



Board Caucus Meeting

Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 10:00am

This meeting was held via conference call

Meeting Minutes

CAUCUS ATTENDEES

Chair David Postman
Member Ollie Garrett
Member Russ Hauge
Dustin Dickson, Executive Assistant

GUESTS

Rick Garza, Executive Director
Becky Smith, Director of Licensing
Chris Thompson, Director of Legislative Relations
Kaitlin Bamba, Management Analyst
Kevin Milovac, Cannabis Manager
Kim Sauer, MAST/RVP Manager
Nicola Reid, Compliance and Adjudications Manager
Kathy Hoffman, Policy and Rules Manager
Audrey Vasek, Policy and Rules Coordinator
Jeff Kildahl, Policy and Rules Coordinator

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

MOTION: Member Hauge moved to re-approve the May 11, 2021, Board caucus minutes

SECOND: Chair Postman seconded.

ACTION: Chair Postman approved the motion

MOTION: Member Garrett moved to approve the May 18, 2021, Board caucus minutes

SECOND: Member Hauge seconded.

ACTION: Chair Postman approved the motion.

GENERAL AGENCY UPDATES

Rick Garza: Good morning, Board members and staff. I just have a few things. One is, we continue on with the interview process for the new DEI (Diversity, Equity and Inclusion) manager. Ollie's assisting us with those interviews and we've got a few this week. Hopefully, we'll share good news soon.

Secondly, our new Deputy Director Toni Hood begins on Tuesday. I look forward to her joining us.

Next, I had a meeting last week, Becky and I, with Ed Goings, who's the senior vice president legal counsel for the Seahawks. They're looking at an amendment to the Lumen Field operating plan. And so I

know that their staff will be meeting soon with Becky to hear their proposal and obviously we'll give you an update as soon as that occurs. And that, as you're aware, happens from time to time when stadiums want to provide either different types of level of service or different service entirely. So that's all I've got today but certainly available for any questions the Chair or Board members may have of me.

Chair Postman: Questions for Rick?

Member Garrett: Rick, on the shot and beer giveaway, how did that come about? Did I miss something? Did we discuss that with the Board? The drinks for getting the vaccine?

Mr. Garza: I don't know, I'd have to go back. I assumed that staff had briefed all of the Board members about the proposal that came forward from the hospitality industry. And that would allow, under conditions and you can see it's just for a certain period of time, from the middle of May to the end of June, as an opportunity to try to get people to vaccinate. And as you're well aware, the Governor and the Governor's office are looking at a lot of different proposals to incentivize people to get vaccinated and that was one that came forward, again, from the hospitality industry. Staff worked to put some sideboards around it because we want to make sure that it's done safely and responsibly. We'll do a better job next time of getting that information to you, Ollie.

Member Garrett: Okay. Like I said, I might have missed it. When I had a few folks from the cannabis industry bringing up "well, what about cannabis" and us having something already in place for alcohol, it kind of threw me off. How did this come about? And what was considered? And like I said, I might have missed out on some conversations. I don't know.

Chari Postman: It did not come up at a Board meeting or a caucus, as far as I know. It was discussed at the agency policy workgroup. That's where I was briefed and there was a discussion around that. And my understanding is, initially the request came from licensees. Rick, is that correct? And then also the Governor wanted to know what we could do to promote vaccines. What was the chronology there?

Director Garza: It really came from the breweries and wineries associations first, who had shared they would like to be able to do it. I think some of them may have created vaccination sites at their brewery or winery to incentivize people to get the vaccination, and then wanted to provide a free glass of wine or a pint of beer. It came from them. And then through the Hospitality Association, as you know, which represents restaurants and on-premises licensees.

I'll just share with the Board and the public that part of the discussion also was that these particular businesses were significantly harmed during the pandemic, where many of them, especially the breweries and wineries, were closed. And so it's twofold. It was one, to assist with getting people vaccinated and then second to assist these businesses. And that's how it was viewed. We had several discussions with the policy workgroup around the pros and cons of that and, again, saw it as an opportunity to try to get more people vaccinated.

The Governor is also looking at a lot of different proposals right now. Some of the states, as you know, many of the states have done what we're doing. And also they're looking at offering lotteries and other means to incentivize people to get vaccinated. So that also just became one of the incentives.

