



## Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board Meeting

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

### Meeting Minutes

---

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

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

#### 2. PACKAGING AND LABELING – UPDATE REGARDING LABELING OF MEDICAL PRODUCT

**Nicola Reid, Deputy Director of Administration**

Nicola Reid: Good morning, Chair Postman Board Member Garrett. Thank you for having me here today. Substitute House Bill 1453 provides a tax exemption for medical cannabis patients. This has resulted in an increased amount of cannabis infused edible products being submitted for approval as Department of Health compliant products.

To expedite formerly approved products, packaging, or labeling, they are seeking approval as DOH compliant product, licensees can submit through a newly developed process that licensing is close to have finished. The new process will have an e-mail address designated for those previously approved products and then a licensee will submit an affidavit, attesting to the prior product approval for the product packaging and labeling, and attach pictures of the labels with the FDA statement and applicable DOH logo.

This process is not for product already packaged, but for future product that licensees plan to have the additional required lab testing completed. This process would also not apply to licensees who intend to add therapeutic or curative language, or that plan to modify serving sizes.

It is really important to note that general use products cannot contain more than ten servings, regardless of serving size, due to the Department of Health rules.

Licensing is looking to share the finalized process through GovDelivery and the LCB website early next week.

Are there any questions I can answer for you?

Chair Postman: What sort of -- I know last time we asked, there were a lot of applications coming in. Are we still seeing that high level of activity?

Nicola Reid: So we did receive to date a total of 451 applications. 248 of those have been approved, and 36 were denied, and that's why we did feel it was important to get imagery attached to the attestation so we could give a quick review to ensure that the product going out there is meeting compliance.

Chair Postman: I think it's a good option. You're handling it in the right way, and I'm hoping it helps move quickly and doesn't bury your staff too much with these, but it's a good sign, too, that people are interested, frankly.

Nicola Reid: Very much.

Chair Postman: So we want to urge it. Other questions from the board? Seeing none, okay. Thank you very much.

### **3. REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF AGENCY DIRECTOR SALARY**

Chair Postman: Our second item here is review and consideration of the agency director's salary. We've all had the chance to talk with the Director after his full year in the position. I would like to propose a 5% increase in his salary, which would set his new salary at \$183,855 a year, and would ask for one if there's any questions from the Board or if not, a motion to approve that.

**Member Garrett made a motion to approve the salary increase. Member Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved.**

### **4. MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION – LOWER ELWHA KLALLUM TRIBE**

**Marla Conwell, DIDA, Tribal and Government Liaison**

Marla Conwell: Good morning, Chair and Members of the Board. I'm happy to bring forward a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for liquor with the lower Elwha S'klallum tribe (HANDOUT 4). They have previously been a regular licensee with us, and now this will be an umbrella MOA with two locations. I would like to ask for an approval of this MOA, and that the Board -- the chairwoman of the tribe, as well as her legal counsel and some of her tribal members are also here remotely and would like to speak afterwards.

**Member Vollendroff made a motion to approve the memorandum of agreement with the lower Elwha S'klallum tribe. Member Garrett seconded. The motion was approved.**

Chair Postman: And now we'll call on Francis Charles, the tribal chairwoman who is joining us remotely for any words she might have or introduction of any other tribal council members.

Francis Charles: Good morning. I have our tribal council members with me. I have Steve (inaudible), council; Councilor Melissa Billman, also secretary-treasurer; key staff: Tonya, our CEO, and Julia our lawyer, that we've been on the phone with you off and on with, as well as Brian our CFO that's present. Mike Watson is on the phone, who is our casino management director. I know he had some things going on at his house that he had to deal with but really would want to thank you for the cooperation and the partnership on this. I know it may have taken us time as well to get through the process in general itself, but it's something that we're looking forward to and moving forward with, with our casino in regards to economics and working that path with our surrounding communities, as well as other tribes that we deal with just, as well, but we're gratified to have this moving forward, and sadly, we were hoping to be there in person, definitely trying to make it later on down the road here, but we have had recently lost a tribal member so we've been dealing with the family to make arrangements on that part of it, but other than that, we would have been all present.

We say thank you for all your work and dedication to make this move forward for us.

Chair Postman: Thank you. Our condolences on the loss of a tribal member. I know how hard that is. Thank you all. We really are appreciative of the government-government relationship we have and that we're able to work through these processes. I'm always glad to see a new one of these approved or amended where a tribe is able to fulfill its economic independence, and that's why we're here to try to help do that in any way. So good luck with it. And I hope we do get a chance to meet in person at some time, and I'll check with my other board members to see if they have any comments.

