



Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board Meeting

Wednesday, May 11, 2022

This meeting was held via web conference only

Meeting Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chair Garrett called the regular meeting of the Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board to order at 10:00 am on Wednesday, May 11, 2022. Member Jim Vollendroff was also present.

2. INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBER – JIM VOLLENDROFF

Acting Chair Garrett: Good morning, everyone. I want to call the May 11 Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board Meeting to order. David is on leave, so I will be Chairing the meeting this morning. And I want to begin by introducing our new Board Member, Jim Vollendroff.

Member Vollendroff: Good morning. Thank you.

Acting Chair Garrett: This is Jim's first official Board meeting. Jim was appointed by Governor Inslee and started with the Agency last Tuesday. He has over 35 years of behavioral health background. He has 13 years as a provider with Providence and 16 years with King County Department of Community and Human Services. And in 2019, he was recruited as the Founding Director of the Harbor View UW Medicine Behavior Health Institute. And he was actually recommended to Governor Inslee for an appointment for this role via a letter that was signed by 22 legislators. So, Jim, welcome to the Board and welcome to your first Board meeting.

Member Vollendroff: Thank you so much. I'm excited to participate in the Board. I've been impressed with what I've seen so far, and I'm really excited to bring my literally decades of experience to the Liquor and Cannabis Board. And I look forward to meeting members of the community. I've had people reach out already in setting up meetings, and I'm looking forward to meeting more people on the industry side of this business. So, thank you so much.

Acting Chair Garrett: Welcome. And we'll begin this morning with Kathy giving us rulemaking timelines.

3. RULEMAKING TIMELINES

Kathy Hoffman, Policy and Rules Manager

Kathy Hoffman: Thank you, Board Member Garrett, and good morning to both you and Member Vollendroff, and I'm so glad to work with you. Looking forward to many years, I hope, of partnering in this great work together.

Member Vollendroff: Thank you, Kathy.

Kathy Hoffman: I'm just so glad you're here. So, I want to give a monthly update for May. And starting with general rulemaking, Audrey will be presenting the proposal for electronic filing rules this morning, and she'll provide a summary on that project and its background in a few moments. With respect to alcohol rules, we will bring the CR 103 or rules for final adoption on axe throwing to you at the next Board meeting on May 25. The presentation had originally been scheduled for today, but we wanted to assure that all three Board Members have the opportunity to vote on the adoption of final rules with that project. With respect to the implementation of Senate Bill 5940 concerning the Contract Packaging Services Endorsement, no comments have been received to date on the CR 101. And that was filed on April 27th. The comment period remains open on that until June 17th, and we began internal rule drafting meetings this month, and there are a few others scheduled for this month, as well.

So, moving on to cannabis rules in progress. I'll be asking you to withdraw the rule proposal on social equity rules a little further along in the agenda today. And also, further down on the agenda, Robert will be presenting the CR 101 or inquiry around THC definitions. And then Jeff will provide background on the project related to pesticide action levels prior to the opening of the hearing on that rule project, so we can hear a little more on those projects at that time. So, to wrap up, the project in House Bill 1210 that changes the word "marijuana" to "cannabis" throughout our rules using the expedited process has received two comments, so far, largely in support of the project. So, with that, I will conclude.

4. GENERAL RULEMAKING

ACTION ITEM 4A – Board Approval of CR 102 for Electronic Service and Filing Rules Audrey Vasek, Policy and Rules Coordinator

Audrey Vasek: Good morning, Board Members Garrett and Vollendroff. Thanks for the opportunity to be here today. Today, I'm requesting approval to file a CR 102 rule proposal related to electronic transmission of documents for service and filing (HANDOUT 4A). For background, this project was initiated on February 2, 2022, when the Board approved filing the CR 101 preproposal statement of inquiry. A new rule section authorizing service and filing of documents by electronic transmission is needed to streamline and modernize business in adjudicative processes as well as bring a consistent approach to this issue across the agency. We anticipate these rules will benefit anyone that interacts with the agency as well as reduce potential impacts to the agency technology Systems Modernization Project (SMP). LCB staff

from the Board Adjudications unit, Licensing division, Enforcement and Education division, as well as the Finance division, were all involved in developing the proposed rule language.

