



## Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board Meeting

Wednesday, October 11, 2023, 10:00 am  
This meeting was held in a hybrid environment

### Meeting Minutes

---

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chair Jim Vollendroff called the regular meeting of the Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board to order at 10:00 am on Wednesday, October 11, 2023. Member Ollie Garrett was also present.

#### 2. YEARS OF SERVICE RECOGNITION – TOM DIXON Chandra Wax, Director of Enforcement and Education

Chandra Wax: Thank you. Thanks to Dustin for driving the slideshow that I sent to him just a few moments in advance, good to see that you made it, Tom. Captain Dixon is here with us. Captain Dixon has 35 years of state service. With such a career, we could tell many stories. But when I was thinking of what I would say today, the words people use to describe Tom really stood out to me. As you can see, he was promoted to Captain, he's worked for the Department of Revenue from 1998 to 1990, started with us in 1990, was promoted to Captain in 2006. And now has 35 years of state service. Those words that people use to describe Tom were words like reliable, we can always count on him personally and professionally, to help us celebrate the good times and to come alongside us in the bad times. He also embraces change. Well, sometimes it's hard to tell. And he looks a little bit old school, he really does support change. And here, you can see that he's even learning how to take selfies. He's a hard worker, leading from the front and from the trenches. You can see here also, he's still working on those selfies. He doesn't take himself too seriously. He has a sense of humor, makes people laugh. Because work, too, can be fun. He doesn't pick favorites and gives everyone the benefit of the doubt. Although, as you can see on the next slide, Pickle really is his favorite. When asked about Tom, people said some amazing things, some amazing words. Above all, he makes people feel valued. I'm going to tell you a few things people said about him, and Dustin, we can just leave this slide up for the interim. He'll throw out 20 ideas in hopes of having a good one. One word: SPEEDO. I'm sure there's a good story there. He treats others with respect, always shares his opinion, makes others feel welcome and appreciated, gives kudos freely, has lots of stories of sailing, lots of talks about his favorite smells. Among those are sailboat cabin mold and the dump, interestingly enough. He's not afraid to try things and later admit they don't work, he does everything with energy and passion, he has outstanding commitment and leadership, he's a role model, he has unwavering dedication, wisdom, experience and guidance, he's always there personally and professionally, he knows everything about this agency, he stops what he's doing

to pay attention. And, for the last slide, there is a reason the word tomfoolery exists. And it's this guy. So Captain Dixon is with us if you have anything you'd like to say, but thank you for your years of service, Tom.

Tom Dixon: Oh, thanks, thank you so much, Chandra, for the nice tribute. It's been a great ride and looking forward to pulling the plug next October 1st. Very much have enjoyed working here, and we've come a long way. Lots of changes. And you know, I was planning on staying with the board about two years and then moving on to a federal agency and seeing the rest of the country or the rest of the world, and here I am 33 years later still at it. So, looking forward to my last year here.

Chandra Wax: Thank you very much and it looks like he's made his announcement. We'll be planning a retirement.

Jim Vollendroff: Hopefully it's not literally a pulling of the plug. Tom, I'd just like to add on behalf of the Board: thank you for your many years of service. I've had the pleasure of meeting you, I believe that the Mountlake Terrace location is where you're at, and impressed with your leadership that you've demonstrated, and the kind words that your staff actually said of you while I was up there, so congratulations.

Tom Dixon Thanks, Jim. I appreciate that.

### **3. RULEMAKING TIMELINES – ALL INDUSTRIES**

#### **Cassidy West, Policy and Rules Manager**

Cassidy West: Good morning, Board Member Garrett. And thank you Board Member Vollendroff. I'm going to go ahead and start with alcohol rulemaking today. So we have stakeholder engagement for the alcohol delivery and MAST 13 Rule Project coming up on October 16<sup>th</sup> and October 18<sup>th</sup>, those are virtual. And then Daniel plans on bringing the 102 to the Board on November 8th. For the trade area rules, we are preparing conceptual draft rules and Daniel plans to have those out by the end of October. Public engagement sessions will be held in November, and in December, Daniel's tentatively planning on bringing the 102. We did receive a rule petition yesterday about beer endorsements, I don't have the details right off the bat, I can give you more, I'm sure Daniel will chat it to me in a second, but that's it for the alcohol stuff. Are there any questions about that?

