



Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board Meeting

Wednesday, February 14, 2024, 10:00 am
This meeting was held in a hybrid environment

Meeting Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chair Ollie Garrett called the regular meeting of the Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board to order at 10:00 am on Wednesday, February 14, 2024. Member Jim Vollendroff was also present.

Garrett amended the agenda to remove the Board consideration of rules petitions in order to have a discussion when all three Board members are present.

2. RULEMAKING TIMELINES – ALL INDUSTRIES

Cassidy West, Policy and Rules Manager

Cassidy West: Hi. Good morning, Member Vollendroff, and Member Garrett. I'll give you an update since yesterday unless you want me to get into details of the other rules. But for the Minors on Premises Project, which Denise is going to be bringing a 101 to the Board at the next Board meeting on the 28th, we have received a lot of comments. And as a reminder, this was a petition that the Board accepted in 2022, and this is twofold. So we received a lot of comments about one petition that was received about children and grandchildren being on the premises, and then there was another petition received about contractors that are under the age of 21 to be on the premises to do work temporarily. So we did receive a lot of comments on the first one, definitely looking for comments on the second one, and Denise plans to bring the 101s for both of those projects and kind of do them in tandem. Any questions about that? Okay, great.

Cassidy West: All right. And then we have another project starting, and on March 13th, Jeff is going to be presenting a 101 for the petition that was accepted in January 2023 from Micah Sherman about having more flexible payment terms and allowing checks to be mailed within three days. And so we are working on a timeline for the 102 for now, but we would expect probably in June or July the 102 would be filed. It depends on stakeholder engagement, but we don't expect a ton on this one. Otherwise, most immediately as a reminder, the social equity and formal comment period ends on the 29th, so please send any comments you have to rulesatlcba@wa.gov. And that is it for today. All right. Thank you.

3. ALCOHOL RELATED RULEMAKING

Daniel Jacobs, Policy and Rules Coordinator

ACTION ITEM 3A – Board Consideration of CR 101 Regarding WAC 314-11-050 – Prohibited Conduct

Daniel Jacobs: Okay. Thank you. So I am here to request the Board's approval for filing the CR 101 (HANDOUT 4A). If approved today, and we filed immediately, public comment period will be open until March 22nd. The rule language will be circulated publicly and posted on our website before at least two public stakeholder feedback sessions. The soonest that we can file the proposed rules is April 10th, which would then trigger another mandatory period to allow for public comment on these proposed rules. The earliest we would then be able to have a public hearing on those proposed rules is during the May 22nd Board meeting. The soonest we would then be able to file the final rules would be the June 5th Board meeting, which would then have the new language, whether it's amended language or repeal, effective July 6th. Thank you. I am happy to answer any questions. But I am requesting approval of the CR 101 on the Prohibited Conduct Rulemaking addressing WAC 314-11-050.

Jim Vollendroff: Thank you, Daniel. I just have one question. I know that there was Senate action calling for the repeal of that particular rule. Can you just describe how that Senate action and our action today -- what are the implications of both of those things happening simultaneously?

Daniel Jacobs: That's unclear at this time. There is actually a hearing on that. The public hearing for that bill happened, it just ended a few minutes ago. It was at 8:00 AM. The current language of Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6105 instructs us to repeal this rule. So if that language passes, I think that it would streamline our process because, right now, our process is designed to address whether or not we want to repeal the language or amend it. And so as I mentioned during yesterday's caucus, I think that we would still need to consult with other advisors and legal to sort of address what that situation would put us in if we are told/instructed by the Legislature to repeal this regulation, so it's unclear at this time.

Acting Chair Garrett: And I was just going to say -- the reason before we do the motion, and the reason we were amending for a full Board on the discussion of the petition is, I was ill yesterday and didn't hear any of the Board Caucus, and David has COVID, and he's not here today, so we want to wait for a full Board discussion on that. With that, I will go back now to entertain a motion on the CR 101.

Member Vollendroff made a motion to accept the CR 101 regarding WAC 314-11-050. Member Garrett seconded. The motion was approved.