To engage stakeholders, we shared the conceptual draft rules publicly through GovDelivery on April 11, 2022, and we received three public comments on the conceptual draft. These comments were neither for nor against the rulemaking, we received some questions, statements of interest, and operational feedback. Those comments are included in Attachment B to the CR 102 memo and were taken into consideration by the project team as we developed the proposed rules. In summary, the proposed rules adopt electronic transmission as an additional means for service and filing of documents. Electronic transmission is defined as including but not limited to email, web portal, fax, or other similar methods. The rule also outlines procedures for service and filing and describes how the date and time of delivery or receipt will be determined. In this case, the agency estimates businesses will not have any costs associated with complying with the proposed rules.

Since the proposed rules authorize electronic transmission as an additional means all other existing options for service and filing such as by mail or in person would remain viable options. And the CR 102 form describes this Regulatory Fairness Act analysis in more detail. So, in terms of timeline, if the CR 102 is approved today, I'll file it with the Code Reviser, and the formal public comment period will open. Notice will be published in the State Register on June 1st, and the public hearing will be set for June 22nd. The public comment period will close at the end of day on June 22nd, and after that, the earliest the CR 103 could be filed would be July 6th. If approved and filed on July 6th, the final rules would go into effect on August 6, 2022. So that concludes my presentation. And if there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

Member Vollendroff: I have no questions, but I do have a comment. And just to make a comment on the thoroughness of this and the work Audrey of you and your team, I think that making sure that the electronic transition is in addition to the way that we are currently doing business is very thoughtful in terms of the continuity of operations for businesses. So, thank you for that overall systems improvement initiative. Thank you.

Member Vollendroff made a motion to approve the CR 102 for Electronic Service and Filing Rules. Member Garrett seconded. The motion was approved.

5. CANNABIS RELATED RULEMAKING

ACTION ITEM 5A – Board Withdrawal of CR 102 Regarding Social Equity in Cannabis Kathy Hoffman, Policy and Rules Manager

Kathy Hoffman: Thank you very much, Board Member Garrett. Good morning, again, to both you and Board Member Vollendroff. This morning, I would like to request your approval to withdraw the proposed rulemaking of the CR 102 that we filed as WSR – which stands for Washington State Register – WSR 22-09-036 on April 13th of this year regarding amendments

to existing rules, and a new rule section that would establish the Social Equity in Cannabis Program, in response to recommendations of the Social Equity in Cannabis Task Force, and it made some other statutory amendments consistent with statute (HANDOUT 5A). So, I would like to ask you to withdraw it at this time because the Agency wishes to engage in additional research and analysis to make sure we align with the intent of the social equity program. We anticipate presenting an updated rule proposal once that additional research and analysis are completed. And we are tentatively scheduled thinking that will be done and ready by the June 22nd Board meeting, so just a few weeks away.

We remain committed to implementing a successful social equity program. So, for these reasons, I would ask for your approval to withdraw this proposal today. Any questions?

Acting Chair Garrett: Thank you, Kathy. I am looking forward to the update. And I think we discussed that this withdrawal would only delay the complete rulemaking process by a couple of weeks?

Kathy Hoffman: A couple of weeks. That's correct.

Acting Chair Garrett: Okay. Okay. Jim, did you have something?

Member Vollendroff: So, it does not impact the overall timeline.

Kathy Hoffman: It doesn't, and I know you weren't here while these rules were being developed, but we did start with a very aggressive timeline to begin this work. And there was some time built into it in the event that something like this might happen, as does with rulemaking sometimes. So yes, this does not impact the timeline significantly.

Member Vollendroff made a motion to withdraw the CR 102 Regarding Social Equity in Cannabis. Member Garrett seconded. The motion was approved.

**ACTION ITEM 5B – Board Approval of CR 101 for Expanding Definitions Related to the Evaluations of Additives, Solvents, Ingredients, Compounds or Concentrates Used in the Production or Processing of Cannabis Products
Robert DeSpain, Policy and Rules Coordinator**

Robert DeSpain: Thank you, and good morning, Acting Chair Garrett, and Board Member Vollendroff. This morning, I would like to request your approval to file a CR 101 Preproposal Statement of Inquiry regarding expanding definitions related to the evaluation of additives, solvents, ingredients, compounds or concentrates used in the production or processing of cannabis products (HANDOUT 5B). I provided a brief in Caucus yesterday, but to reiterate, the purpose of this inquiry is to consider whether to amend or repeal existing rule sections to expand on definitions related to the terms previously listed. If approved for filing today, here is the tentative timeline for this project. A CR 101 will be filed today with the Office of the Code Reviser, and the informal comment period will begin. We will then update internal and external

LCB websites and send a notification regarding the filing to our stakeholders. As Kathy mentioned at Caucus yesterday, two additional deliberative dialogues related to this CR project, one in May and one in June, as well as a Listen & Learn session tentatively scheduled for early July will also be taking place.

