



## Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board Meeting

Wednesday, September 27, 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, September 27, 2023. Member Ollie Garrett and Member Jim Vollendroff were also present.

#### 2. SOCIAL EQUITY PROGRAM UPDATE

**Nicola Reid, Compliance and Adjudications Manager**

Nicola Reid: Good morning. Okay. So good morning, Chair Postman, Board Member Garrett, and Vollendroff. My name is Nicola Reid, and I am the Compliance and Adjudications Manager in the Licensing division at the Liquor and Cannabis Board. I will be giving this Social Equity Program update today on behalf of Aaron Washington, who unfortunately is speaking at a prior engagement. Since the LCB has received the applications, some work has been completed. We received the application scores and supporting documents back from Ponder Diversity Group. The double-blind lottery has occurred, and the sealed results were delivered to the agency. All applicants have been notified via letter on their application status per Ponder Diversity Group's review. We wanted to give you an overview of how many applications came in per jurisdiction and what the highest scoring applicant was within that jurisdiction and what the lowest scoring applicant was. I can read these through, but I think I'll focus on some of the bigger ones.

So for King County, there were 125 applications for eight allotments. The highest score was 310, with the lowest score being 55. Please note that the lowest score isn't the lowest score who got through but just out of the 125 applicants that did apply. In Snohomish County, there were 42 applications, and that was for seven locations, with the highest score being 305 and the lowest score being 50. And so I don't want to take everyone's time going through each jurisdiction, but I figure I could pause here for a moment while people take a look. And, of course, this information can be made available after the meeting as well.

Chair Postman: Great. Can I ask you a question while we're pausing? And you were just saying like in King County, the top score was 310, and then the low score that you mentioned was of all applicants. Do we know off hand what the low score of qualifying candidates was?

Nicola Reid: We do. We do have that information. So I don't have it here with the presentation today, but we do have. There was not a lottery needed in King County, and so the scores were all pretty close to the high, highest score.

Chair Postman: Oh, okay. Yeah, that is what I'm curious about. Just sort of how compact those qualifying scores were. Thank you.

Nicola Reid: Right, right. No problem. And you will see here, there were three counties that are not listed that they did not have any applications, and that was Skamania, San Juan, and Garfield. And then there was another county that had less applications than allotments, and that was Klickitat County. There were two applications with four allotments available.

Ollie Garrett: I have a question. So does that mean that there's still some open allotments from the 43?

Nicola Reid: Yes. So there is, I believe, six open allotments that we will now be able to use towards the next application window.

Ollie Garrett: Okay.

Chair Postman: And in that case, in the next application window, those -- would there be portability then because under our new coming social equity program that is more flexible?

Nicola Reid: I would need to check with the AGs on that. That is definitely a question we could ask.

Chair Postman: Okay. Yeah, one other question on this. You mentioned the double-blind lottery, which we've talked about a lot, but could you just tell people? What are the mechanics of that? How did that work?

Nicola Reid: So each applicant was assigned a random identifying number by Ponder Diversity Group. That random identifying number was then sent to who we contracted to do the double-blind lottery with. They go through a process of basically -- like the way I think of it it's like spinning the numbers, so randomizing the numbers first time. Well, first they assign -- okay, so the identifying numbers go with the lottery, they then assign another identifying number to each identifying number, then those numbers are randomized, and then the lottery will take fake numbers, none that went through, and make sure that they're continuing to get random scores when they do the lottery process, and so they go through a 2-step verification with that. They then have the second set of random scores that are drawn, and they put them in order of how they were drawn.

Chair Postman: All right. Okay. Yeah. The point of this obviously is that the people who are doing that work have no idea of the individuals who are behind those applications. It's just numbers they're seeing, not a name.

Nicola Reid: They're not seeing a name. They're just seeing a number and then a second randomized number, and then all of the work is done with someone else who works there watching over the individual, and then the results were brought to us in a sealed envelope, which had to be cut open. And the person who did the lottery had to witness us open the envelope and then also notify the drawn applicants that they were drawn.

Chair Postman: Right. Great. Thank you.

Nicola Reid: You're welcome. I'll move on here. So this is just an application overview of some of the different statuses that occurred. So many applications were withdrawn. There was 161 due to the applicant not meeting minimum social equity qualifications. And so if you recall that for an application to be scored the applicant had to meet two of the three initial requirements, so this number reflects the applications that did not meet the minimum social equity requirements. There were 254 withdrawn due to their rubric score not being high enough to proceed within the county that they had applied for, 30 due to the applicant not starting the application process. They were sent an e-mail many times, but they were also called every Friday by Ponder Diversity Group to try to connect and assist with them starting the process. And two were withdrawn recently due to not being a successful applicant in the double-blind lottery.