ACTION ITEM 3B – Public Hearing Regarding Trade Areas

Daniel Jacobs: So just some brief background. This is trade area, WAC 314-02-1071, defines the term trade area as it is used in RCW 66.24.630, on spirit retailers (HANDOUT 4B). The law requires spirit retailers to be at least 10,000 square feet, subject to a few exceptions. One of these exceptions is that if there are no other spirit retailers in the trade area of the proposed new store. Meaning you could open a spirit retailer that is smaller than 10,000 square feet if, among other requirements, there are not any other stores in the trade area. But the term "trade area" isn't defined in statute, so we get to define it in rule. A trade area is currently defined as 20-miles unless we are talking about locations on some of the islands or former state liquor stores.

When this rule was initially created after liquor privatization in 2013, there was a proposal to include stores on Tribal land and owned by Tribes in the list of exceptions to the 20-mile requirement. This would have allowed stores on Tribal land or owned by Tribes to open regardless of the square footage. That proposal did not make its way into the final rule language, and some Tribes were unable to open spirits retailers as a result. This rule project has been meant to take another look at this decision to leave out the language about Tribal businesses. We filed the CR 101 in May, circulated draft rule language initially in July and then again in October after which we had two Tribal engagement sessions and a stakeholder feedback session in November. We received industry feedback and suggestions that ultimately were not incorporated as part of the draft rules. These draft rules were filed on January 3rd with the 102, and we have not received any public comment on the draft rules.

This proposed rule language does three main things. One, it removes an outdated reference to how the LCB measures 20-miles; it cleans up language about the retailers that are located on some of the islands, and it adds in language exempting retailers in Indian country owned by Tribes or Tribal enterprises for the 20-mile distance requirement, providing relevant definitions for Indian country and Tribal enterprises with references to federal law. Following the November stakeholder engagement session, we received feedback in the form of proposed amendments from some industry stakeholders seeking to expand the pool of those retailers being exempted from the 20-mile distance requirement as well as a requirement the LCB provide notice to those stores who would have been within the trade area of these newly-allowed federal retailers. We have declined to include these suggestions because of the intentionally narrow scope of this rule project and the fact that expanding the pool of retailers exempt from the 20-mile distance requirement would run counter to our intentionally narrow scope.

Additionally, the requirement for us to provide notice about Tribal businesses would entail us essentially providing notice to private entities about the actions of a sovereign nation, which is a concept that we feel like is not appropriate and also runs counter to sort of the spirit of this rulemaking. With that, I believe we are ready to proceed with the public hearing. I will just note that while we typically don't answer questions that happen during the public hearing itself, I am happy to answer any questions that the Board may have after the public hearing concludes. Thank you.

Acting Chair Garrett opened the public hearing and invited citizens to address the Board. The Board heard from the following people:

Brad Tower: Good morning, Madam Chair and Members of the Board. Thank you. For the record, my name is Brad Tower. I am here today on behalf of the Washington Liquor Store Association and speaking to the rulemaking proposal here, the CR 102. We have some pretty serious concerns about the language that is proposed, and while I would say that if the intent were to narrowly construe this particular measure that the effect of measure is quite broad, and I have got four different points that I would like to bring up about this. The first is that the sale at auction of the state liquor stores was essentially the sale of trade areas, and the LCB conducted that auction on behalf of the state and received a significant amount of money from private citizens in Washington state for the right to operate within those trade areas with footprints of less than 10,000 square feet.

So this proposed rule amendment to change the trade area to allow for a new geographic location to come into one of the trade areas fundamentally undermines that value proposition that was part of the property tax -- excuse me -- the property certificate was sold to those citizens, and I believe that Mr. Cho will speak more to that in just a bit. The second point I would like to make is that Washington State still has by far the highest spirits tax in the nation, and so to any extent to which a retailer might be exempt from certain taxation in liquor sales, that creates a tremendous competitive advantage and could potentially pull away a significant amount of business from the full tax paying entities. So we have some concern about that. I don't have specifics about the application that in terms of Tribal businesses. What is more concerning to me, though, is that when the citizens' initiative was initially proposed to get the state out of the business of selling spirits in favor of private enterprises, it failed, and it failed because it didn't have a restriction on the 10,000 square foot minimum.

The citizenry was very clear that they did not wish to see spirit sales in gas stations, every convenience store, and potentially in drive-through smoke shops or coffee shops. This particular rulemaking doesn't preclude a specific Tribe or Tribal enterprise from having multiple geographic locations of any size footprint. It would eliminate the LCB's ability to object to the proposal of any location of any size that is included in a Tribal trust land. So I believe that there could be something as small as a drive-through smoke shack down in the Nisqually valley that could potentially receive this license to sell spirits along with the items that are being sold in drive-through.