You just raised something, Ollie, that I did receive a couple of emails last week asking from cannabis retailers asking for the same type of allowance. Staff is working right now on a briefing, a discussion brief,

as to whether that's something that we should allow also. And so we'll be sure -- that we briefed you all before any decisions are made with respect to that.

Member Garrett: Great and I'm glad to know you heard from the cannabis industry also. And it just goes back to, as I say, being here out in the community and being asked about certain decisions or policies, having to say that "I read about it when you read about it".

Mr. Garza: I wouldn't want to be blindsided like that either. I do not want that to happen. And so I think since we're discussing it, I think one of the things that I'll make sure we do is bring those to you before that goes out. And certainly a briefing with Brian. You should have seen the press release prior to distribution informing our licensees of how that could be done.

Member Garrett: Right. Thank you. And that's what I meant -- I saw it at the same time they saw it.

Mr. Garza: Message received. We'll make sure we do a better job, especially on something as big as that, that you're informed, Ollie, and included as a part of that discussion with us.

Member Garrett: Thank you.

Chair Postman: Particularly since we are now, like I said, having the same request from the cannabis industry. We'll make sure it happens.

Russ, any questions for Rick today?

Member Hauge: No. In fact, Rick and I are going to be talking later on today. We're good.

Chair Postman: Okay. Nothing further for me today, Rick. Thank you unless you have any last thoughts for us.

Mr. Garza: No, that's it for the day. Thank you.

LICENSING – CANNABIS / LOCAL JURISDICTION OUTREACH REVIEW

Becky introduced Kaitlin Bamba and Kevin Milovac. Kaitlin and Kevin gave their "Licensing Retail Allotment Outreach Presentation" (PRESENTATION 1) and answered questions.

Member Hauge: Can you tell me what response you got from the larger jurisdictions like Seattle, Tacoma, and Spokane?

Kevin Milovac: I could answer that. I didn't reach out to them because they didn't have a ban or moratorium or a license that was available to come back through. If they were in a viable location, we didn't reach out to those areas.

Member Hauge: Okay, so this data is based on a survey only at places where there are current bans or moratoriums. That's correct? Okay -- is there any plan to reach out to jurisdictions, particularly the larger jurisdictions where there are no bans or moratoria and ask if they would be interested in more licenses, given population growth or change in circumstances or social equity?

Mr. Milovac: That's definitely something that we can do. That wasn't on the scope for this survey. Currently, that wasn't a top priority but it definitely is something that we can reach out and inquire about. We did get that data if areas were interested in more licenses through the survey, but we didn't go any further than reaching out to specific ones that still are in the areas with bans or moratoriums.

Member Hauge: Well, that's great, thank you. And this is a really fine piece of work. I really appreciate the way you stated it here. But that next step, I think particularly might be useful to us as we approach both social equity issues and just the general issues of help in the market.

Mr. Milovac: Absolutely.

Member Garrett: I agree with Russ. This is good information. And he actually asked the question that I was going to go into. So thank you, Russ.

Chair Postman: I think Russ raises a great point about how continued outreach, particularly when I look at that slide of the AWC (Association of Washington Cities) survey and that 92 respondents said they were not even aware of the social equity bill and only 26 were. So I think it's incumbent on the agency to figure out what all we need to do to be communicating with local governments, starting at the very basics of "this bill exists and here's what it does and here's what we're looking at". I think that's worth a follow-up meeting for us to really talk about that, and that might then help change some of the other numbers.

And then my only question is, I wondered when you reached out, Kevin, to the cities, and we have a good list, it seemed at least they were open and wanted more information -- can you give us any sense of how open they really did seem? Do you get the sense that some of these jurisdictions are approaching a point where they're going to reconsider some of these things?

Mr. Milovac: That's a great question. Yes, they actually were very interested. A lot of them didn't realize, because of how much turnover happens in government, there was new Commissioner. Some didn't even know they had a ban or moratorium in their area. And then there were some that said "it's a whole new regime in here and we would love information and we'd love to dive into it". One smaller agency said that they needed to take it to the community town hall meeting because that's how they did business. Now they are waiting on my email with the information and then they were taking it to the town hall. So, some may move quickly. Others, as the board of commissioners get settled in, because I think three different ones I talked to, had new board of commissioners. And so they said, it's new, fresh ideas. And they were definitely interested. They just were non-committal.