After that, on September 14th, the CR 102 will be presented to the Board to approve for filing proposed rules. On October 26th, the public hearing would then be held. And then on November 23rd, a CR 103 would be presented to the Board to approve the adoption of rules, making the rules effective on December 24th. So that concludes the presentation on this rule project, and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

Member Vollendroff made a motion to approve the CR 101 for Expanding the Definitions Related to the Evaluation of Additives, Solvents, Ingredients, Compounds or Concentrates. Member Garrett seconded. The motion was approved.

ACTION ITEM 5C – PUBLIC HEARING – Pesticide Action Levels
Jeff Kildahl, Policy and Rules Coordinator

Jeff Kildahl: Good morning, Member Garrett, and Member Vollendroff, thank you for the opportunity to be here today with you. The rule proposal before you today for public hearing would update technical chemical isomer information in WAC 314-55-108 for several of the pesticides currently allowed for use in the production of cannabis (HANDOUT 5C). Other changes to this rule would update rule language to ensure consistency with recently adopted cannabis quality control testing rules, including removal of language concerning the remediation of cannabis products that have failed quality control testing. And finally, the proposed rule amendments would remove redundant language from the rule section and would also replace the term “quality assurance testing” with “quality control testing.” The CR 102 for these proposed rules was approved and filed on March 30, 2022. Since then, we have received two comments on the proposed rules.

We anticipate bringing a CR 103 to you for consideration on May 25, 2022, assuming that no substantive changes are made to the rule proposal. And under this timeline, the rule would become effective 31 days after, which would be on June 25, 2022. And that concludes my introduction on this rulemaking for the hearing today. And may I answer any questions?

Acting Chair Garrett opened the Public Hearing and invited citizens to address the Board. The Board heard from the following person:

Jim McCray: Oh, thank you. I appreciate that. I just want to provide a little bit of public input here that the agency has heard in the past regarding pesticide action levels. This was submitted a number of years ago by a gentleman who at the time had run the pesticide regulation function within the WSDA for over a decade, Erik Johansen, and he submitted some version of the written testimony I just submitted this morning in 2008. And in those suggestions, Mr. Johansen effectively suggested and reiterated a point he had made on numerous occasions to the

Agency, that the adoption effectively of the Oregon Standards by Washington State, and the failure to adopt the recommended standards recommended by the Department of Health in this state and the Department of Agriculture in this state jointly to the agency resulted in a set of pesticide action standards that effectively were not protective of human health. I'm not using the right words, probably, but he was concerned at the time.

And he gave his testimony, and I have given it written, so I'm not going to speak it out here. It relates to specifically changing some action levels based on whether or not the pesticides in question are allowed for use on any foodstuffs in the rest of the non-cannabis market. He really did run through this, and it was a shame at the time, I feel. And now I feel, as well, that the Agency does not seem to have seriously entertained his input and the input of the department at the time. So, I'm not going to read them all. I'm going to use my time for something else, which I will expand upon in the general comments. However, there are a couple of other things in these rules that I did not put my written input. One is in trying to align them with the quality control, not assurance, but quality control changes that you put into place a month or two ago, you have chosen to make them aligned with, I guess, 102 or one of the subsets of the WAC there.

I want to remind you that there is another subset of the WAC that also makes reference to pesticide action levels. But now, it will be the inconsistent one and doesn't seem to have been covered in any of these rulemaking sessions. And that's the one that relates to the CBD, the important CBD testing, which requires pesticides, and it still uses the old language. So, for example, the standard of whether something is bad for a pesticide there uses the word, "if it is deleterious." These current rules that you passed a month ago, and the ones that you will basically accord by adoption in these rules, change the word "deleterious" to "harmful." So there was never any explanation given for that change of language. It's fairly obvious from a legal perspective that that raises the bar somewhat for bringing punitive action against someone who abuses it and puts consumers at risk. So again, it is certainly an industry-friendly move. It's not a very consumer or patient-friendly move.

