



Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board Meeting

Wednesday, March 4, 2026, 10 a.m.

This meeting was held in person and online

Meeting Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Vollendroff called the regular meeting of the Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board to order at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 4, 2026. Member Holmes was also present. Written public comments will be attached to these minutes.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Member Holmes made a motion to approve the February 3, 2026, Caucus; February 4, 2026, Board Meeting; and February 11, 2026, EMT meeting minutes. Chair Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved.

3. YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION

TAMARA BARGER, LICENSING AND ADJUDICATIONS COORDINATOR

Presenter: Nicola Reid, Licensing and Regulations Deputy Director of Administration

Nicola recognized Tamara Barger for 20 years of Washington State service, all with the LCB. Tamara first worked in the retail stores, then moved to the Licensing division. She worked in the Customer Service unit before becoming a Liquor Licensing Specialist, and later a Liquor Licensing Specialist Senior. She then became a Cannabis Licensing Specialist before joining the Adjudications unit four years ago.

Her fast turnaround time, strong documentation skills, and the ability to prepare exhibits and discovery make her a highly valued member of the team.

4. RULEMAKING TIMELINES – ALL INDUSTRIES

Presenter: Kevin Walder, Policy and Rules Manager

Kevin gave an update on the work the Rules team is doing. They are working on 11 rule projects and preparing a petition response for the Board to review.

The team recently received public comments on the draft rules for retail alcohol product placement. After reading the comments, they made some changes. They are now working with an economist to survey licensees who may be affected by the rule.

The team also met with the Washington Cannabis Licensee Association (WCLA) to hear their concerns about the cannabis retail management agreement draft rules. These rules are meant to carry out Substitute Senate Bill (SSB) 5403. The updated draft is expected to be shared with stakeholders later this month, with stakeholder sessions planned for April.

5. ALCOHOL RELATED RULEMAKING

ACTION ITEM 5A – Board Approval of CR-102

Topic: 2025 Legislative Implementation – Contract Kitchens for Spirits, Beer, and Wine Restaurants (EHB 1602)

Presenter: Jeff Kildahl, Policy and Rules Coordinator

Jeff presented a CR-102 that would update current rules (HANDOUT 5A). The changes would let domestic breweries and microbreweries subcontract with other people or businesses – including mobile food trucks – to meet the food-service requirements. These requirements apply to beer and wine restaurant licenses and to spirits, beer, and wine restaurant licenses.

These changes are required by Engrossed House Bill (EHB) 1602, which the Washington State Legislature passed on April 14, 2025.

Member Holmes made a motion to adopt the CR-102 for the 2026 Legislative Implementation Package for Contract Kitchens. Chair Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved.

ACTION ITEM 5B – Board Approval of CR-105

Topic: Trade Practice Repeal

Presenter: Daniel Jacobs, Policy and Rules Coordinator

Daniel explained the background of a CR-105 that is needed to repeal rules a court has ruled invalid (HANDOUT 5B). If approved, the Board will repeal the following three rules: WAC 314-23-065, 314-23-080, and 314-23-085.

Member Holmes made a motion to adopt the CR-105 for Trade Practice Repeal. Chair Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved.

6. CANNABIS RELATED RULEMAKING

ACTION ITEM 6A – Review and Consideration of Rules Petition

Topic: Verifying Patient Recognition Cards

Presenter: Kevin Walder, Policy and Rules Manager

Kevin explained a petition from John Kingsbury. The petition asks the Board to start rulemaking that would require cannabis retailers to verify patient recognition cards and keep a record of the verification before giving a medical cannabis excise tax exemption. (HANDOUT 6A).

Substitute House Bill 1453 passed in 2024 and became law on June 6, 2024. It will stay in effect until June 30, 2029. The bill changed RCW 69.50.535 to allow qualified medical cannabis patients to receive a tax exemption when buying Department of Health-approved cannabis products from a retailer with a medical endorsement. WAC 314-55-090, which covers this tax exemption, took effect October 12, 2024.

The question is whether the Board should accept the petition and begin rulemaking to change WAC 314-55-090 so that retailers must verify a patient's eligibility before applying the tax exemption.

Kevin detailed several reasons why new rulemaking may not be needed. One key reason is that retailers are already required to verify patient eligibility in the Department of Health database and to keep a record of each tax-exempt transaction.

Because of these reasons, the Director's Office recommends that the Board deny the petition.

Member Holmes made a motion to accept the Director's Office recommendation and deny the petition. Chair Vollendroff did not concur. Because the motion did not pass, Chair Vollendroff called for an extra Board meeting to continue the discussion when Member Garrett returns.

ACTION ITEM 6B – Board Approval of CR-102 for Cannabis Retailer Advertising (ESB 5206)

Presenter: Jeff Kildahl, Policy and Rules Coordinator

Jeff presented a CR-102 about cannabis retailer advertising. On January 1, 2026, Engrossed Senate Bill (ESB) 5206 took effect. The bill expands the advertising options to cannabis retail licensees. WAC 314-55-155 has also been open since 2022 for a broader review, and it may be updated as part of this rulemaking.

Several changes are being proposed for WAC 314-55-155. These changes would increase the number of exterior signs retailers can use, clarify the size, location, and content of those signs, and update some existing definition.

Member Holmes made a motion to adopt the CR-102 for Cannabis Retailer Advertising. Chair Vollendroff seconded. The motion was approved.

7. ADJOURN

Chair Vollendroff adjourned the meeting at 10:46 a.m.