Chair Postman: That's really interesting and you're right, there's turnover all the time. And again, as we look to inform local governments about social equity, we should remind them each of what they've done with local bans too. It's possible the policymakers today don't even want to do that. We need to get information to them. So, again, that's really interesting information. Thank you for that.

Mr. Milovac: I'll take it one step further with the Lewis County reach-out, their biggest concern was wastewater runoff. They thought there's a huge abundance of water that was being pumped into the sewers. A lot of the places that I've actually been out to, they're pretty efficient in their water use and don't try to waste much water. And so they just had this concept there were gallons and gallons of wastewater going back into the streams and into the sewer. So, being able to kind of clarify around that or dispel some of the myths, that was great.

Member Hauge: Kevin, talking about impacts of wastewater, we've heard recently from people who are not really familiar with the agency or the market talking about the drain on electricity and the increased carbon footprint of indoor grows. Is that something that you picked up on when you were talking with local government representatives?

Mr. Milovac: No, they were just totally focused on the wastewater. They didn't really go into much as far as electricity. I would assume because it's on the west side, they would probably need to be an indoor grow just for efficiency purposes. So usually, we see our outdoor grows over on the East side. But yeah, Lewis County, in particular, didn't have any questions about the actual electricity use.

Member Garrett: Regarding the ban for Lewis County, for the retail stores, what was their concerns there?

Mr. Milovac: Overall that's the way it's always been. We got on the topic of producer/processors and that was their concern there. But it was infusing a controlled substance into communities, pretty much anybody that has a ban or moratorium, that's their general stance. So, just getting ahead of this -- or with the times and where we are currently. And hearing the success of other areas and providing jobs for people and bringing more people to their area. So they were listening to all the plusses on it as we walked through what the pros and cons are.

Chair Postman: It's just a really good reminder for all of us, the world has changed so much since we started this project. And there was a lot of fear, a lot of unknown. And, like you were saying, there's success stories out there or stories of how local governments have managed this really well. And I think, hopefully, local governments also feel really confident about their partnership with the LCB itself and are able to get through the licensing process. It's definitely time to touch base with everybody, I think, in local government again to tell them both about existing bans and moratoria and most definitely social equity.

Mr. Milovac: And, I've received incredible feedback with regards to the shift in enforcement having compliance consultants now and how much more we're educating. I've even placed emphasis on it with my staff. I was able to speak to that as well, working with local law enforcement, having this partnership. But more so, we're educating our licensees so much more. Kaitlin's team is constantly working on our website to make sure we have all the right information on there for all the licensees. Now we're even bulking it up even more for social equity. I think that's a huge piece is that we're educating and growing our licensing so we have good viable locations with people doing the right things.

Chair Postman: That's terrific. Thank you both for all the information on this. It is really good to see. And it also just gives us a map of what we need to do. I look forward to being able to sit down with folks and talk about how we make sure local governments know what they need to know, come into the current day, the new world that exists. So thank you both very much.

Mr. Milovac: Thank you all for your time.

Becky Smith: I just wanted ask Chris if he had anything to add here?

Chris Thompson: I did. Thank you, Becky. In relation to the discussion that you've just been having, Board members, especially with the substantive conversations that Kevin's having with local governments, I think it might be worthwhile to consider the revenue side as well. And one reason I mention that is my own conversations with staff from city of Tacoma late last year, when they were preparing the briefing for the City Council. Now, the state budget has \$15 million that's allocated directly to local governments on a per capita basis if they do not have a ban. However, even the staff in Tacoma

weren't aware until I walked through the system with them that there are sales tax revenues available to cities or counties based on retail sales. So, that's a potential revenue stream that may not have much awareness around at the local level and seems possible we might be able to model what a similar sized city has realized in terms of that as a potential factor, which might be relevant for local governments.

