, or the Okanagan Valley. Thank you for your time.

Greg Shiels: There's very little I can add to what's already been expressed by my fellow co-workers and some of my colleagues in the industry. Kinyon Case, I'd like to second all of his sentiments as well as Burl Bryson. Yeah. I just want to say how much this job means to me, and yeah, echo the sentiments of all my friends who have already spoken. I've been with Walden for five and a half years in a variety of roles, and in this time, I've met some of my best friends, two of my groomsmen who have already spoken, my wife now of almost a year. This place has brought together a lot of really special people, and it brought us together because of our shared passions and our commitment to being good people and doing our best in this industry. Trying to set a higher standard and holding ourselves to higher standards for the products that we put out to our consumers. The proposed rulemaking would have a devastating impact on us, and it just couldn't happen to a more conscientious, good-hearted group of people. I would just like you to take that all into consideration when this is readdressed on April 22nd. Thank you for your time.

Richard Funk: My name is Richard Funk, and I'm an employee of Walden Cannabis. I'm speaking today because I believe that action level set forth of 0.0 parts per million is unrealistic and an action spurred on by emotional fear and being rammed through in the name of public safety. There are clear guidelines set forth by the EPA that should be adopted, and any other action by the LCB is without scientific merit. What if we applied the zero tolerance level regarding methanol in liquor? We know that methanol is a toxic chemical but allowable tolerances because we know that small amounts are not harmful. Any action by the LCB other than providing a ppm level of 0.04, any other action other than that is without scientific merit. Thank you.

Elijah Roque: Okay. So my name is Elijah Roque, R-O-Q-U-E. Roque, like okay, Roque. I want to start off by saying that I found the recent investigation conducted by the WA LCB to be unbecoming, as there was a lack of transparency and forthrightness in the way the information was communicated, and the investigation was carried out. As a government entity, I believe there is a responsibility to uphold the highest standards of professionalism and ethical conduct, which unfortunately, did not seem to be the case in this instance. I've been here for five years,

and I'm the Fulfillment Manager here at Walden Cannabis. And I spent that Easter weekend, my daughter's first Easter, just trying to be happy as I can be to show my family that everything's going to be okay. But we spent that weekend with this information living large overhead. And as hard as we tried to show good faith in everything, it still hits us in a devastating way.

Their lives, they are having immediate impact with the decisions being made and are at risk of being unemployed for who knows how long. And I really do implore you to use science as evidence. For example, the Agency of Toxic Substances and Disease Registry states that no effects were seen in volunteers who took a small daily dose of DDT by capsule for 18 months, things like that. Everything that has been said by each one of my colleagues is something I back wholeheartedly. Thank you for this time.

David Busby: Awesome. Thanks. I am here to not talk about DDT or DDE. I'm here to talk about CCRS. Over the past couple of days, the processing time on that system has really shot up from what we have observed over the last 12 months. It used to be fairly quick. We could get a response or a result from that thing inside of an hour. And now we've got some stuff that's taking more than 24 hours. And we've chatted with some other software integrators that are having the same issue. And this is a problem because we have a situation where the licensee creates new inventory in the system. We have to put that into CCRS, but it's taking eight or more hours for that to get acknowledged. And then in order to get a manifest to a buyer, we have to have the inventory in the system, but the inventory is taking eight hours. Then we put the manifest in. The manifest is taking eight hours. That's a total of 16 hours.

The previous behavior that licensees had been used to, the things that licensees everywhere else in the USA are able to do on systems backed by like a bio track or a metric type of API, a real-time system, they make that stuff, they can press the button, they can go and deliver that product. If we want to follow the rules of the LCB in Washington State, we have a 24-hour or longer wait period to get the document back from CCRS. So this seems like a real good opportunity for us to all use the contingency manifest. Right? But the LCB says don't use a contingency manifest as long as CCRS is working. But there's not a clear guideline for when the CCRS is considered not working. When should that contingency manifest be allowed, and if the Agency can provide some clarity on that? We have opened some tickets about the CCRS. According to that, it's working in specification.