Jim Vollendroff: Just a quick comment welcoming you all and thanking you for your participation today. The number of you demonstrates your commitment and interest, and we really appreciate that. Our relationship with the tribes statewide is important, and we really value your participation, so thank you.

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

### **Justin Nordhorn, Policy and External Affairs Director**

Justin Nordhorn: Good morning, Chair Postman, Members Garrett and Vollendroff. It looks like we're just going to start with covering some rulemaking timelines. I'm just going to highlight some of the things for this month and that are coming up. We covered a lot of the timeline yesterday so just for sake of highlighting, we have a CR 105 coming up on August 28th for the gender-neutral pronouns, and that's going to cover all WACs.

We also have the lab accreditation; public comment period is ending on August 16th. So that's this week. So we'll be concluding that informal comment period prior to drafting the 102.

We also have a public hearing coming up on August 28th, and that's for the medical cannabis excise tax, and then we have three public hearings coming up in September, and September 11th, we will host public hearings for the cannabis payment flexibility, social equity in cannabis, and the THC bill implementation.

## **6. ALCOHOL RELATED RULEMAKING**

**Daniel Jacobs, Policy and Rules Coordinator**

### **ACTION ITEM 6A – Board Approval of CR 101 Regarding House Bill 2204 for Emergency Liquor Permits**

Daniel Jacobs: Thank you and good morning, Chair Postman, Members Garrett, Vollendroff. This morning, I am requesting approval for the CR 101 on implementing House Bill 2204, which created an emergency liquor permit which allows our liquor licensees with manufacturing capabilities, such as wineries, breweries, distilleries, to temporarily operate their retail capacities at another liquor licensee's premises if the manufacture's premises become inaccessible or unable to operate due to an emergency or road closure (HANDOUT 6A).

So this bill was passed during the most recent legislative session and addresses the following scenario. A hypothetical winery has to close during the summer due to a nearby wildfire and a beer wine restaurant in a nearby town wants to allow the winery to offer tastings at the restaurants while the winery can't operate at their premises.

Prior to this legislation, Washington liquor law would not allow this to happen. However, the new bill, which is codified at RCW 66.20.010(19), allows a permit for this exact activity, where a winery or brewery or distillery is unable to operate or is inaccessible due to an emergency or road closure, they can get an emergency liquor permit to operate in a retail capacity on the premises of another liquor licensee.

The permits are issued for 30 days at a time per statute, and they can be renewed for a period of another 30 days at a time as long as the emergency continues.

The statute specifically defines an emergency by pointing to the emergency department's statute and there are conditions about how much liquor can be stored at the premises, and other things, such as that a host, or a retail licensee who's hosting a winery, brewery, distillery can only host a maximum of three permit holders at a time.

We actually issued a policy statement on what folks are allowed to do and what they're not allowed to do for the time being until we get rules in place. Some of the guidance is likely to find its way into the rule.

If approved today, there will be an informal comment period until September 14th. We plan on holding two stakeholder engagement sessions on September 30th, and October 3rd, and to have proposed rules filed by October 23rd.

Following the rule filing, there will be a formal comment period until the public hearing to be tentatively held on December 4<sup>th</sup>, and assuming that goes well, the final rules will be filed December 18th with the rules in effect January 18th. Based on this I'm hereby requesting approval of the CR 101, on implementing House Bill 2204 on emergency liquor permits. And thank you, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

**Member Garrett made a motion to approve the CR 101 implementing House Bill 2204. Member Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved.**

## **7. CANNABIS RELATED RULEMAKING**

### **ACTION ITEM 7A – Rules Petition Review and Consideration Requesting to Amend WAC 314-55-570(4)(d) to let previous Round of Social Equity Applicants Move the County of Their License**

**Daniel Jacobs, Policy and Rules Coordinator**

Daniel Jacobs: Good morning again. This morning, I'm recommending that the Board deny three rulemaking petitions received, because the Board has already accepted identical petitions during the June 18th Board meeting, and the draft rule language on the social equity rulemaking was filed just last week, and so the public comment period for the social equity rulemaking is open right now (HANDOUT 7A). So on June 17th and 18th, the LCB received three nearly identical rulemaking petitions from Michael Carter, Brian Chan, and Juan Galvan, requesting that WAC 314-55-570 be amended to allow social equity applicants, who received social equity licenses during the most recent round of applications to move the location of their license from one county to another, and if this petition sounds familiar, it's because it is. It's the identical request that you already got three other petitions on. You heard that petition during the June 18th Board meeting and accepted that petition.