The other thing I was going to mention relative to Russ' question and some other conversation about this, we are aware for sure that there's interest in more licenses in at least a couple of large cities in Washington. And to that end, the LCB proposed an amendment to the social equity bill revision that went through this session, HB 1443, to allow the state's largest cities to request additional licenses. That effort was not successful, in part because right at the end of the session, there was some confusion among legislators and legislative staff about what the agency's authority is as we were trying to work with them on language for an amendment. That effort fell apart, in part because of confusion about what agency authority exists and in some sense that the agency could "just move" licenses, at least within counties. So maybe another time if there's interest, I can share more information. I just wanted to let the Board members know that our staff held a briefing last week with legislative staff to give them a fuller picture where I understand their focus is primarily on what the law says the agency can do or cannot do. We wanted them to be aware of other considerations that the agency would face if they just said "well, the agency can move licenses, at least within the county. So let LCB deal with this." I pointed out that there are a number of administrative considerations, including, if you were to untether a title certificate, for instance, from one city where there's a ban, where could it go. We've got 569 potential requests as soon as we open the door to one license moving. In managing that and in avoiding chaos of everybody trying to go to a location that doesn't want that many new stores, are administrative considerations beyond the legal authority issues that they were primarily focused on. So, I think we made some good headway in building a better understanding in the legislature among staff around these issues related to where a license is assigned and how to deal with the situation where it's not really usable. The law is relevant but there are other considerations including legal exposure and just managing all these other potential requests that other licensees could put forward.

Chair Postman: That was great. Thank you. Really good point on the tax revenue piece too. Again, we have history now. We've got data. We have other, like you said, like-sized jurisdictions that both could provide a comparison but also just help their colleagues and local government answer questions too. So, I just think we need to get out there and do a little public information for local officials about this. And, again, Kevin's point of the turnover and people who might not even know their own city has such bans in place. It could be a rich vein. So I look forward to that conversation. Any last questions on this subject from board members or Becky, anything? Hearing none, let's move on.

Another interesting issue that we're going to dive into -- Alcohol Impact Areas - review and consideration, particularly the Tacoma West end. I'll turn it over to Kim Sauer the MAST and RVP manager and Nicola Reed, the Compliance and Adjudications manager. Take it away.

ALCOHOL IMPACT AREA – REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF TACOMA WEST-END

Nicola introduced Kim, who gave a presentation on the Tacoma West-End AIA (HANDOUT 2) and then took questions.

Chair Postman: The compliance stats are really good and when you look at the fire and police calls dating back to 2016, it's a good snapshot. But there is a trend of them both going up. The police calls have gone up. Is there concern that you heard from local officials about that trend? Is this what they see going on city wide? Or what's the level of worry that something is going on in that area?

Kim Sauer: Great question. I actually contacted the city officer who's working with me on this report. And basically, there's a lot of a homeless issues going on right now and seems to be the drug problem is going up as well. This is right where the Tacoma transit area is located. So, they're actually seeing a lot of other problems also happening in this area. They also have a detox center there close to this proximity as well. All that is making that stats increase.

Chair Postman: Great, thank you. Other questions from board members?

Member Hauge: I don't have any questions and I'll move approval that we continue with the Alcohol Impact Area as presented.

MOTION: Member Hauge moved to renew the Tacoma West-End AIA as described.

SECOND: Member Garrett seconded.

ACTION: Chair Postman approved the motion

Chair Postman: That is approved. We will renew that. Thank you both for the presentation and the continuing work in monitoring this. Thanks so much.

Now we will move to Board meeting prep and rules update. I'll ask Kathy Hoffman, the Policy and Rules Manager, to take it from here and take us through the next steps.

BOARD MEETING PREP AND RULES UPDATE

Kathy Hoffman: Great. So, good morning, Chair Postman, Board members Garrett and Hauge. I'll provide a brief update on cannabis rules today and then the next board prep will be led by Jeff.

I'll start with the cannabis quality control rules. And this is consistent with the last update I provided. Now that Jeff is with us, we'll be working this week on reestablishing the timeline for this particular project. I did receive confirmation from ORIA, the Office of Regulatory Innovation and Assistance last week that the deadline for bids on our convenience contract is June 9, and OFM will follow up with responses on that shortly thereafter. We learned that there was a change in staffing at OFM that caused a bit of a delay in moving that contract forward. But we're back on track now. So this is good news for us. And I'm looking forward to working with Jeff to move this important work forward.

Moving on to criminal history background check redesign, our "listen and learn" session to review draft conceptual rules was rescheduled to June 1st, so, next week. Even so, we remain on track to be able to bring a proposal to you in late June. And so that places finalization in early to mid-August, aligning with our current rule development plan for project.