And I'm happy to use the system as it works in its specification with if it takes 24 hours to upload the data as long as the licensees. Well, the ones that remain are able to conduct a business in a timely fashion that we've all been accustomed to since 2014. Thank you.

Neil Juneja: Hello. My name is Neil Juneja at Gleam Law, I'm the managing partner here. And I just wanted to briefly go over a few things regarding the DDE issue. The first is, I believe this is really an emotional response to a scientific question. Primarily, we have substantial research that went in at the federal level on what is a safe amount for inhalation from the EPA. A far more research in evidence than we've done in this state, and those limits are four times higher than what we've set in this state. So I think we should rely on the federal government here, or at least

do a scientific solution to this as opposed to an emotional solution. Second, the farms implicated are effectively the breadbasket of cannabis in the State of Washington. So we're not just talking about removing these farms from commerce. We're talking about a substantial majority of products on every shelf in the entire industry from edibles to concentrates. We're implicating a decimation of the industry as a whole if we go ahead and carry this out.

Third, with the holds, we've requested the actual results of the studies on this, and the LCB through enforcement has flat out refused to be transparent and provide this evidence whatsoever, so we really cannot review these objectively, and I find the lack of transparency to be highly suspect. And, finally, I flew in from Germany this morning in order to be here today. And while I was meeting with law firms there, they knew about this issue. We've been getting calls from the New York Times, from Reuters, from the AP asking for statements on this. And we were the first state, Washington and Colorado. We're stewards of cannabis worldwide. We set a good example or a bad example from the governmental standpoint, from an industry standpoint. And I mean, the fact that we're getting all these calls is a rather scary issue. I'd like to be a good example for the world and other states as opposed to what not to do correctly.

And that's what we're looking like right now. I think we really do need to go into this with a scientific standpoint. And that's really the issue I have with what's going on right now. Thank you very much. I concede the rest of my time.

Bron Taylor Carter: Okay, great. My name is Bron Taylor. Twenty years ago, I was appointed the Samuel Hill Eminent Chair in Christian Ethics at the University of Florida. More importantly, I'm the father of the cofounders of Walden Cannabis, Anders and Kelsey Taylor, who I believe will speak to you later. As an ethicist for decades, I have taught my students how to analyze and make difficult moral decisions. I tell them first to determine what values are relevant to a given ethical decision, and then gather and analyze the best available evidence pertinent to that decision. We also wrestled with what to do when the facts are not clear and how to consider risks and benefits in difficult cases. Often, this is not easy. And you on the Board know this quite well. And I'm sympathetic to the challenges that you face in your regulatory role. Now, quite obviously, I know Anders and Kelsey very well. Their values are based, that they based Walden Cannabis on include providing a quality healthy product, which is why they do not use pesticides.

They also elected to grow their plants outdoors and in the sun in order to minimize carbon footprints from their business. I also know how much they care about their employees. It's a little hard not to be choked up about this, that they are heartbroken at the prospect that their business might fail, and all these good people who you have been hearing from will lose their jobs, livelihoods, and as you heard, their careers. I also know that there are residual pesticides in the soil at their farm, that if there are residual pesticides in the soil of the farm, which would not be surprising, if they're being found in unhealthy levels, and if they're being found in unhealthy levels in their products, Anders and Kelsey will readily agree that those products should not be distributed. But I also know how studiously they study all the relevant facts.

And when they say there are types of products that they distribute and process, which come from both their and other farms and are both processed by them, and as you've heard, by others, and consequently they are confident that many of the products they are distributing are safe, I believe them. Of course, you ought not to take the words of those you are charged to regulate at face value. But I do think it is a moral imperative to listen carefully and fairly to them and others in the industry as they seek to convey their understanding of the facts. If you do that, I believe you will arrive at a wise and nuanced decision that sets reasonable standards for when product containing chemicals of concern should be pulled from the shelves. To the best of my knowledge and assessment, allowing the sale and distribution of many of the products Walden produces are and remain safe.