So for title certificate letters, 10 title certificate holders qualify to move within their county. One of these qualifiers did hold two title certificates, and so that is why there are 11 of them. And so the title certificate counties, there were two in Benton County, one in Clark County, one in Lewis County, one in Pierce County -- or two in Pierce County, I'm sorry -- and four in Snohomish County. Okay. So the double-blind lottery letters, two counties had a double-blind lottery, and that was Clark County and Snohomish, and this was for three available licenses. So six people went through to the lottery, and that was for one location in Snohomish County and two locations in Clark County. That lottery has occurred with the results delivered, and so the applicants that were drawn were notified via letter as were the applicants who were not selected in the lottery. So we now have the preliminary letters of approval that we have sent out, 37 letters were sent to the highest scoring applicants, a total of 40 letters including the lottery winners. So at this point, all applicants have been notified of their application status per Ponder Diversity Group's review. So we have 40 applicants that are now approved to go through the application process and meet the other requirements to hold the license. There is no timeline on finding a location, financing, or things of that nature. But, of course, due to availability within counties, you know, the quicker you are able to secure a location or financing, it could be a better approach if you're able to.

So on the letter that everyone has received regarding their application status, they were given an initial appeal process, which includes the e-mail address and how to appeal. This is like the first part of the appeal process. We will then draft an official statement of intent to withdraw that will be emailed to the applicant, and that will include all the information found during Ponder Diversity Group's application review, supporting documents, all of that. If an applicant would still like to proceed with their appeal after reading the pertaining information, they can just respond

to the e-mail and let the adjudications coordinator know that they would like to proceed. That would then initiate the official appeal process.

The application and all of the supporting documents will be sent to the Office of Administrative Hearings and then assigned to an Assistant Attorney General. And the applicant, of course, does have the right to hire counsel, but it is definitely not a requirement to appeal a decision. Applicants will receive a pre-scheduling order with schedule dates from the Office of Administrative Hearings and will be notified by the AG's served with information any time a document or something is filed. So we know that many applicants are interested in obtaining their application file. We would be happy to get those out. The requests do need to go through public records, and they can be emailed at [publicrecords@lcb.wa.gov](mailto:publicrecords@lcb.wa.gov). We also know that a lot of applicants are really curious to know their score, and now that all applicants have been notified of their application status, we are looking at ways to make the scores more readily available so that you're not having to do a public records request, and we'll be discussing this further today.

Chair Postman, Board Members Garrett, and Vollendroff, may I answer any questions for you?

Chair Postman: I'm good at this point. No, thank you, Ms. Reid. Appreciate that. I'll just add at this point and will remind folks again when you go on that slide about the appeal process, the Board -- the three Board members sit as the adjudication panel for anything that is appealed from the Office of Administrative Hearings. We operate in a quasi-judicial manner in that case, so we are prohibited from talking about, or to, or learning anything about those appeals. It'll be kept from us by staff and the AAGs, and when we act on it, we can only act on what's in the record. So if anybody is appealing, they really should not speak to a Board member about it because that Board member then likely will have to recuse themselves from acting on it. And with only three Board members, we really need to hold all of us for that important job. So just as a reminder that we've always already gotten from Counsel, of course, but the three of us and to the public and our own staff, the Board just needs to be walled off from the appeal process.

There will be other people in the agency on the staff side, including the director, the licensing director, who are not operating in a quasi-judicial manner, so that is a different question. But for Members Garrett, Vollendroff, and myself, we really have to pull that off for the good of the process. So just as a reminder. Okay. Thank you so much. Thanks for all the work on this, and I know there's a lot more work to be done still but appreciate that update. This is a big milestone and appreciate you and your team's work on it.