And that's a theme that goes through -- I'll be frank -- the way this agency has run the quality assurance and quality control rules over the past few years, many opportunities have been afforded to improve the lot of consumers of cannabis use with respect to the safety of the product. And those opportunities are generally not grasped and indeed, with every single successive iteration of quality assurance/quality control rules, the agency has further degraded the quality and safety of the product that is available on the market. You'll be hearing more from me on that later. However, for this, thank you very much for your time, and I appreciate it. Please consider this input. It really is Erik's input, primarily, but I thought it needed to be said again. Thank you.

Acting Chair Garrett closed the Public Hearing.

6. 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:

Christopher King: To the last gentleman, briefly, I just want to mention that the testing issues and failures of LCB have been going on for some time. My camera won't turn off for some reason. That's odd. But such is life. These problems have been going on for some time, and that is a subject of some Rule 408 settlement negotiations that John Novak and I are having. And Jim McCray is helping out with that, and I'm not sure how much of that I can share with you. But we share your concerns on that front, and it's a part of our federal litigation. You can look the case up and see some of the issues there. We've been working on that in a professional manner with them, and there are all kinds of holes in that, some of which we agree with you as you just pointed out on the deleterious to harmful. That's one of them. So we're in lockstep on that one.

Next, I have a couple of questions on protocol for the Board. Seeing as we're going back in to work these initiatives out as far as cannabis equity, Libby Haines. Now, she's the only black person and black female that we know of who passed the so-called fraudulent lottery. And that is what Darrell Powell, NAACP Economic Adviser, said it was fraudulent. And by the way, I have an email from Jim Buchanan, who said that Darrell Powell likes my work. That's a fact. Okay? But anyway, so what I'm getting at with Libby Haines is that I returned to my original premise, which is that the pioneers and people who passed the lottery but then had rules apply to them that were subsequently changed, should be at the front of the bus. Okay? Not the back of the bus, they are sitting up front with Rosa. All right? So, I can't see any reason why, can anybody on that Board see any reason why someone like Libby Haines should not be at the front of the bus now? Anyone?

Acting Chair Garrett: Mr. King, we are listening to your public comment.

Christopher King: Okay. [Indistinct] I'm allowed to ask a question. If you're not going to answer it, I'll just let the record reflect nobody answered it. That's fine. I'll move along. Next point. Protocol, I wonder about some protocol issues and what happens when you receive information or questions from BIPOC constituents because I have a certified return receipt before me from Kevin Shelton with a final date of eight July 2020 as social equity was just starting, and that is numbered 7019 2280 0000 9170 1812, received by the Board on that date. And this is a letter to you, Ms. Garrett. And so the question becomes what happens with that correspondence? Because he has sworn under oath that he did that pursuant to Nate Mile's instruction. And nobody has controverted that, even though Nate Mile's lawyers sent me a cease-and-desist request two weeks ago and I told them to provide some affidavits, and we'll talk. You know? Right. It's pretty simple. Right? And they haven't done that.

So, I'm just curious, what is the protocol when you receive something like that, what happens to it? Does it just like sit there or like -- there has to be -- you know, I was a government lawyer. I know there are protocols and procedures for when you receive public inquiries like that. So, does anybody know what? Can you identify where that protocol is for me to look up, or what?

Acting Chair Garrett: As I stated, we're just here to hear your public comment. Dustin is taking notes of things, and he will get back to you to answer your questions.

Christopher King: Okay, but I'm asking you though, Ms. Garrett. Did you remember receiving a letter from Mr. Shelton? Okay. Great, great, great. Also, does anybody here ever remember we make any antisemitic comments? Because I was accused of that by Paula Sardinas, who also said I was disbarred. That's false. Because the point of fact I was suspended for one year, and my Jewish mentor said that racism, ignorance, and reactionary politics played a role in that one-year suspension. So that was defamation when she reached out to Sami Saad to tell him that. There is a material difference between a one-year suspension and something of moral turpitude that would result in disbarment. I could go join the bar today if I pay off my fines. Okay? So I'm not disbarred. That's false. All right, thank you very much. Have a great day. Bye-bye.