And then the final thing that I would bring the Board's attention is that the way this is drafted is one-sided, and I would say so if a Tribal enterprise proposed to open in a geographic location that was inside the defined trade area of a non-Tribal entity, they would be exempt and, therefore, eligible to receive that license. But if the Tribal entity already has an existing geographic location and a non-Tribal entity proposed to open up nearby, I believe they would be prohibited by the 20-mile trade area definition from opening that non-Tribal enterprise. So we haven't created a separate island of potential activity on the Tribal reservation. What we have done is simply exempted them from the protections that have been afforded to those people

who purchased those property rights. With that, I will wrap up my comments and be open for any questions.

David Cho: Hi, Madam Chair. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is David Cho. I am the President of the Washington Liquor Store Association. We represent the owners of the former state and contract stores who operate stores less than 10,000 square feet. If you remember, about 12 years ago the state sold off the rights. At that time, we numbered about 330. We are down to about 20% of that, through a number of business reasons, people left the business. They didn't survive. But nonetheless, I represent the entrepreneurs that made it through, so here we are. I am here to speak about the importance of trade area and how that influenced my decision and our members' decisions to operate stores and to buy these title certificates that the state sold. As a group we purchased these certificates from the LCB during the liquor privatization.

This process entailed learning and understanding and calculating all the rules that the LCB told us we would have to operate these liquor stores, and the biggest determinant was the notion of trade area, and that was important because it protected our rights to operate liquor with less than 10,000 square feet. We knew a Safeway could open up, we knew a Costco could open up, but we were protected, and that had a value. And as a result, the state received about \$33 million from entrepreneurs like me who determined that I know the rules, the state gave me this contract, and I am protected, and I can operate and make this kind of money, and that is how the state sold off these rights, and that was the actual process. It is, in our opinion, unethical for the LCB to now say we will rewrite this contract, we will redefine what trade area is after the LCB collected all these millions from us entrepreneurs.

And on a personal note, I have four title certificates. I own a location in Tumwater. I bought that right. That is not open because Costco right next door can sell items sometimes cheaper than I could buy them. But I understand because I knew that they are a big company, and they can get volume discounts, so I understand. I also have the rights in Kirkland. In Kirkland, I had a business, but that whole area was redeveloped in Totem Lake. They did not want me to open up a liquor store there because they sold to Whole Foods and other big companies, and I could not move within the one-mile radius of my certificate, but I knew that rule going into it there was a calculated risk, so that store is not open.

So I have a store in Woodinville, which is doing very well. We sell a lot of craft spirits, a lot of local spirits. I have a store in Tacoma that does very well. We serve the community very well. We are very responsible. But the point is, I know the rules, I calculated my risks, I understand what the LCB did, and us as members, feel that it is unethical because now they are saying, "let's change the rules." All this money we receive from you is now going to be -- the value will be going down tremendously. So that is what I'm here to say. I am happy to take any questions you like.

Acting Chair Garrett closed the public hearing and thanked everyone for their input.

4. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Acting Chair Garrett invited citizens to address the Board regarding any issues related to LCB business. The Board heard from the following people:

Jim Rios: Oh, okay. I am not sure if my camera is working or not, but I'll just go ahead and get into it. Good morning. It's a pleasure to speak to the Board once more to address ongoing concerns that were highlighted during the LCB JET interactions in late January. I and many others are relieved at the decision to redact the photographs taken of patrons at queer establishments. This act has eased the minds of many individuals and helps to ensure their safety long after. While we in the community do agree that photographic evidence is important for case building, I would like to suggest that the LCB Board issue a policy that agents of the LCB take caution of collateral capture of individuals when they are not germane to an infraction or active criminality, and if collateral capture is unavoidable, that as a default policy patrons and photos will be redacted, helping to mitigate a cascade effect with regards to people's safety concerns at a future point.

I noted at last week's meeting the Board is seeking to address biased concerns within the agency and policies long established. I urge you to look at policies with the lens of today and not of when they were written. Bear in mind that many policies of years past were written with intentional bias rooted in patriarchal and puritan motivations, motivations no longer acceptable today. I would like to reiterate the enforcement is necessary and welcomed, but I would like to recommend that engagements should consist of a two-pronged approach. The initial contact team and a standby team. The initial team would ideally consist of no more than three people, and if serious interactions or acts of criminality are observed, then the standby team would be called in.