Jim Vollendroff: Great. Board Member Garrett, any questions? No questions. Thank you, Cassidy.

Cassidy West: Okay, so I'll move on to cannabis. We have a collaborative rulemaking discussion for vendor and educational sampling today, it's also virtual, it's on one to three, and then I do have the PowerPoint up for that discussion on the laws and rules webpage. Actually, all of the stakeholder and any public engagement, you can find all those announcements on the

laws and rules webpage, and then it'll link you to the actual invitations on our current outreach page. And so going back to cannabis, we'll be bringing the 101 for the medical cannabis endorsements petition that the Board had accepted on October 27th. Also on October 27th, I'll be bringing the CR 101 for the social equity, and that's SB 5080. And then, at the end of the month, we'll be holding stakeholder engagement for the THC bill. So that's it for cannabis. Today, I will be presenting a rule petition response for action this morning. But would first like to review some of the changes that have been made to the petition response format, and that's reflected in the response I'll be presenting. Okay. So to improve transparency and accountability in the way the agency responds to petitions, changes to the existing format have been made based on best practices for good governance that were developed using a variety of academic literature. The petition process described in RCW 34.05.330 and chapter 82-05 of the WAC does not provide guidance for what should be included in petition responses if petitions are approved, but it does go through and provide some guidance on what's to be included if petitions are denied. And so with that, we developed some criteria for when deciding when to approve or deny a petition. The following factors will be considered to the extent practicable: LCB statutory authority and obligations, alignment with the agency's policy goals and priorities, the immediacy of safety, environmental or security concerns raised, availability of LCB resources and priority of the issues raised, level of public interest, whether the problems or issues are already under consideration by the LCB and other rulemaking issues, merits of the petition, LCB's relevant past decisions and current policies, social equity and DEIB impacts, and potential impacts related to preventing diversion and promoting public safety. Are there any questions about the new format before I begin on the petition response?

#### **4. CANNABIS RELATED RULEMAKING**

**Cassidy West, Policy and Rules Manager**

##### **ACTION ITEM 4A – Rules Petition Review and Consideration Requesting to Amend WAC 314-55-083(4)(f) to Allow Batch Tracking of Cannabis Plants**

Cassidy West: Okay, so in the petition, Mr. Anders Taylor from Sweet Leaf Sowers requested that the agency initiate rulemaking to amend WAC 314-55-083(4)(f), which provides the security and traceability requirements for cannabis licensees. More specifically, the petitioner requested that the rule be amended to allow groups of plants that are under the same strain and growth phase be grouped together under a single unique identifier and tracked. Under the current rule, clones may be grouped in lots and once the plants reach eight inches in height or width, each plant must be physically tagged with a unique identifier and tracked individually. After the plants are harvested, they're once again grouped into lots or batches. Mr. Taylor provided the following reasons for the proposed rule change: It would simplify the processes for plant inventory management to reduce the compliance burden, a class reduction that will result from not having to tag and tap plants individually, ensuring cannabis is traceable from seed-to-sale is necessary to prevent diversion and promote public health and safety, and the proposed rule change would not substantially impact the current seed-to-sale regulatory framework, especially since clones and harvests are tracked in batches or lots.