### **3. ALCOHOL RELATED RULEMAKING**

#### **ACTION ITEM 3A – Board Adoption of CR 103 for 2023 Liquor Legislation Implementation**

Daniel Jacobs: Good morning, Chair Postman, Members Garrett, and Vollendroff, LCB staff, and Members of the Public. I'm here this morning to request approval of the rulemaking order or

CR 103 regarding Implementation of 2023 Liquor Legislation (HANDOUT 3A). If approved today, these rule changes will go into effect on October 28th. This project was initiated with the filing of CR 101 on May 24th, addressing three bills. The first bill expanded the type of work that minors can perform on liquor licensed premises. The second bill banned the sale and manufacture distribution of products that combine alcohol and cannabis, and the third bill created a special permit for owners and operators of short-term rental units. Most folks will know Airbnb or VRBO, and it allows the owners operators of those units to provide a complementary bottle of wine to renters over 21 after verifying ID and complying with some other requirements, like advising about laws against public consumption, etc.

This law also allows these permit holders to obtain wine directly from wine distributors, and this last bill is the only one of the three that we at the rules team ended up doing rulemaking on, and that is the only bill that requires rulemaking on this. The only changes that we're proposing are to change the two regulations that we have on the books on wine distributors. These two regulations talk about what wine distributors can and cannot do, and we need to change these regulations in order to add that wine distributors now can sell directly to these special permit holders. For anyone interested, these rules are Washington Administrative Code 314-24-180 and 314-24-190. Draft rules were circulated in early July, and the public was given two weeks to comment on them. We received one written comment. And when the CR 102 was filed -- sorry, we only received one written comment between the time that the draft rules were released and when the CR 102 was filed on August 2nd. That comment was asking for more detailed recordkeeping. Specifically, they had suggested that perhaps the permit holders would be required to have a name and signature log for renters who are going to be accepting these complementary bottles of wine.

The other suggestion was that perhaps the permit holders should be required to keep a log of how many bottles of wine they buy and turn these logs over to the LCB on an annual basis. Neither of these suggestions have been adopted into rule and I'll just briefly explain why. The name and signature log, that one wasn't adopted because such a log if turned over to the LCB would be a public record and potentially subject to unredacted public disclosure. As you know, we're only allowed to redact things from public disclosure when a law tells us we can redact it, and there wouldn't be anything that would allow us to redact any information from it. Secondly, the bottle tracking suggestion wasn't incorporated because on the wine distributors end, they already have to track this. Wine distributors already have to keep track of who they're distributing bottles to. So when the permit holders acquire wine from wine distributors there is already going to be a record of that on the wine distributor end, and wine distributors are already turning those records over to the LCB, and so because of that, we already are going to have that data.

Additionally, I had a robust discussion with a stakeholder focused mainly on prevention and public health about how the ID check would work and why the Liquor Cannabis Board didn't think it was necessary to add to the already detailed statutory language. The person was asking why we didn't put it in rule. We had an extended e-mail back and forth conversation, and I have included the entire conversation in the concise explanatory statement. That will be assuming

that this gets approved today, the concise explanatory statement is going to go on our website. And for folks who want to look at it, they'll be able to read our entire e-mail conversation.

Additionally, I asked if they wanted our e-mail conversation included as a public comment, and they said yes. So I just wanted to be transparent about it. The public hearing was held September 13th, and there was no testimony provided, and no written comments submitted either before or after. If approved today, like I had mentioned, the rules will become effective on October 28th. Some previous paperwork had said that they would be effective October 27th, but because the rules become effective 31 days after, and some months have one more day than other, I just miscounted. So if approved, the rules will be effective October 28th and not the 27th. I'm happy to answer any questions. And based on this, I'm requesting approval for filing the CR 103.

**Member Garrett made a motion to adopt the CR 103 for 2023 Liquor Legislation Implementation. Member Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.**

#### **4. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

Luc Carlin: Good morning. How you guys doing? So I am just observing from the outside. I'm actually doing like a documentary series on this overall process, this tenure process. I grew up in Seattle and went to Garfield High School. So I kind of weirdly enough saw the very beginning of this whole process and happened to go into cannabis reporting, and then just ended up here. Now I just kind of want to talk about like just -- I'm not trying to get too general or too broad when I talk about the LCB specifically, but like just conflict of interest, right? I'm curious. What do you guys think like for someone so -- for someone like Ollie Garrett, right? She owns a company called PMT Solutions that collects debt -- specifically from cannabis companies. Or is that true? I want to confirm that. But like what do you guys think about that in terms of is that really a good look? It seems like a pretty big conflict of interest, right? No response?

Chair Postman: Well, mister, since you haven't participated with us before, I'll let you know it's not a Q&A session with the Board. And then I would also ask you if you have things as you just said, you don't know -- that they're true, I'd rather you didn't share them until you could figure that out, but you can go ahead with the comments, but it's not a Q&A session.