And I also just want to underscore how much I am impressed by the young people who have come before you today and have talked about how Walden has helped them to establish long-standing good-paying careers with health benefits, and that you ought to be really careful to not unnecessarily destroy their hopes and their dreams and that of their families. There are just so many dimensions to this. And don't oversimplify the case here. And I wish you the best. The last thing I just want to underscore is that I know this firm, and I know that if the Board does not quickly moderate this administrative hold that this company will quickly be out of business and others also. Time is of the essence to make a reasonable fact-informed and science-based decision.

Jeremy Moberg: Okay. Thank you for the opportunity to provide a comment today. I'd like to commend the Board for pausing on the adoption of emergency rules to collect more information and move forward in a way that's deliberate. I think that is commendable and deserves noting. I would also like to mention that the way that this was conveyed to the public, it cast a wide net that implicated a geopolitical region in Okanogan County. Okanogan County has branded itself as a cannabis producer, and a lot of people started getting calls associated with this investigation that had nothing to do with it. So I'm pleased to see that the language has changed some. These historic pollutants are not unique to Okanogan and, in fact, are all across all of Washington State. So I was pleased to see Chandra referred to this as an in eastern Washington, and I think that's the correct way to refer to it.

So I guess, communications are important when it comes to these matters and can have long-lasting effects on companies. So I appreciate your time and look forward to working with the LCB through our association to provide as much communication and help as we can. So thank you for the time.

Sagar Ghanghro: Okay, awesome. Yes. So my name is Sagar Ghanghro. I work with Walden Cannabis. I work with them as a sales executive and, yeah, I want to thank you guys for at least pushing the vote out a bit before we get more information. There's not much I can cover that we haven't covered already. So I guess I will kind of touch on a few things here. I've been in the industry for seven years, and over that time I've developed relationships with purchasers, producers, processors all across the industry. And really, this industry is built on trust, big time. So the way that this was introduced to the entire industry in the public, I mean, it had really

damaging effects to the point of as a salesperson that trust, and those relationships were somewhat damaged.

So when we're talking about everyone going on unemployment and stuff like that, I mean, I just want to reiterate that doesn't mean we're going to be able to come back from that and have the exact careers that we had. We're talking about long-term career damage here for real people. And then the second thing I wanted to address, if we did set the tolerance levels at zero, I mean, we risk putting out a ton of farms. I mean, like massive damage would be done to the cannabis supply. And we were deemed an "essential good" not too long ago. And currently the whole world is in a time of inflation. I mean, you have products and goods like eggs skyrocketing, gas skyrocketing. Cannabis has been the one thing that the price has actually come down to help consumers' pockets. If we do this, we risk raising that price. And as an essential good, we're driving the cost up. We're not helping where the world is right now. Yeah.

And besides that, I just want to reiterate, I really hope that the LCB approaches this collaboratively as we move forward. I do think that this is a huge opportunity for us to finally work together. Everything in the past has kind of felt combative, and this is a golden opportunity for us to work together, the LCB and the Cannabis industry, and I really hope that that's how it's approached. And yeah, that's all I have to say for now.

Micah Sherman: Hi, there. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. For the record, my name is Micah Sherman, and I have a small farm here in the Olympia area. And I also serve on the Board of the Washington Sun and Craft Growers Association. First, we just wanted to thank you guys for delaying action on this. We think that was the right call. There's quite a lot of work to do to get this situation resolved, and a little bit more time to do that is definitely in order. So we appreciate that. I don't have a whole lot else to say, besides our organization just wants to go on the record and say that we're not interested in being like the tobacco industry. We want to make sure that we're approaching this situation with a much more cooperative and collaborative approach than that industry. We're not interested in seeing tobacco companies as a part of this industry.

That's something that we're involved with at the national level to ensure that the same sorts of corporate malfeasance that occurred in that industry for decades doesn't become a part of this industry. And we want to be very clear about that separation. It's very important that we do better than that industry. So there's lots of other agricultural standards that we can look to that I think are going to inform what to do here. But we just want to say that very equivocally, that the tobacco industry is not a role model, is not a guiding light, and is not something that we should be embracing. Thank you.