So batch-tracking is a method of inventory management that assigns a unique identifier to a group of items that share the same characteristics. Batch-tracking allows inventory to be traced from origin by location, and through its movement through the supply chain, maintaining a chain of custody for that inventory. There are different types of batch-tracking systems, such as barcodes, RFID, QR codes, serial numbers, etc. All of it can capture and store the inventory information necessary. In the cannabis industry, tracking by batch means keeping a record of the quantity of plants and its yield. When plants are harvested, the flowers are combined into lots at which point the individual plant can no longer be distinguished. It's important to consider whether there's a continued value by requiring licensees to track each plant individually, rather than the quantity within a batch.

The agency has statutory authority to make the rule change. The petitioner's request is aligned with LCB's statutory obligation to consider economies of scale and the impact on licensees' ability to comply with regulatory requirements and undercut illegal market prices. Licensees are responsible for all costs with the reporting and traceability requirements. And given this, it may be prudent to consider whether the current requirements impose an undue burden, while not necessarily providing a greater benefit with regards to preventing diversion and promoting public health and safety.

Approving the petition would initiate the collaborative rulemaking process in which feedback would be solicited from stakeholders and other interested parties about the rulemaking topic that's relevant for us to make those decisions and assess the compliance burden and any associated regulatory outcomes with the current rule requirements. The petitioner's request is aligned with the agency's current policies, policy goals and priorities, and relevant past decisions and current policies.

It's been a decade since adult-use cannabis was first legalized in Washington State and there have been significant advancements in the industry, and technology. LCB has used a variety of traceability vendors and software since legal marijuana began. CCRS was designed to be an interim solution, until a more permanent solution could be developed. Although the rules were written such that the inventory tracking software must have adequate seed-to-sale capabilities, CCRS does not track all aspects that are required to be tracked by licensees. Subsequently, Policy Statement 2110 was issued in December 2021 to describe the adjustments to the traceability system, or traceability recording reporting requirements that would be supported by CCRS. For example, although the rules require plants to be physically tagged with a unique identifier generated by the traceability system, CCRS does not generate these unique identifiers, so licensees must report the unique identifiers to the traceability system.

LCB is also currently developing a charter for a traceability project in which the goal is to clearly define the cannabis regulatory program and provide a vision for the future of cannabis regulations, reporting, and traceability in Washington State and for this successful transition to a long-term reporting system that fully supports the reporting obligations and traceability needs. Accepting the rule petition would initiate the collaborative rulemaking process to gather relevant internal and external feedback necessary for informing the future of reporting and traceability.

Additionally, there's a high level of public interest in addressing the traceability frameworks, so we would expect those conversations to be really robust. The proposed rule may not significantly impact public health or safety in a negative way. The concept of batch tracking is not inconsistent with the existing regulations which already allow groups of plants to be in clones or after harvest, grouped together and assigned a unique identifier. So instead of assigning each individual plant a unique identifier once it reaches eight inches in height or width and breaking the chain of custody, the original unique identifier assigned to the clone lot would remain throughout the harvest and processing until the lots are packaged for retail sale. Therefore, the base material used in the processing of the concentrate or infused product would be identified by the lot number originally signed to the clones or lots as required by that WAC section. If the petition's accepted, to ensure the proposed rule change would advance public health and safety and prevent diversion, at least the following would be required: a robust seed-to-sale traceability system that would capture where the plant originated; clearly defined regulatory framework for a batch-tracking inventory management system that's compatible with a seed-to-sale traceability system; the regulatory framework must identify a specific quantity of plants that would be within a single lot or batch, identify the characteristics for plants that make up that lot or batch including, but not limited to, being planted and harvested at the same time, being of the same cultivar, etc.; a requirement that licensees will need to physically tag lots or batches with that unique identifier or generated by a traceability system; and then require reporting so that there's an adequate chain of custody from seed-to-sale.

Washington seed-to-sale regulatory framework for traceability is effectively the same as in other states with legal cannabis, including those that allow batch-tracking, require individual plant-tagging or allow both. Colorado is considering a transition to batch-tracking and Oregon will transition to batch-tracking system in 2024. Other states, including Maine, which allow both batch-tracking and individual plant-tagging, have not documented increased penalties on licensees associated with diversion, or adverse public health outcomes that are a direct result of batch-tracking inventory management system.