Additionally, during the July 31st Board meeting, the Board approved the CR 102 and draft rule language on social equity rulemaking, which is where if you were to accept this petition, that's where the rubber would meet the road and that draft rule language was filed August 6<sup>th</sup>, and as I've stated already, public comment is open right now on this. The social equity rule file is already going to reflect that social equity license mobility is supported by the members of the public and because the CR 102 has already been filed and public comment period is under way, the Rules team can consider, assuming that this petition is denied today, we can consider the denied petitions as comments in support of social equity license mobility, as I just stated.

So again, there's no reason for the Board to accept these rulemaking petitions, because the Board has already accepted identical petitions and indicated its interest in addressing this topic, and the way that this topic would be addressed has already been put into motion by virtue of the rule language filed August 6<sup>th</sup>.

Based on this, I'm hereby recommending that the Board deny the petitions for rulemaking submitted June 17th and 18th, requesting to amend the social equity rule, because identical petitions were already accepted less than two months ago, and the requested changes are already reflected in the proposed draft rules.

**Member Vollendroff made a motion to accept the staff recommendation to deny the requests to amend WAC 314-55-570 (4)(d). Member Garrett seconded. The motion was approved.**

**ACTION ITEM 7B – Board Approval of CR 102 for Cannabis Sampling (WAC 314-55-096)**  
**Justin Nordhorn, Policy and External Affairs Director**

Justin Nordhorn: Yes. Good morning again Chair Postman and Members Garrett and Vollendroff. Today, we're going to be asking for approval to file the CR 102, which is proposed rules for cannabis sampling, amending WAC 314-55-096, which relates to current vendor educational and internal quality control samples for cannabis licensees (HANDOUT 7B). The proposed rule language is a direct outcome of stakeholder engagement and aims to streamline the existing regulatory framework while ensuring that the safety and accountability remain. The rulemaking was initiated following a petition from the Washington CannaBusiness Association also known as WACA on July 8th, 2022, which the Board accepted on August 24th, 2022. The goal is to address inefficiencies and update the regulatory framework to better reflect industry practices.

On March 1st of '23, we officially began the rulemaking process with filing the CR 101 which started the informal comment period and external engagement on the rule development. Internally, the proposal was developed in collaboration with representatives from LCB's Enforcement and Education, Licensing and Regulation, Finance and IT divisions, as well as our Public Health Education Liaison.

Our approach to this rulemaking focused on understanding challenges, complexities and impacts for cannabis businesses, providing and receiving cannabis samples intended for negotiating sales, and educational purposes. And I would like to call out that this should not be confused with other sampling that we require for lab testing, and so this is separate and apart from that type of sample.

Results of our stakeholder engagement led to this proposal, which overhauls the current sampling regulations in order to support efficiencies and reflect the need of the industry without compromising public health and safety.

So during the informal comment period from March 1st to April 14th, 2023, we received a total of 12 written comments. Comments identified necessary areas of improvements, including, but not limited to the misallocation of vendor and educational samples, the need for sample sizes to better represent products consumers are actually purchasing, greater ability for internal quality control samples focusing on the consumer experience again versus the lab samples, and simplifying the compliance requirements.

So our in-person discussions on March 9th of '23, we held a meeting with the industry Members and the discussion provided a deeper understanding of the practical challenges posed by the current sampling framework.

And the feedback provided reinforced themes identified in those previous comments. In July of '23, we conducted a targeted survey across different license types, producers, processors and retailers, resulting in 428 respondents.

The survey helped us gather specific data on sampling preferences and operational challenges. Collaborative rulemaking discussions occurred, and they were held on October 6th and 11th of 2023 to discuss the proposed concept of trade samples, which merges the vendor and education samples into one category.

So the feedback received was focused on several key areas. The sample sizes, many stakeholders highlighted that the current sample limits were insufficient for adequate product evaluation. We have required creating separate samples, and not what was being sold through the stores, and it was not providing the same level of education for the bud tenders as if they were to consume what the consumer is actually purchasing.

Regulatory complexity, the licensees regardless of business size expressed concerns over the complexity of compliance, and business needs. Stakeholders emphasized the need for sampling regulations that accommodate diverse product lines, business models and also operational cycles.