Sami Saad: Okay. My name is Sami Saad. Mr. Jim, I want to welcome you to the Board. You are a new Board Member, but you don't know a lot of stuff happened to us. I created this business. I came the first one. I'm Muslim. It don't make me better than anyone. I am African. I am black. But we are being disrespected by the Board. Ms. Ollie Garrett herself, she said, "I will help you," when she meets with us publicly. And she know I was the first one. I created this business like everybody else like Shelton. He was thinking about it. Right now I am African mixed with a little Jewish. I don't make me better than anyone. But unfortunately, everything, it went to the white Jewish. This is not against Jewish. This is against the white Jewish that took everything for themselves. They came after us. They get everything. Ms. Ollie Garrett, her ex-boyfriend just got a shop. His name is Nate Miles. That is a disrespect to the community. I came and I voted for this bill, HB 2870. I went to Olympia, and I opposed the bill at the end because Mr. Shelton and his brother told me and Peter Manning, the one he got a weed shop with Nick Miles. They got a weed shop. They were against this bill. They told me, "Don't vote." They were using us. [Indistinct], the legislator, he get mad at him. But they make this bill pass anyway. They said, "We will listen to you guys." They appointed Saldaña. She didn't help us. I went to her office. I've been disrespected. Mr. Jim, they need to address our issue. We have a lawsuit going on. I've been threatened to be killed. Don't speak about Jewish community. I'm mixed with the Jewish. This is not against Jewish. This is against those group of people. They're making Jewish people bad, and they are not. If you know who I am, I am one of those guys. We have been making a great relationship between Israel and Sudan. I'm from Sudan. And the Embassy just testified, and I have emails. So I own one of the best junk removal company or the biggest junk removal company in Seattle, and I own different businesses. I made the weed shop to help in the community.

Everybody know who I am in Rainier area and Renton. I shouldn't even say that because I've been threatened. They broke my glasses and all that. And I lost the trust in LCB. I lost the trust in the fake police. You know, I'm even taking it to FBI. Mr. Jim, the Governor appointed you. They need to know Ms. Ollie Garrett and Paula Saldaña cause they don't represent us. They're using us. Ollie Garrett came after that to reinstate her ex-boyfriend license. That's what I think. She came in 2016. She was dating him before that. The people who get the license, that's the

people she used to date, two of them. Did it make sense? Me, Mr. Shelton, and ... what's her name? I forget her name, Libby. We are not getting anything. We should be in the front of the bus. Not because we are better than anyone. We create this. We lost thousands of dollar. I used to support people, Mr. Jim. You like a doctor. You used to work for the hospital, use your common sense. Mr. Jim, I have family. Now they became crackhead. I used to pay their rent. Ask about me if, as a community -- I'm a community leader. First thing, I am black. I am mixed. I am African. I am Sudanese. We are more than 65,000 Washingtonians. Do you know, Mr. Jim, the Social Equity Group, they made it. Even they didn't listen to our opinion. This Board Member, you guys, you have to be careful supporting each other. You have to be very careful because you guys damaging us. They don't even take the public opinion. Do you know we will repeat the story over and over and over this month for two years this been going on to -- hey, you guys mistreating us. They meet with my community. It's been assigned by the social equity groups, and that group does not exist, I think, anymore for this to help us.

Peter Manning: Hey. I'd like to welcome Jim Vollendroff to the LCB, and thank you for having me, Ms. Garrett. I have just a couple of questions for Mr. Vollendroff. We have had a problem with social equity in Washington. I, along with the person by the name of Aaron Barfield and Paula Sardinas...for years we fought for social equity. We were somewhat instrumental, and we helped draft House Bill 2870 dealing with social equity. I belong to Black Excellence in Cannabis, I should say that. My question to you is, are you aware of the problems that black people and brown people have faced within this industry? And what do you hope to bring about being a Board Member now? What's your target? What's your goal? I mean, I know this is more inclusive than just social equity, but what are you going to do for social equity? Can you tell us that?

Member Vollendroff: Yeah. I think that as Acting Chair Garrett indicated, we're here really to listen more than respond. But I will say that I have a deep commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion that has been a part of the work that I have done at the University of Washington. I also have a deep commitment to the mission of the LCB, and I will do my best to listen. I'm really in a mode of listening and understanding at this particular time, and welcome conversations as I get more familiar with the work of the LCB to further have conversations around this particular issue. I've been impressed by the work that I've seen so far regarding social equity and look forward to continuing to support the efforts of both the industry side and the LCB in regard to social equity.