So all of these states do utilize Metrc as a traceability software. Batch-tracking inventory management is a standard in many other industries including food and drugs, both of which have significant impacts to public health and safety. Therefore, today, I'm going to recommend that the Board approve Mr. Taylor's petition for rulemaking, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

**Member Garrett made a motion to accept the rule petition. Member Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved.**

## **5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

Gregory Foster: Good morning, Member Vollendroff, Member Garrett, it's good to see you all today. I'm here today to express my gratitude for Kathy Hoffman, her work, and to encourage agency leaders to ensure that her legacy of transformation is carried forward and built upon. So Ms. Hoffman spent five years at the agency, and she dramatically reformed the policy and rules program, and had this added capstone of leading the formation of the research program. And so in all that work, she centered transparency and public engagement and seemed to be driven by a pretty deep sense of responsibilities as a public servant. So now, I don't want to belabor this point, but by way of contrast, Member Garrett will probably remember the kind of previous regime with Joy, and Heidi was a very different kind of approach and style. And I'm just gonna leave it at that. So Ms. Hoffman, she recognized that value of engaging diverse voices much earlier in the process. She would share draft conceptual rules publicly, during the CR101 phase, to help shape her thinking, and she would host pretty novel stakeholder engagement processes, like listen and learn forums, deliberative dialogues and work groups. And she also engaged the Board earlier than her predecessors. Ms. Heidi was known for some pretty long expositions and pretty rambling discussion sometimes, which, you know, actually, it was pretty interesting to hear and I encourage the board members to engage in impromptu discussions more publicly and share what you've been learning and what you're thinking about. But it did sometimes lead to some surprises and some kind of awkward conversations sometimes. My understanding of Ms. Hoffman, she'd brief you privately, each. And I think she respected really the dignity of the Board, and the wisdom of formal processes.

So one example of that, that I'd like to highlight, is the process that she developed around rulemaking petitions. And we heard that that process today has been changed. So statute requires the Board to respond within 60 days of receipt of any rulemaking petition. And Ms. Hoffman began briefing Board members publicly, two weeks prior to the Board meeting at which you would be required to make a decision. And you know, that respected that process and your power to make this decision and allow for feedback to be incorporated. It also allowed for the unexpected. Things come up, people get sick, and life happens. But that clock is ticking. So in the case of this batch-tracking petition, I was interested because of my background, I've helped the agency with traceability in the past. It's complicated, and it's controversial. I could have offered perspective if I'd heard about it two weeks ago. I could have offered perspective if I heard about it yesterday, but the Caucus had to be canceled yesterday on very short notice. I could've provided a written feedback, if there was anything published, but there wasn't in this case. And I could have been able to provide comments today.

But the Board positions the general public comments after you take action. And that's not the case with other agencies necessarily if there's action that's going to be taken that day. So long story short, this experience has me considering the implications of kind of the very different kind of two-week notice that you got from Ms. Hoffman, and I just really want to encourage you to please support your staff and your leaders in appreciating retaining and building upon that transparency and public engagement which Ms. Hoffman brought to the agency and which has made a big difference and helped a lot of people. Thank you.

Christopher King: It looks like Mr. Postman has left the room. That's unfortunate. I see you got a note passed to him because I wanted to have a discussion with him about an unqualified statement that he made, an affirmative statement that he made at the last meeting, where he said that these people are not journalists. And I just would love to know and I'll follow up another time when I get a chance. I'd love to know what people to whom he was referring. Okay, because was it Luc Carlin? Was it Anne Continelli? Was it Peter Manning? Was it Mike Asai? Was it me? I mean because I need to know who he views as not being a journalist. Now you guys were there. Did you agree with this comment? It's a yes or no question. I mean, he made an affirmative statement. And I've watched you guys for years now selectively engage in Q&A. Okay, so it's time now, since an affirmative statement was made that impugn the integrity of my friends and myself, I think you need to answer that question. Did you agree with him, that we're not journalists?