So as a response to the feedback and incorporating into this particular draft set of rules, we're suggesting changing representative sample sizes. The adjustments are proposed that allow for more representative sample sizes, ensuring trade samples accurately represent products that are being offered for sale on the market to consumers while focusing on the smallest marketable product size to limit the volume of samples across the state. This also eliminates the need to create separate products specifically for sampling, so we'll be able to take it right out of the production line and then categorize it as a sample and have it move through that sampling process in that manner.

The equivalency standards, what we considered when we looked at increasing the size, we looked at this from various product types to ensure fairness and consistency in the sampling practices, and the sizes reflect the common retail purchase unit and also provide a realistic amount for evaluation of products by licensees and employees. So the equivalency standards for the different product types are three and a half grams of cannabis, one gram of concentrate, and a single package containing no more than 100 milligrams of THC in the package in 10mg servings.

Reducing sample categories is also another proposal that we're doing and merging vendor and education samples into the category of trade sample. This also reduces subcategories for traceability recording, alleviating some of that burden. Quarterly limits are considered now instead of monthly limits, so we're changing from the monthly limit approach to a quarterly. This accommodates operational cycles for producers, especially those with seasonal outdoor production.

We're also proposing limits on trade sample distribution increasing, so producers will be able to distribute 96 trade sample units per quarter to processors, enabling comprehensive product assessments. Processors may in turn provide 120 trade sample units per quarter to retailers, facilitating staff training, product familiarization and sales negotiation.

The employee sampling from the retail perspective in particular is allowing current paid employees of retail licensees to receive up to 15 trade sample units per calendar quarter, and these samples are strictly for educational purposes and cannot be used as compensation or incentives. This may appear to be a lower amount of samples for the number of samples to employees, however the quantity is more representative, and so instead of having to try to figure out how to get that accurate representation, we're consolidating those into one area.

And this is also a change to focus, not really a change, but more specific in statute for current paid employees. So it has to be able to be verified through payroll that these samples are going and not going outside of the license business.

Traceability and recordkeeping, all samples need to be documented in the traceability system, and this includes keeping detailed records of the product type and amount, and the licensees and employees involved in sampling. These changes are to ensure transparency and monitoring of compliance.

Designated storage areas, we're requiring trade samples to be stored in designated areas separate from non-trade samples, and this separation is essential for being able to easily identify those samples during audits and premises checks and so we're leaving a significant amount of flexibility in how that separation is to occur, but we do want them separate so we can easily identify where are the samples, how many do you have, and are they complying with the sampling regulations?

Internal quality control sampling, we're increasing the sample sizes for internal quality control to allow 14 grams of cannabis flower per harvest for producers; eight cannabis-infused products not to exceed ten milligrams per serving; and 3.5 grams per batch of cannabis concentrates. And a larger sample size will enable more thorough internal quality assessments helping to maintain consistent product standards and support the product innovation.

We're also making a change to the sample jars. And so the proposed changes include requiring sample jars to be transparent, so customers can view and smell the product that's before them, and we've heard some of that from some of the other feedback around how consumers are approaching purchases. So the modification is intended to enhance consumer interaction with the product. And then they can make purchasing decisions based on the preferences.

We're also having a new option for disposing usable cannabis from the sample jars when it's no longer needed on display, and what we're suggesting is allowing those samples, as one of the options to be provided to current paid employees, as a sample, but counting towards their quarterly sample limit. So it would not require the automatic destruction, but if they wanted to provide it as one of the samples towards limits to employees, they would be able to utilize that versus disposal or sending it back to a processor for destruction.

The economic impact assessment was conducted, evaluating the potential costs related to the proposed rules. Costs could include labeling, which we envision as stickers on the product that are saying basically "trade sample, not for resale".



The storage, and the enhanced recordkeeping requirements for traceability. However, these costs are expected to be offset by the overall reduction in regulatory burdens of creating separate products specifically designated for samples and having those associated labels that would have to accompany those samples.

So these changes presented will simplify the regulatory landscape, reduce costs and ensure that the sampling practices align with industry operations while maintaining safety and accountability. We believe this proposal represents a significant step forward in aligning our regulatory practices with the needs of the cannabis industry and ensuring a safe and transparent market. Therefore, I respectfully request that the Board approve the CR 102 for WAC 31455-096 related to cannabis sampling.

If approved, we plan to host a public hearing, scheduled for September 25th, 2024, and if a supplemental CR 102 is not needed on October 9th of 2024, which would make the rules become effective November 9th of 2024.

So thank you for your time and consideration, and I will be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Postman: I just want to make sure I understand something. You were talking about the sample jars for customers. The samples are not for customers.