Anders Taylor: Thank you for having me. I am Anders Taylor. I'm one of the founders of the Walden Cannabis. I had some statements prepared today that many of the things I was going to talk about have been covered related to making sure that we're looking at the science. But I guess a lot of my employees have definitely made me very emotional. One of the things I want to make sure is we don't conflate what was just said with respect to behaving like the tobacco

industry and using EPA guidance as it relates to the science behind what the standards are for health because I think it's very important. Right now, one of the reasons that we've got ourselves into this situation is that the LCB's default 0.1 ppm has kind of led to a situation where some results were popping higher than that, some were lower, and because the Board saw a few results that were higher than that consecutively, it led to a decision that I don't think was very well considered.

I certainly didn't consider the complexity of the business that I run. For example, when this order was delivered, the captain called me on Thursday evening. One, he did call me with no information to arriving about how the decision was come to or what the decision was being based upon. Furthermore, he didn't have any test results to share with me at the time. Nor was the Board able to share test results with me the following day when I called later to follow up with Chandra. And in my conversation with her she conveyed test results that were at 1 ppm back in the middle of the summer, which was astonishing to me in that conversation because if that was the case, then I would have expected immediate action by the Board, given what I understood to be the potential health consequences. I mean, the EPA has done the science. Right? And the reason that she told me that she -- and my attorney was on the phone when we had this conversation -- the reason she told me that the limits were raised was that we went from 1 ppm up to 2 ppm.

And that was the reason we had to take immediate action. Okay. That seems reasonable, except that I haven't seen any test results to support that. Jim MacRae, who spoke first here today, was kind enough to provide me with some of the test results that he has related to this, which I don't think he has provided those to the Board yet, but what I have there, I can certainly provide. The highest of the test results that I have seen goes back to the middle of 2020. And that is the only test result that I've seen that goes above that 0.4 ppm guideline. And so it has me wondering what happened at that point in time.

And also, how is it that we came to a decision that was different in this case than in a situation where it's four times lower than what they found at that time, where they shut down not just one location, but the letter was so sloppily written that came to me that it said that all of my facilities needed to be shut down? And having gotten that message on a Thursday evening right before Easter weekend, I was very distraught. We don't have much money. You know? We go paycheck to paycheck, and it's very important for the Board to understand the kind of impact this has had. I currently cannot plant, so I would like to implore the Board to reconsider this broad administrative hold beyond just every facility and consider swiftly acting to move towards tobacco guidelines so that we can make some decisions about what to do in the spring right now. I understand. I hope you'll be willing to have a meeting with me later today. I'm going to be around all day and to meet with Chandra, as well, who I know was part of this decision-making process.

Kelsey Taylor: My name is Kelsey Taylor. I'm also here with Walden. And I apologize for some emotion. Seeing all of the impacts on my employees has been really hard for me. I do appreciate you delaying this unscientific and fear-based emergency rulemaking. It's important to

be judicious and thoughtful when protecting public health and consult with experts. I echo Jim MacRae's statements of feeling more optimistic with this Board, and I hope that continues. I would like to address a few of the statements made earlier by Ms. Chandra Wax. The holds you placed were actually placed on licensees who did not have any DDE testing, and you had to walk that statement back on Monday. This announcement was severely damaging, as you have heard from my employees already, and lacked an understanding of our supply chain and the relevant science, no doubt because there were no conversations ahead of time with us.

I am sure that you have good intentions, but this was hasty and capricious and made in ignorance. I hope you had a nicer Easter Sunday than my employees did. Your statement about having done recalls on licensees from previous tests above action limits does not comport with the facts. I am looking forward to having that meeting with you so we can go over past handling of this issue and discuss the science behind cannabis processing, the reasons behind end-product testing in protecting public health, and EPA tolerance limits for dried tobacco, the nearest analogue. I still have not been able to get the test results despite calling you incessantly since Friday, despite calling the Governor's office, despite calling my legislators I have not been able to get the COAs, and I don't know why. I have been promised that they will come to me, but they still have not come to my desk. Why?

Please let me know when this meeting that we are going to have is, because this is the first time that I am hearing about it, and I am very much looking forward to it. Thank you for your time.