Jim Vollendroff: Christopher, we're here to just listen to you today.

Christopher King: Okay, well, you gotta keep listening all right, because here's the thing. First of all, y'all know, Mr. Postman knows about my journalistic background, going back to the 80s when I managed the Cincinnati edition of the Ohio Call and Post, the only statewide black newspaper ever, I think, you know, and then there was like, also the Indianapolis Star, lots of freelance stuff, but let's bring it up to current, okay, and the things that I've done right before I got here. We all know, you probably can't read this, but what it is, is from the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, registration for news media under Supreme Judicial Court rule 119, Part B. Registration for news media individuals not employed by a news organization. Who? Christopher King, JD, King cast, Chris King's First Amendment page, bla bla bla bla bla 2012. That's a little more recent. So I don't know, I think I'm a journalist. What's this here? About public speaking, the board lifting a ban on public comments? That's part of a lawsuit that I drafted. All right. And that was in New Hampshire. Front page news, working with city council to change the law, about restrictive speaking, okay. And then I got the commendation from the city and the aldermen for that. So I think I'm a journalist, but let's bring it even more current than that. You might have seen two weeks ago, I sent you a video of that budtender in that white-owned shop as most of the shops are, of course, like, 540 out of 545 of them, something like that. So you may have seen that I was in there reviewing some policies, and the budtender dropped the \$300 preroll on the floor in front of me. And I picked it up for her. But anyway, yeah, so the only reason that I'm in that shop interviewing a budtender is because I'm what? A journalist. Yeah. This was the press pass I had at that time with my credentials at that time. Okay? So I'm not going to hear this stuff. You know, that's embarrassing for Dave Postman to say that. All right? It's ridiculous. And guess what, at that time, when I was working with I'm on Location, I was working with one Jeff Burnside, who's more a journalist than Mr. Postman or me, arguably, Jeff Burnside has Emmys. Okay? We worked together. We produced a couple of videos. All right. So I might suggest to you that the real journalists, we are the real journalists. Alright. The journalists that are phony are the ones who worked for the old newspaper that Dave Postman worked for, okay. And journalists could have other occupations. You know, when he worked for Vulcan in a communications capacity, he was working for the transition team for Mayor McGinn. Okay, we all know this. All right. But the real journalists, nobody's asking for any information

about Director Lukela right now except me. All right. So, nobody's asking for that. That means they're not real journalists. It's ridiculous. Goodbye.