Minutes approved this 22nd day of April, 2026



Jim Vollendroff
Board Chair



Ollie Garrett
Board Member



Peter Holmes
Board Member

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

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

Written Comments:

From: **John Kingsbury** <homegrow2018@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, Feb 26, 2026 at 4:01 PM

Subject: petition to check patient credentials

To: <jim.vollendroff@lcb.wa.gov>, Garrett, Ollie A (LCB) <ollie.garrett@lcb.wa.gov>, <pete.holmes@lcb.wa.gov>, <gretchen.frost@lcb.wa.gov>

Cc: <kevin.walder@lcb.wa.gov>, <nathan.olson@gov.wa.gov>

Dear Board,

I have just finished reading [Kevin Walder's recommendation to decline my petition](#) to require stores to verify patient credentials before issuing excise tax exemptions. Aside from pointing out the dismissive tone of the recommendation, I would like to highlight the fact that such a requirement would demand very little from the LCB, while adding an extra layer of prevention, as well as a tool and data point in case of error or malfeasance on the part of retailers.

While rejecting my "ounce of prevention" petition might seem consistent with an agency that has not taken the absence of a functional "seed-to-sale" traceability system seriously since 2017, I invite you to turn over a new leaf and accept my petition, which addresses a fairly high-stakes concern. On the face of it, this would demand little from the agency.

Be aware that simply rejecting the petition without a more substantial, and less-dismissive, response to these real concerns will likely create more work for the agency than, for example, creating a largely AI-generated report on kratom (a substance that, as far as I know, the LCB does not regulate).

Clearly, the Governor's office would receive an appeal, and every relevant legislator will hear from me regarding the concern that money is being lost without the agency taking the most basic safeguards. If something goes wrong with the excise tax system, everyone will certainly place responsibility where it squarely belongs—on the WSLCB.

Lastly, the reasoning that LCB should not establish a requirement for retail stores to verify patient eligibility before issuing excise tax exemptions because "they should be doing it anyway" feels less like a valid argument for not codifying the requirement, and more like a an affirmation to the question, "Why not do it?"

The downside to accepting my petition is small. The downside to not accepting it could be huge.

Thank you. My original petition is attached.

John Kingsbury

From: **John Kingsbury** <homegrow2018@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 3, 2026 at 10:27 AM

Subject: red herring - real time verification of recognition cards

To: Vollendroff, Jim (LCB) <jim.vollendroff@lcb.wa.gov>, <pete.holmes@lcb.wa.gov>, Garrett, Ollie A (LCB) <ollie.garrett@lcb.wa.gov>

Today, in his discussion of my petition, Justin Nordhorn brought up the issue of LCB having the ability to conduct "real time" monitoring of patient verification. He mentioned this might create an IT burden. Nobody is asking for real time monitoring. There is nothing in my petition that would require IT, or LCB monitoring changes.

Thank you for considering the petition.

John Kingsbury



The Cannabis Alliance
12345 Lake City Way NE #170
Seattle, WA 98125

3 March, 2026

Re: Public Comment for Board Agenda Item - Retailer Verification of Patient Recognition Cards Prior to Applying Medical Cannabis Excise Tax Exemption

Dear Chair Vollendroff and Board Members,

I am writing in support of the petition requesting clarification of WAC 314-55-090 to explicitly require retail licensees to verify patient recognition cards in the Department of Health database prior to issuing the medical cannabis excise tax exemption.

The central issue is not whether verification is contemplated in existing rule. It is whether the language is sufficiently clear to ensure uniform compliance in practice.

The current rule states that an exempt sale must be made to a qualifying patient who has a valid recognition card and is in the database. However, evidence presented in the petition suggests that verification is not consistently occurring in retail settings. When real-world application does not align with regulatory intent, clarification is not redundancy. It is good governance.

This petition does not request the creation of new technological infrastructure or real-time monitoring of transactions. It asks only that verification be explicitly required and documented prior to granting a tax exemption. This is a narrow clarification of existing requirements and would impose little to no additional burden on the Board.

The medical excise tax exemption is time-limited and subject to formal legislative review. Its continuation will depend not only on policy intent, but on demonstrable integrity in its administration. The Legislature was explicit that the purpose of this exemption is to ensure medical cannabis products remain accessible and affordable for qualifying patients. That objective depends on uniform, accountable administration of the exemption in practice.

Protecting the integrity, transparency, and auditability of this exemption is not a procedural detail, it is essential to preserving patient access and sustaining legislative confidence in the program's effectiveness. Clarifying verification requirements now protects patients, protects retailers from future liability, and protects the Board from avoidable criticism.

caitlein.ryan@thecannabisalliance.us (253) 235-9054 thecannabisalliance.us

In alcohol regulation, codifying ID verification requirements is not considered redundant simply because licensees should already be doing it. Clear rules reinforce training, normalize best practices, and create enforceable standards. The Department of Health database already exists, and verification authority is already embedded in statute. This is not a request for new authority. It is a request for clarity. From a compliance education perspective, accepting the petition would signal to retailers that verification is not discretionary or implied. It is mandatory and documented. That is consistent with the Board's responsibility to expand and strengthen compliance education programs. The downside to clarifying this requirement is minimal. The downside to ambiguity, particularly in a tax preference that will be formally reviewed, is considerably greater. For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Board to accept the petition and initiate rulemaking for clarification purposes. Doing so strengthens the integrity of the medical program, reinforces uniform compliance standards, and demonstrates proactive stewardship of a high-visibility tax preference. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'C' followed by a long, horizontal, slightly wavy line that tapers to the right.

Caitlein Ryan, PhD
Executive Director
The Cannabis Alliance