With respect to the permanent rules referencing the State Board of Health Vitamin E Acetate prohibition, no comments have been received today on the CR 101 and the formal comment period ended for that last week. So tomorrow at the Board meeting, I will bring a CR 102 package for your action. If approved, I'll file it with the code reviser and that will set the public hearing for July 7. And under that timeline, we can then bring a CR 103 package to you by July 21 and then allow the current emergency rules we have

in place to expire because that expiration date is just a few days after the effective date of these rules under that timeline.

Moving on to the Tier I Expansion proposal project, we received one comment thanking the agency for the proposal. We received another comment this morning very much opposed to moving these rules forward. Our public hearing on that proposal is set for June 9. Under that timeline, we can bring a CR 103 package to you for review on or about July 7.

And then finally with respect to the CR 101 we recently filed concerning THC isomers beyond Delta-9. No comments have been received to date. Our “deliberative dialogue” session is scheduled for the morning of June 3 and our focus for that session is cannabis plant chemistry. We’ve assembled a well-qualified and diverse group of experts to keep the focus on cannabis plant chemistry and we’ll explore about five questions that are really concentrated on things like isomerization, the differences between heat and solvent processes, and byproducts of conversion. We really are committed to grounding this work in fact and data and we believe this approach is the most appropriate and productive way to situate this work moving forward.

That concludes my update for today. Can I answer any questions?

Chair Postman: For Member Hauge, do you plan to attend the “deliberative dialogue” on the 3rd?

Member Hauge: Yes, it’s my intention.

Chair Postman: Okay, great. Then I won’t attend.

Ms. Hoffman: We will record it just in case you want to listen.

Chair Postman: Great. Any other questions for Kathy on cannabis?

Member Garrett: I have no questions.

Ms. Hoffman: Thanks very much. Now to Audrey for alcohol rule updates.

Audrey Vasek: Thanks, Kathy and good morning, Chair Postman and Board members. I have a few brief updates today.

For the first update, the rule project to implement 2020 legislation Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 5549, related to distilleries, is complete. After the CR 103 and final rules were adopted at the Board meeting on May 12, the CR 103 was filed with the code reviser’s office. A concise explanatory statement was sent to all those who provided public comment and a GovDelivery message with this information was also sent out to subscribers. The recently adopted rules web page has been updated as well. These rules will go into effect on June 12 and this will be the final update I provide on this project.

The next project is the rule project to implement 2021 legislation, Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 1480 related to the Covid-19 alcohol allowances. This project is officially underway now that the CR 101 package has been filed with the code reviser’s office. The notice will be published in the Washington State Register on June 2. The initial comment period is currently open and will remain open until July 2. We’ve received one comment so far in support of the rulemaking. The internal workgroup has begun meeting to develop conceptual draft rules and once those are developed, we anticipate holding one or

two “listen and learn” sessions in July or August to gather public feedback. Following those “listen and learn” sessions, I anticipate tentatively bringing a CR 102 package in September.

Next, for the rule project to create summary suspension and stay provisions to enforce the Governor's Proclamations. It's the rule project that considers making the current emergency summary suspension rules on this subject, WAC 314-12-250 and 275, permanent. The Board approved filing the CR 101 on April 14 and the initial comment period is open until June 5. We've received 15 comments so far with 13 of those emails and counting coming in just today and yesterday. All those comments so far have been opposed to the rulemaking. I'll send an update at the end of the week to the internal work group and the Board with a table containing those comments we've received so far. The internal work group is currently in the process of developing the conceptual draft rules. We've met several times over the past month and are currently considering options for moving forward before sharing conceptual draft rules publicly and gathering feedback through “listen and learn” sessions. I anticipate we'll have more updates on this project in July.

Finally, for the distillery reporting and payment rules project, the public hearing is on the agenda for tomorrow's Board meeting. This is the rule project that considers revising the distillery reporting and payment requirements in chapter 314-28 WAC to be consistent with the Court of Appeals decision in *Blue Spirits Distilling*. The Board approved filing the CR 102 and proposed rules on April 14 and we've received one written comment related to these rules so far. The formal public comment period opened on the 14th and will remain open until close of business tomorrow, May 26. After the public hearing, the project team will meet to review the comments received. If no substantive changes are made to the proposed rules, the final rules could be adopted on June 9, at the earliest, which would put the effective date on July 10. More information about these proposed rules is available on the LCB webpage and I encourage anyone who might be listening today and is interested in commenting and submitting those comments before end of day tomorrow.