Sami Saad: Hey, how you doing? I wanted to be fair, and that's what I learned since I was a kid. And sometimes when I'm here it's just for my shop, I'm fighting for something I have since day one, because I've been in medical cannabis since day one. I want to say thank you to the Board. Maybe I couldn't understand you at the beginning. I couldn't understand that it was you, Mr. David Postman, you show me with respect. The point, maybe I disagree because I want everybody as pioneer to have their license and I still do from my heart. And it became a combination of both, you know, the convicted felony and the pioneers. And the good thing is, I fall in both category. It was not big a deal for me. But I fought for the whole community, the community said from the Rainier to Quala, to, we are more than 65,000 Washingtonians. Thank you to the board, what we're looking for more from you guys, thank you Ms. Ollie Garrett. Sometime misunderstanding would happen. I found out from a friend of mine, his name is, he own a shop and that shop, he got it from the lotto. He didn't get it because somebody gave it to him before Ollie Garrett being in the Board. So the way I learned from my mom and my dad to say the truth, it is on me or against me. I could not understand you, Mr. David Postman, but you've been very respectful. And if you respect someone, of course, they will give you respect. Misunderstanding happened, but like I said, thank you to the Board, looking forward to see more people as finally getting their license. I'm not gonna lie, you know, so to me it's a big happiness for the whole community because we're building a school and we just finished the blueprint, and I should help them. And it was the same celebration of me to hear the voice of, I win the social equity license, I'm looking forward to work with the Board. Much respect, I wish you guys the best. Sometime people don't understand. And they should not take it personal because this is all about licensing about this. And I just want it to be fair and to be faithful because the community asked me to say the truth and to go and to thanks. And the board have been listening to those 25,000 Washingtonian as to Sudanese-American and East African. And it make us more than that. And a lot of people celebrating, because we're going to build a school, not you know, for us is the most important, you know, treat me with equity. And sometimes we can be lost. But this is not the fault of this Board now, because this is a new Board. And I want to thank everyone, and I wanted to say, sometimes nobody perfect, things happen in life. But we should respect and to reflect what we have on what we lost respectfully. And my mom asked me before I came because I lost my father, since I was fighting for this. And it made me cry when I went away. But at the same time, the truths are true. Nobody perfect. But I wanted to say hey, Mr. David Postman not because just again, my license, I'm going to have to be fair, you never disrespected me. As well as the whole Board members, sometime, people, if you see somebody mad, and you don't know exactly the whole thing, oh, my 30 seconds is looking forward to see the Board work with those pioneer that didn't get the license, like what his name, Kevin Shelton, and that's very important for the community. And the community, my community say that is your friends that get the license. So we look forward to see more license for those people, more equity for them. But as far as the community, they say hi to you guys. And no disrespect. We've been fighting in the past. It's all about the license. Thank you so much.



David Busby: Cool. Thank you for having me. One thing I would like, the first thing that I would like to talk about is the petition for the rule change on plants and multiple plants under one tag. I'm pretty excited that the Board has moved that you know, loads of the states have that kind of stuff going on. They're allowing for some batch processing on these materials, it saves a considerable amount of time for the producer side, the farmer in the equation, and I think that's actually a pretty big deal and I'm excited about that. A thing about that is that WAC 314-55-010 says that an immature plant is something that's below 12 inches, and then in 314-55-083 they also talked about the trees being over 8 inches in height before they're considered a mature plant. And it seems like those two sections of the WAC are in conflict with each other. I'm not a lawyer, but that might be something that can get cleaned up during this rulemaking process, since now the height of the plant won't be any kind of differentiating factor. A second thing to note is the CCRS upload for plant information may need to be modified so that you can include the quantity of trees that are represented underneath some specific identifier. And then the third thing I would like to add is that the CCRS, I got an announcement, I think it was from Brian a couple days ago that CCRS is going to do confirmation emails on all the stuff that we upload. And I'm very excited about that, too. So thanks for your time.

Mike Asai: Thank you. Good morning Board member Vollendroff, and Board member Garrett and the audience. My name is Mike Asai with Black Excellence in Cannabis, I'm the VP. I'm also the owner of Emerald City Collective, first downtown Seattle dispensary unjustly shut down. I just wanted to briefly make a statement. Back in 1851, it was considered a mental illness for my ancestors to want to be free. It was phrased: drapetomania was a supposed mental illness that in 1851, American physician Samuel A. Cartwright hypothesized as a cause of enslaved Africans fleeing captivity. The reason I'm saying that is because, you know, this fight for inclusion has been going on for a long time. And it's been very warranted. As I've said before, you know, Peter Manning was the one that started this fight, got connected with Paula Sardinias. Ollie Garrett got on board. And in essence, Governor Inslee in the state of Washington. But, you know, we're hearing rhetoric as if, when we speak, that we're complaining. And it's the old notion of like, the victim is not the victim anymore. And I just want to say that, no, we don't come up here just to complain, we come up here to hold the Board accountable. Peter Manning empowered me in these past several years. He's my family, we've known each other for many, many years. But we weren't connected when we all had to close down. I lost faith, in the state of Washington, I lost faith in the LCB, I had no faith in the LCB at all, I lost faith in politicians and legislators. And, you know, when I come up here and speak, this is from years. This is from years of pain for me, and others. We drive down here from King County, it's not easy. It's not easy to talk in front of a light or white folk. And I don't say that with malicious, I, my son is half white, and Native American. I have aunties and uncles that are white. I have Asian in my family, my family, I have lesbian, gay, whatever you want to call it, it's all in my family. But I just want to say, you know, that when we speak here, we're not complaining, what we're doing is bringing to light that maybe things have not been brought to light. And sometimes it takes one or two people to bring that to light for the entire community. Because the community is really intimidated of the LCB. The community's intimidated of the Capitol, they just are and this is because of years of oppression of African Americans. Okay. So with that being said, I also want to transition to, right now, there's an issue with the IT, people need to be able to check their