Luc Carlin: Okay, okay. Yeah. So I guess just to kind of like, you know, kind of go into conflict of interest and just, you know, and I'm not trying to throw any shots to you, Ollie, at all. I'm just -- it just seems like the system here is a little bit if you start to looking under the surface, there's a little bit -- there's conflict of interest all across the board. You know, I understand this a tough process. This is super hard. It's a new industry. But you know, I think -- and it's -- I'm really glad to genuinely see you guys roll out the social equity program, and I hope it does well. I genuinely

hope it succeeds. Most have it, right? But you guys do have a chance to, you know, actually potentially make this a shining example of what social equity could be, which I hope to see, but yeah, I'll just include that. I just want us to all think about conflict of interest, and really, is this really what we're -- are we doing this for the social equity applicants or are we doing this to like virtue signal to show the rest of the country that we're not the only state that hasn't done social equity? But anyways, I really appreciate you guys, and we'll probably be talking here more soon. Thank you.

Sekayi Perkins: Good morning. Greetings, everybody. My name is Sakai Perkins. I'm a former owner of the Green Thumb Collective, current owner of Green Wall Street. Today marks a milestone for the people of our great State of Washington and our beloved cities and counties across the region. I'm here to announce that the WSLCB, the Washington State Liquor Control Board, FMSGs Global Strategies, Ponder Diversity Group, Washington Build Black Alliances, also including the Honorable David Postman, our Excellency Ollie Garrett, and my mentor, Paula Sardinas, should all be commended for their exponentially magnanimous duty in which was accomplished under dire state of affairs. Congratulations to you all and thank you for having me. Okay.

Sekani Perkins: First and foremost, I have to thank all respective parties involved for what was a long, tedious process that created an atmosphere of anxiety on both ends. I want to commend the Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board for exercising integrity, patience, transparency, and social responsibility throughout the duration of this session. The ultimate success of any program is dependent upon a foundation and structure. I can honestly state that the groundwork laid for the Social Equity in Cannabis Program in Washington state was thoroughly developed with the conscientious effort of providing justice for the BIPOC communities as well as the countless casualties that have been impacted by the war on drugs. I believe the program is a step toward balancing out some of the inequalities caused by a past system designed to hinder the BIPOC communities while simultaneously allowing predominantly white communities to prevail. The individuals who were fortunate enough to get approved for their licenses reflect the liberal, progressive, and diverse society we have in the State of Washington.

I applaud the third-party contractor for the program, the Ponder Diversity Group. The manner in which the system was established is an indication of the level of quality performed for the program. Additionally, I want to give praise to Paula Sardinas and Brian Gilcrease at FMS Global Strategies. The quality mentorship, customer service, and care provided at FMS Global is by far second to none. I highly suggest to those who are interested in getting involved with them in the industry to engage with mentors such as FMS Global. In conclusion, I feel the program in its entirety is an overall success. I must say I was reluctant to believe in the process, given the sensitive history behind social equity. However, I was compelled to show -- excuse me -- I was compelled to allow justice to prevail naturally. So thank you all. Congratulations to all the winners. I know some of us that may have not made it, which includes me, but my message is for everybody to have patience and bear with the Liquor Control Board because everything is a process. That is basically it in a nutshell. I don't want to take up too much time. Thank you all.

Christopher King: Terrific. I am here. Great morning, everybody. I come in the spirit of unity and education and open government as always. The first thing I want to say is congratulations to the people who prevailed thus far in, and that is a wonderful thing. I'm happy for them. And I want to also give some congratulations to a rather forceful presentation by my adversary, Mike Asai, in front of Seattle City Council. We're going to come back to that one in a minute, but that was fantastic. I mean, the way he went after Kshama Sawant, I think was appropriate. And I'm going to share something with you about the fact that I mentioned in an e-mail, I was Kshama's first videographer. That is a fact. So this picture was taken. I'm standing right next to KShama the day she won. There you go. Been around the block with her, but we're going to come back to that in a minute.