The point is don't lead with a team that looks like a raid force when it is not necessary. In terms of equitable enforcement, there is a need for tracking visits of licensees. When I spoke with Mr. Vollendroff last week, he mentioned a tool in development called a dashboard. He can speak more intelligently about it. But I would like to suggest incorporation of essential reporting database that all community enforcement agencies will report to and pull data from so that community-level agencies, the LCB, and civil liberty organizations would have a central data source to query. I would also like to suggest that the LCB Board ask their licensees to submit their demographic information emphasizing the purpose is to ensure equitable enforcement and to conduct trend analysis to head off unbalanced enforcement as well as streamlining enforcement itself while eliminating duplicative effort which could lead to perceived bias-based enforcement.

Bringing focus back to the queer community, it's important to understand our community is quite diverse. It transcends politics and racial groups alike because our center of gravity is sex regardless of if it's heteronormative or not, promiscuous or not, or for transgender or not, the point is we are not part of a particular yet powerful heterosexual community that also practices what is deemed by them to be biblically acceptable. This key distinction has been the central

target by them tirelessly persecuting our queer and other sexually-liberated communities because for them sex has always been dirty, perverse, and should be regarded as immoral if it is not biblical. This is why same-sex relationships and sexual health education are continually facing legal challenges othering our communities. This attitude has prevailed long before our nation was founded and codified in laws and policies around the world.

As long as people in power and influence continue to reject the concept that sexuality is as human as breathing, segments of humanity will be othered, hindered, and persecuted for being different. We need to understand that being different is perfectly human. It just requires empathy, patience, and I urge you to consider this during your rulemaking. Thank you.

Sami Saad: Hey, hello. How are you, Ollie? And hi, everyone. And I just wanted to say hi for the Board. I just want to deliver a message from my community in Kent and Renton and Tukwila, and Seattle. It is really very important for us this one to be heard. To be different, it don't make us better. We are -- we black in the law [audio cuts out]. We are Sudanese American and East African Americans. We were always facing we are not being treated equal. We want you guys to hear us. Our community as Muslim and even Christian, we don't like alcohol. We don't support alcohol much. But this is the people drink. We, we, you know, it's the freedom of whatever people choose. But we would love from you do not see 211 and hurricane in Seattle and Tukwila because it's affecting our people, and we have a lot of people that used to use us back in the day. They used to come and get medical cannabis from us. They refused to do so, and they became alcoholic. So we fail -- they fail the LCB. They affected them in the past Legislation. Not you guys. This is a new Board.

We look forward to you guys to work out with us because even a City of Renton, for example, I am one of those pioneers. I see the social equity going forward is better than it was, but it still is not, you know, acknowledged as still as pioneer is being left to those. The pioneer exactly and [indistinct] is not working. It may be working for me because I fit everything, every criteria. That's why I am a winner. But I want to tell you guys some people is being left, and they are not from Sudan. They are African American and other. If we acknowledge them, they are less than 40, we can close that page, like Kevin Shelton, Libby, those people, they being exist, being pioneers. We have shops before 2017 and 2012. We've been having shops, and I cannot be medical shops. Now I am a winner because they fit every criteria you guys looking for but other not. But at the same time, we didn't get four and three like others.

But, unfortunately, in the City of Renton we cannot allow and, unfortunately, the City Councilor, Eddie, he's an African American. He's not acknowledging this a new social equity. You and he is not giving us the equal opportunity. This is like we are in limbo, and we need equity. We live in the city. They have people became alcoholic because they don't want to buy and get cannabis or donate to those, you know, other people, not discriminating them, but we need to be acknowledged. We are different. We are Muslim. We are African. We are not African American. I am the only one. You know, they have all the one like I [indistinct]. He bought it from a Caucasian man. He's in Renton. Another Renton, he's in the Skyway. He bought the shop. He

bought it by himself. He is from Ethiopia, and he don't want to even want it to have the news because there's no equity, he said, until those black people were being acknowledged.