addresses. They're looking for locations and right now they're not able to and I don't know if that was brought to the board's attention. I know within, under the director within the office, I know there's been some talk about that, but I'm not sure if the Board knows about that. So, you know, people don't need to have to always email this cannabis specialist and say, "hey, can you check this address?" It needs to be to where hey, it's supposed to be they can go online, they have an address, they could check it. They might want to check it at midnight. So anyway, I just wanted to bring that to the Board's attention and look, we at Black Excellence in Cannabis, myself, we see the change here. We are happy with the changes. We want to see more changes, but we recognize and see the changes that has been going on here. And we're happy about that. We would not have supported 5080. 5080 came out of what the taskforce initially was talking about before everything got manipulated. And so we're excited to see, you know, what's going to transpire in the future. So thank you for your time. Appreciate it.

Tran Du: Okay, sorry. Yeah, sorry. Yeah, got mixed up. I was logged in under my name, versus Matt Schoenlein. My name is Tran Du, Matt Schoenlein's right next to me. I'm one of the co-owners of Shawn Kemp's Cannabis, and so is Matt Schoenlein, we just wanted to come here and talk about how to address, maybe change the penalties for selling to minors. We recently had an ABN or an administrative violation for selling to a minor. And it was really beyond our control. Because we have policies and procedures in place for everything that we do. The employees are required to sign policies and basically

Jim Vollendroff: I need to interrupt you for just a second to just acknowledge that we can't talk about specific cases so, happy to hear general comments, but we just need to keep it very general and not talk about specific cases.

Tran Du: Okay. Yeah so I guess what I'm asking for is that first violation for selling to a minor be an educational infraction, rather than an actual monetary penalty, and having it hang over the head of the business for two years, which creates undue stress. So that's what I'm asking for. Because, without speaking specifically to the case, in our situation, anytime that we onboard a new employee, they're required to spend one to two days of training and shadowing, they sign documents stating what they're supposed to be doing. They're required to check IDs, required to scan IDs. Before they even start the transaction, they're required to enter the date of birth into the point-of-sale systems to even start the transaction. And in this situation, the employee did none of that. And because the employee failed to follow all the procedures that we had put into place...

Jim Vollendroff: Again I just want to remind you, we can't talk about specific cases, so just continue to keep it broad if you can, thank you.

Tran Du: Yeah, I'm sorry, I'm trying to keep it vague. But that's the motion that I'm asking for is for the Board to consider first infraction for a sale to a minor, be something that's educational, and that the business takes care of it as a human resource issue, rather than it be an actual penalty that hangs over the head of the business for two years, which creates a lot of undue stress. And then, you know, now we're required to spend additional money to make sure that

this is not happening. And it's, you know, we're actually, even though we have two stores, two retail stores, we're still considered a very small business, and we're operating in the red still, and it creates a lot of stress around the business when something like this happens and the first infraction becomes something that sticks with the business for two years. That's all I have to ask, all I have to mention, just so we can get the process of talking about it going.

## 6. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 10:46 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

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