Ben Huff: I'm also a partner at Walden. I'll keep it short. Everyone has covered pretty much everything. There are a couple of things. One was just thinking about how this administrative hold was communicated and how it went down. I appreciate and understand processes probably created around the idea of catching bad actors in an industry. I want to be clear, and for you guys to think about for future process, if something like this comes up again, that if it's something that doesn't involve a bad actor, then the communication should be very different. I understand if you're trying to catch a farm that's using pesticides illegally and trying to sneak and get away with it, the need to have discretion to act swiftly and to perhaps have less concern about like what happens to that business, per se, because the public health comes first, and you're catching a bad actor. This was not the case of that.

Obviously, as you can tell from all of our employees and my fellow partners in that conversation, you can tell that was not the case here. So I think that a different process is needed when dealing with businesses which are, frankly, victims of behavior from 50 years ago. So I think that's the main thing I want to cover. Everyone has covered everything else that could possibly be said about this topic. So I also look forward to any future meetings on this topic to discuss how we move forward. Thanks.

Peter Manning: Good afternoon, Board, Chairman, Vollendroff, and Ollie Garrett. My name is Peter Manning. I'm from Black Excellence in Cannabis. This week was different for us at our organization. We actually worked in tandem with LCB to get 5080 passed. It's a great bill. We'd like to thank the LCB because we know that you guys worked really hard on this to make this bill

pass. We were down here at the legislative session pretty much for the 90 days that it took to get it through. We appreciate you guys. We want you to know that those in our community recognize that effort as well. As you can tell, there's no negative rhetoric that came through today. I think we all understand that the Agency is moving forward for equity, and we appreciate you guys. We most definitely think the Agency made a great choice in picking Marc as the legislative liaison that represents the Agency. He is wonderful, phenomenal, very easy to get along with and to communicate with. And he's sincere about what he's doing. That was a great pick whoever did that. Hey, kudos to you. Nicola Reed is instrumental. And she's been helpful with our agency, as well -- I mean, with our organization. We appreciate her. I'd like to give her a shout out as well. David Postman, Ollie Garrett, and Vollendroff, you guys have done a phenomenal job. Please understand that we see you guys, we recognize you guys, and you guys have done great, 5080 rocks. We made some amendments. You guys agreed with them. It's beautiful. Thank you very much.

Mike Asai: I usually say, "Good morning!" But we're in the afternoon now, so good afternoon, Board Members, and people here present. I want to say I'm very compassionate about Walden and what's going on. Not really understanding, but I just want you to know that Black Excellence in Cannabis, we are behind you. We're supportive of that. We come from the medical days. We're pioneers. So just want you to know that you have our support. I'm Mike Asai, commercially collective vice president of Black Excellence in Cannabis. 5080 expands social equity success for black and brown communities. LCB presenting this legislation for social equity program success was very important. On January 10, 2023, Black Excellence in Cannabis suggested amendments to Senate Bill 5080. These amendments expanded the Social Equity Program to 2032, and also added producer processor licenses for social equity.

I want to give a huge thanks to Senator Saldaña, Representative Intiman, Representative Reeves, Board Member Garrett, Board Member Postman, Board Member Vollendroff, Marc Webster, Rick Garza, and LCB staff. Last but not least, I want to give a thanks to Paula Sardinias, former Representative Pettigrew, once again, Ollie Garrett, and Peter Manning for bringing social equity in cannabis to Washington State. Because of Peter not giving up the fight for inclusion dating back to 2015, we have social equity in cannabis in Washington State. It took courage and a lot of persistence over many years. I personally thank Peter. My family and friends personally thank Peter. And I just can't thank him enough and all others who've been a part of social equity. Thank you.

Gregory Foster: Hello. So I'm Gregory Foster with Cannabis Observer. And today has been an interesting one. And I want to commend the Board Members for their courage. It takes -- I believe it took something to go against what your staff have been telling you, to recognize and to listen to your stakeholders, to listen to consumers, and to recognize that we just needed to take a pause on this one. And there have been lots of things that have been expressed today. I'm very impressed with the testimony that has been provided. I think it's been very reasonable, very heartfelt, and I know that you all heard that. It sounds like there is still a lot of work to do on this one. But it mainly revolves around the definition of an action level. You've heard recommendations to look to the federal government for guidance on similar products. And

there's an element here that's also tied up in the THC Bill that was put forward by the Agency around this idea of being able to detect very low levels of these compounds.