Peter Manning: Okay, great. Hey, and I just want to say this. We believe here at Black Excellence in Cannabis that Governor Inslee and the LCB, we believe you guys are making progress. We see a change in the Board. We see a change in the LCB's direction. We recognize that, and I'm going to try to address that and bring that to my community and tell them that. But what I said before, I just want to say this, I think that there should be some type of press release from the LCB or the Board to the black community and brown community to let them know the progress is going on or what's happening out there, what you guys are trying to accomplish. Because there is so much misinformation that is put out there about everything that it's just not accurate. It's not right. We need clarity, and just coming from me doesn't help. I think

something would have to be said from the Board and the LCB about this issue of social equity. And that's all I have to say. Hey, thank you. I'll just keep hanging out here at the meeting and check everything out. Thank you.

Jim McCray: Oh, thank you so much. I want to reiterate other speakers. Welcome to Board Member Vollendroff. Welcome. I was really thrilled when I saw that you had a behavioral health background. I think that's going to be a wonderful addition to the oversight of the agency. And at some point, hopefully, we'll get an opportunity to speak one on one. I'm an experimental psychologist by trade and did substance abuse research way back when and have been an avid student of the data that has been thrown out by the market in Washington State over the last eight years. So that's my background. A couple of things. I wanted to follow up a little on my input earlier. Thank you, Dustin, for allowing me to do this by phone. One thing you may have noticed is you didn't get a whole lot of input on this ruleset, and it's a fairly important one when you consider that now the 99% of the product sold in this market is not medical for patients is now actually going to be tested for pesticides. That's a very good thing. That is progress.

It's so much of the other little things that were done to the rules that bring it a step backward in overall consumer safety, in my opinion. And I have pretty strong and well-informed opinions about that, in my opinion. I wanted to give a bit more story about the gentleman who did the rules that are submitted in writing earlier this morning. And it might speak to why you sometimes have a dearth of input. And you know, on October 3, 2018, Erik Johansen gave testimony to the Board on a public hearing. It was Item D on that Agenda. You might want to listen to the recording of it. It's at time 00:02:20 on that recording. And he basically stated his opinion, and then Board Member Hauge -- I believe, Board Member Garrett, you may have been there at that meeting -- asked him, is he speaking for himself or speaking for the agency, the Department of Agriculture? And he said he was speaking for the Department of Agriculture; it's his job. He's going to be a cannabis point and he's the pesticide guy there.

So, within three working days, he was pulled from his cannabis responsibilities by the WSDA, and within two or three more working days, he was pulled from over a decade of leading the pesticide registration program at the agency. So I read that as a vindictive action on the part of the agency because a very good public servant did not follow the party line and perhaps put inappropriately the words of the agency in his mouth, but he was working at his job. So the vindictiveness, it does not just go to licensees, it goes to public servants, it goes to anybody that crosses the agency. That is part of a culture of what you're now overseeing, Mr. Vollendroff. It's there. It's real. And you can read the history. I can give you a summary one-on-one at some point if you'd like to know. Two other things, this is the kind of behaviors of the agency that really should be reeled in a little bit. We have just recently gone to referring to cannabis instead of marijuana.

That's very good. One of the recent outputs from the agency made reference to high-THC cannabis which is a value-driven term in whatever communications people had something to do with forming it. I would suggest you not use such terminology. Cannabis is defined on the basis of its THC content, which is more than 0.03%. After that, it's hemp. So bringing in a term that is

not defined as high-THC cannabis. it's [audio cuts out], it's even a certain I would say prevention-minded and biased perspective [indistinct] [audio cuts out] interpretation. I warned you in February not to listen to the direction staff was going. They put this new interpretation out there, it's horrible. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Acting Chair Garrett: Thank you, Jim. And if there is more you want to add you can email that to us, and we will take a look at it. With that, that's it for general comment. And with that, the May 11th Board Meeting is now adjourned. Thank you all for joining us today.

7. ADJOURN

Acting Chair Garrett adjourned the meeting at 10:40 am.

Minutes approved this 5th day of November 2025



Jim Vollendroff
Board Chair



Ollie Garrett
Board Member

Not Present

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.
--