I am the first canopy in medical in Washington state ever. Even I have a copy of a background from the state. I am just telling you guys, listen, you and Legislation. We support you, Ollie. We support you, all of you guys. We know we have a misunderstanding in the past. The problem is not you guys. The problem is those black leaders there and aren't presenting the right issue. The right issue is the black pioneers that need to be exist. And that boundary 20 miles, one mile, 1000 miles, that's too much for us not allowing us to have the equal opportunity as people with [audio cuts out]. Those people like in the City of Renton is only two white [audio cuts out] the Evergreen market and the other one is 420. Even the Evergreen Market he bought it from black people. So there is no black person. I need to be exists. We need to be acknowledged, that's all. No disrespect. But we want to thank all of the people working for you guys, Sara and all of them, I really salute you guys, but sometimes misunderstanding happen. But like I said, the problem is not the Board, the people reflecting to the Board, so we need the Board to acknowledge those pioneers. That's all. But thank you for working for the social equity. I look forward the social equity to happen. I wish the work on cannabis to work on harder and faster. Thank you so much. I just wanted to say that that's I just want to deliver the best for the community. Thank you so much allowing me to speak. Thank you, Jim, and thank you all of you guys.

Gabriel Neuman: Thank you. I am a Gabriel Neuman Policy Council and Government Relations Manager at GSBA Washington's LGBTQ+ Chamber of Commerce. Thank you, LCB, for your diligent response to concerns brought by community and for your willingness to engage and learn throughout this process. I had the pleasure of meeting with you on Monday, where I highlighted particular areas of concern that we have heard from our members. I am repeating these points today so that they were reflected on the record among community:

First, we want to make sure that regulations and compliance are checked; however, care should be taken to ensure schedules of LCB compliance visits do not disproportionately target LGBTQ+ establishments. Second, compliance visits should be conducted in a way that prevents potential disruption to patrons, including patrons' privacy. 3.) The Liquor Control Board should liaise with the LGBTQ+ community to understand the bar culture as it pertains to events, clothing, performance types, etc. 4.) Need for LCB to work directly with our managers and owners to address compliance issues. 5.) LCB should establish a way of rebar owners to view and engage on anonymous complaints, and 6.) I repeat the call for the full repeal of the lewd conduct WAC. Thank you so much again, LCB. I really appreciate your willingness to come to the table and engage in a fruitful process going forward. And please consider GSPA as a resource going forward. Thank you.

Skye Theriot: Thank you. Hi, Members of the Board, staff, and public. My name is Skye Theriot, and I am here today to thank the Board for their decisive action by acknowledging and respecting the courageous voices who shared their stories since the raids on the LGBTQ+ licensees. My story started in rural Louisiana, and when I relocated to Washington state in 2010,

I was excited to escape the rampant homophobia that I experienced growing up in a part of our country that is still controlled by religious bigots. Having spaces where my community can escape the routine exclusion, which is still highly present even in our state, has been paramount to healing the mental health impacts of growing up where I did. This Board's action helped to recognize the importance of these safe spaces for those of us who are able to live our life out in all places and for those of us who are not. While being shirtless or in jockstrap in a bar may seem trivial to some, having this freedom of self-expression creates a world where I and many others are able to meaningfully see that it is okay to be in the bodies we are in.

Being surrounded by others who get to share that same freedom creates an environment where people in our communities get to see bodies being celebrated that may not match the toxic mainstream one size and its small messaging. Personally, having been able to see other bodies that look like mine dancing freely on the dance floor has impacted my own physical and mental health journey as I navigated life, working diligently to drop my weight from 275 lbs. I learned it was okay to look the way I looked, and there were places I could be free from judgment or ridicule, places where body diversity is celebrated instead of shamed. In my own battles with body dysmorphia, this has been a life-changing relief that has allowed me to escape the world of self-hate.

Repealing the prohibited conduct rule will provide meaningful impacts across many areas of health and safety, including the removal of the state-sponsored revenge porn created through previous enforcement, allowance of licensees to establish their own dress codes, and further ensuring safety for those in our community who are seeking a place of inclusion to be themselves while they cannot be out in the rest of their lives. Further, I stand in solidarity with the strippers, our workers, in supporting Senate Bill 6105, as it progresses through the House. During the time our state's legislature is working to define the bounds of the adult entertainment bill, I would like to ensure clarity that while correlated the issue of repealing the prohibited conduct rules is an issue that deserves merit on its own as well as in conjunction with what those workers have been accomplishing over the last six years.