The Senate said within the THC Bill said anything with zero. You had to have zero THC to be able to have anything outside of the regulated market. Everyone said wait a minute now. That's not possible for us to actually make a scientific assertion, certainly in our private labs, which aren't able to achieve the levels of quantification that the state lab can. And so if you had moved forward with these proposed rules that go into effect immediately, then everyone would be out of compliance. Right? There is no private testing lab that has standard methods for detecting the different compounds that have been added to the panel. I've heard it would take up to six weeks, I believe, to actually implement that from one lab at great expense. Being added to the panel means everybody's expenses are going to go up, because now every product would then have to have that test, which is good. Right? Like, glad we did the pesticide testing.

But we needed to definitely take the pause. You all made the right choice today. Thank you. Now we have more work to do. And so I ask you to look critically, definitely listen to all the different stakeholders around this piece, and we'll talk more about it in the future. Thank you.

9. ADJOURN

Chair Postman: Okay. Yeah. I would just say in brief, we do have a lot of work to do on this. We're committed to doing it. While what we did today wasn't what had been planned on the Agenda, I think staff is in agreement with what the Board did, and there's not a tension there. It's just people are moving fast, and now we'll have a chance to slow the ball down a little bit and address some of these questions, obviously, including the question of zero, and other things, the specific geographic area I'm interested in, and others. I think it's not unreasonable to be concerned about the test results, and I heard that from some of the testimony today that people are. Not everybody, but some are. And I think we are doing what we need to do to look at that. And we are working to schedule a meeting for Friday, I believe, with licensees that we'll have, and Rick can address more of that right now. But we're going to have a lot of our people there to answer questions and to hear from people. But it's not the only form of communication. Rick, can you tell us what we got?

Rick Garza: As our meeting, we put the meeting together and sent you notice for 1:30 to 2:30 on Friday. The reason why I took it off wanting to meet tomorrow was to try to make sure that we've got the right people from the Department of AG, Department of Ecology, and Department of Health in that discussion with you all. Because some of the questions I'm not sure we can all answer as far as the LCB. But certainly, we've been working with the Department of Ag, as you know, and the Department of Ecology. We were there yesterday taking samples. And so we'll have that opportunity. And as you had asked Kelsey, you should have received notice during the meeting that we'll be meeting on Friday.

Chair Postman: Yeah. We're trying to get all the right people there who can answer questions that are in those areas of this that are not under our purview. But other than that, I will just say to anybody else is, if people have thoughts, I would encourage you to send them to us. Send them to the Board. Send them to Enforcement or Policy and Rules, whoever it is that you want to connect with. We are interested in hearing from people. I have learned things from people in the last couple of days. And as I always do in this case, I had also just urged people not to assume ill motive. And on the part of the public employees who were here, just as we don't for the people who were working with across the table, things are moving quickly. We've now slowed them down. But people here are working for the right reason, which is protecting the public health. And that doesn't mean that there aren't times where we have to put a hold on our own action, which we did today. And so that's done in I think in agreement from staff from Rick on down.

So a couple of people have mentioned it's an opportunity to work together collaboratively. I believe that is, but I think that it's going to take people on both sides to work in that way. And other than that, we will continue to keep the broader public up to date on what's happening. But we do have some very specific outreach with licensees in the area, which we're working to put together. And so, hopefully, we'll be able to sit down and answer a lot more questions that both you have and, frankly, that the Board has. And we'll do that. So okay. With that, I am going to adjourn the Board Meeting. And we will be sure to keep people up to date on when we are going to bring back rules or whatever those next steps will be. So with that we're adjourned for today.

9. ADJOURN

Chair Postman adjourned the meeting at 12:27 pm.

Minutes approved this 26th day of March, 2025



Jim Vollendroff
Board Chair



Ollie Garrett
Board Member



Peter Holmes
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.