Justin Nordhorn: Correct.

Chair Postman: They can never get anything, we don't get to say take one for free. This is just for employees, but at the same time, we're saying, because I've heard this from retailers. They want people to be able to open a jar and smell it, and see it; is that right?

Justin Nordhorn: So this wouldn't allow for the opening of the jar, but you would be able to see it through the transparent -- and most people, I think, are utilizing the glass jars now, but you would have the transparent and then the mesh on the top so you would be able to see and smell it.

So when you do the destruction, that's the other part of this where we say instead of having to go through disposal protocols, you'll be able to utilize that as a sample, because these samples are coming in based on the product that's coming in, and so that would allow for alternatives for cost savings and those types of things without really compromising the public safety interests of not having excessive amounts of samples.

Chair Postman: And they can't be sold, right?

Justin Nordhorn: They cannot be sold. They cannot be donated other than to the employee. They can't be used as an incentive or compensation.

Chair Postman: One of the things, I think, that's good about this code change is we're going to get rid of the educational category, because that always seemed really misleading to me. It's marketing. We're not using it to teach.

Justin Nordhorn: Exactly, and that's why the trade sample approach is going to be more efficient for everyone, because no one has to think about what they want to categorize, versus vendor educational. This is a trade sample, I'm going to negotiate a sale, or I'm going to educate the bud tenders.

Chair Postman: There's an industry understanding of what that entails.

Justin Nordhorn: And why have regulatory burden of breaking those up and tracking them separately?

Chair Postman: And it's one of those common-sense evolutionary changes that I'm glad we're doing. It won't address the number one question I got since I've been on the Board, which is do you get free samples? So just to be clear, no we still don't under this.

Is there a motion to approve the CR 102 for cannabis sampling?

**Member Garrett made a motion to approve the CR 101 implementing House Bill 2204. Member Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved.**

## **8. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

Christopher King: I've got the mic. Terrific. Terrific. Everybody here. I've got my capable host Vanna back here notifying me every 30 seconds given the shortened time frame that we're speaking in now, but anyway, today's theme is: Cronies, thieves and gatekeepers. And first off, I want to say that I had the occasion to run into Peter Manning and also Jacob Stone at Cantanna Fest over the weekend and a couple of things became clear to me. And that is that I need to issue an apology to those guys, to Mike Asai and Peter Manning and we've gone around the home run on this, but I was misled by some information a couple of years ago about some people who really were in it for their own agenda and weren't entirely truthful about some things, but whatever the case, let's just say we've had a meeting of the minds, and we're good now, and we're all unified. Not unified per se, but we have a common understanding about the common enemy, and the common enemy is you guys.

So let's talk about Ollie Garrett for a second. I recall that Ollie said in a KING 5 interview that she wasn't aware of all these issues of cronyism and unlawful favoritism in I502, and Peter gave me his letter October 6th, 2016, where he specifically mentioned it to her. Okay? Yes. He did.

He said I believe it was thought out and executed with the intent to keep Black people from taking part in it from its inception. Yes. He did.

And see I thought Ollie was a gatekeeper also, because I still have going back to this issue when Kevin Shelton sent that letter out and, you know, there was no response to that. It was to Ollie Garrett, and I have the whole e-mail chain, too, where it was mentioned, it was supposed

to be coming to her, and it was coming from P. Haley at AOL, and other people that were trying to get some help for Kevin Shelton and there was just no response there. But yeah. So that's another issue. But then I come to this notation here that Ollie had told me she didn't want me using Tabor 100 in any of my correspondence, or the Tabor e-mails, and I questioned her on that, because I have an e-mail here from September 25th, 2020, in which she specifically mentions Tabor 100 right here, okay? Yeah. And she says "darkness will have a season so glory will have an eternal (indistinct)." And I just wonder about that, because now, it seems to be that Launch – and you guys did Launch right? You paid Launch to do some work and Ollie did you host Launch at a Tabor 100 event? Ollie? Were there any -- is there financial records of that event with Tabor 100, and you? Because the Secretary of State in Oregon had to resign because of her intermingling with the cannabis industry so, you know, I noted that a couple years ago.

Paul Brice: Paul Brice, Happy Trees owner, retailer, also a social equity applicant. I wanted to talk about the title certs, and a lot of things, but four minutes, so I'm going to try to get what I can get in. Four years also being a task force member, nowhere did we talk about the title certs being able to roll their way in to be able to be part of the social equity program. Devaluing the program, bringing more non-black or brown, we all understood what the intent was.