As the Board has acknowledged, local jurisdictions around our state created their own rules and guidelines regarding nudity to match the constituents' requests. Given the diversity in our state, it is paramount that we allow those jurisdictions to continue governing in ways that align with the values of those who are being governed. The City of Seattle has determined that for our city, nudity is acceptable. As Member Vollendroff mentioned in a previous meeting, I can walk to the bar in a jockstrap, yet with the prohibited conduct rules in place, I was not able to go inside without causing a potential violation for the establishment I was entering. Given that our bars already make up a tiny portion of the overall licensees in our state, burdens like citation or the risk of losing their license are undue and can pose serious impacts to the financial well-being of both the establishment and its employees. I am excited to participate as the rule continues forward, and I am eager to hear from our community as we work together to navigate the path ahead. Thank you.

Peter Manning: Oh. Well, good morning, Acting Board Chair Garrett, and Vollendroff, and I hope David Postman gets better, God's speed. I would like to address what has been on my mind. First off, I would like to say congratulations to the LGBTQ community for their accomplishments dealing with this agency. I would also like to put out there that the LGBTQ community -- I don't want to get it wrong -- understand that black and brown people have been dealing with this agency and their enforcement unjustly for since its inception when it was the Liquor Board, and then it became the Liquor and Cannabis Board. It has never treated the black and brown community as equals. We have fought every step of the way to gain equity in the market that should be open to all of us if we are Washingtonians. It's -- I don't even know -- ten years in the making, I have been fighting this fight. We still don't have one black owned store in Seattle open.

During my investigation from Black Excellence in Cannabis -- I am President of Black Excellence in Cannabis -- me and my team discovered major corruption inside this agency. We have pointed it out. We have asked this agency to look into it. Crickets. Nothing. The LGBT community, please understand that we are allies with you. Look at our pain and suffering. Come see us and see what we are going through as a community, too. We are oppressed by the same people. We need people. This agency has always picked on people that don't fit the narrative of white conservatism. If you -- black people, brown people, the gay community have always been at odds with this agency, and I would like to know why. We need to have this agency audited, I believe. I will say that repeatedly again and again. I do not think for one moment that Vollendroff and David Postman are racist or bigots.

What I think they inherited was a festering -- and I am not speaking of all employees here. There are some good employees here -- but there is a core element here that has a tendency to pick on the disadvantaged people of the state, and we need to know -- we need to understand why. I don't even understand how you could walk into a gay establishment and try to shame someone for expressing who they are. It didn't -- that made no sense to me. What government interest was that? But please understand, this is something we've been dealing with in the black and brown community for years over enforcement, National Guard, DEA teaming up with the LCB to do a raid on a grow in the backyard of a black house that somebody black or brown owns in the black neighborhood. This agency most definitely needs to have someone look at it. It needs to be audited. We got to come together, people. The LGBT community, the black community, the brown community, we are at odds here. We got to have -- we got to unify. Let's get in here and -- these people do not have control. They only have the control that we allow them to have. Thank you.

Chad Swaney: Hello Board and members of the public and staff. Thank you so much. My name is Chad Swaney, and I am a member of the Queer Life Night community, here to speak out in support of the repeal of WAC 314-11-050. I want to start out by thanking Chair Postman, who unfortunately isn't here, and also Member Garrett, Member Vollendroff, Director Lukela, and Director Wax, for their quick action on an issue that impacts my community deeply and profoundly. I have worked in state level advocacy for many years, and this is the quickest response to the Community by a state agency that I have ever seen. And I also appreciate your

willingness to listen to me and to members of my community and take our concerns seriously. I want to talk a bit about why I think the repeal of 050 is so critical.

For hundreds of years queer people have been told that our bodies are sinful, they're shameful, or somehow broken. Policing the bodies of queer people has a long history of violence, from raids in queer spaces in Victoria, England to violent raids in New York City in the 60s, policing how we dressed to current day, when states are enacting draconian laws, denying medical care to trans people, and then right here in Washington when queer people in what they thought were safe spaces found themselves subject to humiliating inspection and photography of their bodies by law enforcement wielding flashlights. The good news is that while we can't fix centuries of wrong, and we can't change what is happening in other states, we can take at least one small step here in our state to remove this harmful language from the WAC. Queer bodies have been policed, shamed, and marginalized for too long, but you can do something about. I urge you to repeal 314-11-050 and allow Washington to be a safe place for the vibrant, self-expression of our queer community. Thank you very much.

5. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 10:46 am.

Minutes approved this 13th day of August 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.
--