I want to talk about this issue here though first with Bill Lukela. What I want to find out -- because I don't want to jump the gun on anything, and maybe there's some law that you guys know about that I don't know about because I have been litigating these issues for years, and I have almost never lost a case dealing with public records, but I'm just trying to figure out as I stand with you in solidarity, there was a cover letter, there was a resume, there were Kennedy snapshots. There was a file called William Redacted. There was LCB director interview notes redacted. A thing called WL Notes. I'm not sure what that is. And then there's something else Lukela 05/11/23 redacted. But basically, like I say, though, the whole laundry list I got nothing. And so I asked you this morning for public information request because I want to figure out, hey, why didn't I get these materials? So, anyway, that is that piece.

So the next thing you know, what you have is with Kshama. I worked, like I said, I was her videographer, you know? And back when she won, these are all my videos with Kshama, like 10 or 12 of them, you know, like back at Bill's bar the night she won and all that. And one of them is really keen. It's the -- Kshama's the one in solidarity to sue MERS to help fight homelessness at People's Assembly. That was tongue-in-cheek after all of us got tired of her. She used to march and rally with us and fight the banks of foreclosure. I was busy keeping people in their houses, working in the Foreclosure Fairness Program, and doing all that stuff with the licensed local council, and then she just bailed on us. You know? And back then, she was standing strong against people like Steve Hobbs, which I find hilarious now because all the civil rights activists are all busy giving money to Steve Hobbs. And so I think his complaint is well lodged, but his complaint might be too narrow.

I think it's everybody. It's the whole system. You know? And even now, as you guys are working to try to correct some of this, I mean, let's get down to brass tacks. It's going to be, you know, 12 years will have gone by from the time that I inappropriately voted for i502. You know? And in that time, in fact, I think my first Kshama video was 2013. You know that? So time has taken on. And so even now these black pioneers like Kevin Shelton didn't get it yet. Libby, the craziest thing about Libby, Kevin and Ben Shelton didn't get it, but Libby, as we know, she's the one who actually is the only black person that I know of -- that we know of who actually passed the lottery that Darrell Paul called the fraud. He's now like NAACP President, but anyway. She's the one who passed and then got it taken away. And then the law that got it taken away, the policy was



changed, and then she still didn't get a license, and so of course she's frustrated. I'm her friend and I'm frustrated for her. So I'm going to sit back and watch, and I hope that we can get some answers here and keep on moving. I got to get back to work. Y'all have a great day.

Mike Asai: Good morning, Chair Postman, Board Members Garrett, and Board Member Vollendroff, and for those who are here present. My name is Mike Asai, with the Emerald City Collective. First downtown Seattle dispensary 2010, second black-owned in Washington state. It's been a long journey. And I'm also the Vice President of Black Excellence in Cannabis. Let me just say this, you know, the attacks that have been on Ollie are just disrespectful, unnecessary, and it needs to stop. And I'm not attacking the gentleman who spoke this morning, but what I am going to say is let's get the facts straight. Governor Inslee appointed Ollie in 2016. If there was any conflict of interest, that would have been dealt with in 2016, so let me just make that clear. Governor Inslee is a smart man. He knows what he's doing. He appointed Ollie to make the start of the change here at LCB. So let me say that.

I'm here and I have been here because of Peter Manning, who started this fight in 2015, a lone soldier. Peter's my family. When we had to -- was unjustly shut down in 2016 because of Senate Bill 5052, you know, I really -- I gave up. My son had got in trouble. We were forced closed by the City of Seattle via the state. I didn't believe in politicians. I didn't believe in the system. I had no hope. Peter kept going, and that is because he has a fight in him that he will never stop. And because of that fight, he got connected with a very well-known lobbyist named Paula Sardinias, which in essence got the agency to do agency led Bill 2870. And I have to say this, you know, there's still a lot of scraps. How can I say it? I'm here with a heavy heart. You know? Rick Garza was a bad stain on this agency. He did a lot of corruption. He did a lot of bad. He didn't care about the community whatsoever. There are hiccups that have been going on because of Rick Garza's lack of leadership, and lack of caring. I'm glad he's gone. There needed to be a change here.

I commend you, Chair Postman. I commend you, Ollie. I commend you Board Member Vollendroff. You guys are part of that change that we need, but we still need some changes still to keep continuing. I know everyone's done a great job here with the social equity program. We still have more to go. But you know the facts are the DIA map got leaked out to the community under regards of leadership. It didn't get leaked out to the black community. It got leaked out to the white community. The March 1st date was leaked out to the white community, and these are facts. Okay? And so, you know, we're at a point where, yes, the program has come to find license being issued, but you know there's an issue there with the rubric score is not being provided to applicants, and I think the agency understands that. I think they know that. And I think the Board members, I think you guys probably didn't really fully know that. And it's unfortunate because it's like you guys are kind of the scapegoat at times, and that is unfortunate. But this program beginning under Rick Garza, and I'm glad he's gone. I'm glad there's new blood here and change is happening, but we still need to continue to do better for the black and brown community and reach out and just do better. Thank you.