The intent was for black or brown. Right now, I'm out here in Spokane, I don't know if you can see this, but Washington State social equity cannabis for the retailers, I'm going to spend my last two minutes and show you what I had to see for the last nine years every time I go into one of these conventions of what it looks like. (Audio freezing) No black or brown. You're not going to see black or brown in these events. There never is any black or brown. We're all excluded. There's also upstairs. (Audio freezing) These are all the retailers. This is the most prestigious event that we have for Washington State. And this is what it looks like every time you come to one of these events. So the inclusion for the most harmed, most affected, it's more serious than you guys think to just completely think that you guys are actually doing the right thing and helping what the intent was. Again, I've been in court many times in my life, and I've seen judges and judges will always tell you, "well, we know what the intent or the true intent of the law was." We know what the true intent here was for. It was for black or brown. And by letting title certs in willy-nilly, find a white person that lived under DIA, you're social equity with the rest of us? Even the tribes, they're all having their own little thing. It's supposed to be something for the black or brown, and you guys are acting like, you guys aren't smart enough to figure out how to make this for black or brown. This is just wrong. You guys are all too smart. The whole misleading us, making us -- making mistakes here so we can talk about correcting a mistake here, and so we can't talk about the real matter at hand, this is for black or brown. If it doesn't go the way of black or brown more inclusion, then this shouldn't even go through. Yes, I plan on signing a petition, but you guys are all too smart. You guys are -- you guys know how to write things. You guys know what the intent is. Just quickly, go into more conglomerates or corporates. Ramsey owns like 12 of these social equity licenses. Other people own four. You're rewarding corporations more than the individual Black sole proprietor that have more bearing than someone, who puts together 12 people to just get the rubric to bring more white people in. Makes no sense of what we spent five years on to get for the intent of.

Tamiko Henry: Okay. So in 2015, whites were allowed to open stores with no credentials, while blacks and browns were denied, in spite of being better qualifiers. What is the LCB going to do to correct this?

Chair Postman: We don't do question and answer here, but if you have questions, we can have somebody get back to you or you can e-mail us as well, and we'll get back to you. I guess we have your e-mail.

Tamiko Henry: So e-mail you the question, is that what you're saying?

Chair Postman: You could do that, or if you want to ask your question now, we can have somebody follow up and e-mail back to you, from the e-mail you sent to sign up.

Tamiko Henry: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Postman: Okay. I'll make sure somebody follows up with Tamiko Henry.

Peter Manning: Yeah. I was here. Good morning, Chair Postman, Board Member Vollendroff and Garrett. I was here earlier; it wouldn't allow me to unmute. This resonates. It does. It really does. You know, I went to an event, Cannafest, the LCB was there in full force. It was hosted and put on by Black people. Overenforcement of LCB officers there. But I also went to all-white event at a white farm similar to that Cannafest, no LCB were present. There was plenty of weed consumption, edibles, smoking, everything. Listen, you guys treat us differently. Even in an industry that is allegedly legal here in the State of Washington. I sit back, and I look at all the times Ollie Garrett told me we don't look in the past. I would hate to have Ollie Garrett teach my kids anything about Black history, because they would never understand that they were descendants of slaves, and the 400 years of struggle we had to go through in dealing with white supremacy. This would be overlooked under Ollie Garrett's watch. Why do I think Ollie Garrett would be pay any attention to what's going on with the Black community when it comes to cannabis? Think about the wealth you guys robbed from us for the last ten years. And you have made no clear pathway to help us get that back. Whites have solidified this industry. They control it. They dominate it. They influence this industry so much they have greater influence than the LCB. They're writing policies. Cannafest at the behest of WACA, the LCB was instructed by WACA to strip their permits or interfere with the permits in Seattle, to come in, in full force at their event, to harass them. If the LCB can be bought, then let Black people have a little piece. How much money do we need, Postman, Ollie? How much money do we need Vollendroff to get our take? We have no respect with your agency. We have none. The Native Americans have respect. The whites have respect. When it comes to black people or brown people we have no respect. This needs to change. You know we've got you guys dead to right on how you did that in 2015. Rebecca Smith needs to be fired. Nicola Reid needs to be fired. Jeanne McShane needs to be fired. Beth Lehman needs to be fired. We're not done with this, man. This fight is going to continue until we make it right. Thank you.

## **7. ADJOURN**

Chair Postman adjourned the meeting at 10:50 am.

Minutes approved this 9th day of September 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>
---