Peter Manning: Good morning. Chair Postman, Mr. Vollendroff, and Mrs. Garrett. My name is Peter Manning. I'm with Black Excellence in Cannabis. I just want to tell everybody there's a rumor floating that I am somewhat trying to shut the program down. No, I merely asked that we take our time in considering how we look at the rubric points because there were some discrepancies in the point system, and I believe there was corruption in data. I am pleased to say that I know of several individuals that obtained a license or application to receive to get a license. I'm happy with that. I'm overly thrilled. I have been fighting this fight for nine years. When I first came to this boardroom -- not this particular boardroom -- in the older building, it was hundreds and hundreds of white folks that were talking about how great the industry was, and I was the only black person telling it was not. I was overlooked for whatever reason, but I fought for nine years to get us to this point, period, and that is a fact.

I do have a problem with information that I discovered a couple of weeks ago, or about a month ago, that a representative from Ponder Diversity Group was supposed to speak at an event. Had that happened, the program would have been scrapped. I also understand that the same breath that that same person who was a representative of the Ponder Diversity Group was also scheduled for a job interview here within that same week here at the agency at the LCB, which I thought was a direct conflict with Ponder. All I'm saying is Black Excellence in Cannabis is a watchdog for the black and brown community. We have been that way. Nothing has changed. We will never change, and we will continue to fight the fight. For anyone to say that Black Excellence in Cannabis is trying to stop a program that is going to benefit the communities of color, and I mean Native American, I mean Latino, and descendants of slaves. There's something wrong with their mentality.

We are moving forward to make this more inclusive of those people I just spoke of in this industry because we were affected by the war on drugs. We were given years in prison for less than an eighth of weed, while our white counterparts were growing warehouses full of weed, getting no scrutiny from anyone, and we all know that. So moving past that, our communities need to get rid of the gatekeepers. Those black and brown people that have been in positions of power to speak out and say something, and black and brown people haven't got nowhere, those are the gatekeepers. We need not look far. Look at the same ones that you haven't got anywhere with, those are the gatekeepers. Look at the ones that are making progress. Those aren't gatekeepers because they're not scared to confront. Those are activists. We need to get the blinders off our communities, black and brown people I'm speaking. Disregard what the gatekeeper tells you. He works for the interests of the white oligarchs or the white liberals or whoever you want to call it, the people in power.

Just a month ago, white retailers had a meeting in the Central District, predominantly black area, to figure out a way to neutralize Black Excellence in Cannabis. They spoke on this for 45 minutes, and all we speak of -- we're not talking about harming people, we're not talking about robbing people, we're talking about inclusion in the \$100 billion industry in the State of Washington, and they don't want us to get a part of that. Come together black and brown community. Get rid of your gatekeepers and join a movement that will move. Not necessarily

Black Excellence in Cannabis, join a movement that is moving for our people in the right direction of economic wealth. Thank you.

## 5. ADJOURN

Chair Postman: Thank you for the comments. That is the last person we have signed up. I just want to say real briefly, we give broad leeway for people to speak during these 4 minutes. Some think too broadly, but that has been the practice we have, and we'll continue to do so. But I got to say, those that come and call themselves journalists and then throw things that they say in the same sentence are unsubstantiated prove that they're not journalists, and I really wish people could refrain from those sorts of attacks. And I got to say I feel the same about things that were said about Rick here today. There is no substantive evidence, proof, investigation, or anything else that would lead anyone to believe that any of those things were true. And I just wish we could work on the future and do this without trying to cast aspersions over and over and over again, which has been a regular part of these conversations now for years, and it's unfortunate. That is not what these meetings are designed for.

These meetings and people's ability to speak freely helped us shape this program in the ways that some people today applauded this program. So it's kind of an important role to play. The people need to be respectful in that. So with that, we're going to adjourn today. We'll be back next Tuesday for a Board Caucus. We're adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 10:49 am.

Minutes approved this 4th day of June 2025



Jim Vollendroff  
Board Chair



Ollie Garrett  
Board Member



Peter Holmes  
Board Member

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

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