That concludes my updates. If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

Chair Postman: I have none today. Any other questions for Audrey?

Member Hauge: None for me.

Member Garrett: None for me.

Chair Postman: Okay. Thank you so much. Kathy, is there anything else on rules update or Board prep?

Ms. Hoffman: No, I think that's it for today, Chair Postman. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER AND EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT REPORTS

Member Garrett: There is a Task Force meeting this evening that I will be in from 4:00 to 7:00. And, it looks like some of our DEI interviews have canceled, but tomorrow I will be participating in at least one interview for DEI manager.

Chair Postman: Great. Thank you. Member Hauge.

Member Hauge: Thank you. The only thing I want to share it this time I guess is how my thinking is going on this Delta-8 issue. And I'm still working through conversations and meetings and I'm looking forward to the "listen and learn" session on the 3rd. This is how I'm looking at the issue right now. And I offer this so I can be corrected later if I'm looking at it wrong. There are really two issues around the hemp based biomass issue, as I've been calling it, or Delta-8. That is that the excess hemp based biomass from legal hemp farming can be turned, because there's so much of it, into enough Delta-8 THC to become slightly intoxicating -- I don't know how intoxicating it can be -- it can become intoxicating. It is being spread around the country and it is in our market, perhaps in our stores. We're looking into that. That is a big issue. As regulators of intoxicating substances, we should be very concerned about that.

The other issue, though, is a little different. And that is that, again, given the mass that we're talking about with hemp based biomass for distillate purposes, it is much cheaper to produce Delta-9 from hemp based biomass than it is from cannabis biomass. And that is the, I think, probably the trickier question because reasonable minds can differ on what we should do. As I noted before, I think the positions are being staked out. One side seems to say "it's just progress and this is the way the markets going to go and everybody's got to stand by". The other side is "we've got a market here limited to the state of Washington. And it is based upon farmers of different size and processors of different size. And the introduction of a much cheaper source of THC Delta-9 isolate or distillate is going to really disrupt that market". Again, no judgments but that is how I'm looking at it. There are these two separate issues that we need to address in different ways. Delta-8 coming into the market in intoxicating quantities and hemp based biomass to being turned into Delta-9 at a price that is much cheaper than that can be achieved from utilizing regulated cannabis biomass. Thank you.

Chair Postman: One question for you. Talking about the impact on growers, and they obviously have different views. Are you hearing from current licensees who are pro Delta-8 who are saying, "yep, let it go. We need this. It's a good product for us", or is it mostly people outside of the current licensed scheme?

Member Hauge: Well, yes, I have heard from, not license holders, but people who have a financial stake in turning hemp based biomass into Delta-9 to be utilized in our regulated market. They're making a lot of money, apparently, and want to keep doing that. However, they're not license holders as I understand right now. And I'm really kind of unclear about how hemp based derived Delta-9 is coming into our system. But it is and has been. And I would like to see how that is happening. I think that is the first question to answer. And then again, if you are in a position where you can take advantage of the scale of the market that will change when hemp based isolate or distillate for Delta-9 replaced cannabis based biomass, yes, you're going to make a lot of money. If you are not able to take advantage of that, if you are a producer, not a processor and you are counting on raising cannabis and making ends meet by selling cannabis based biomass after you sell the bud, then you're in trouble.

Chair Postman: Yes Its complicated. Thank you for that. Dustin, anything for you to report today?

Dustin Dickson: Thank you, Chair. Just quickly, I mentioned this morning before the meeting started but just so the rest of you know, this week should hopefully be our last set of WebEx based platform meetings. We should be able to finally transition into Microsoft Teams going forward. So, after the Board meeting tomorrow, fingers and toes crossed, we can say goodbye to this platform and move on to something better.

Chair Postman: Great, thank you. Appreciate that. When we do that will we be able to have the public on there as well so they can see slide presentations or things of the sort?

Mr. Dickson: Yes, absolutely. And for testimony as well, the public would also have the option if they would like to turn cameras on so we can see who's speaking.

Chair Postman: Okay, terrific. Great. Thank you. Well, then that concludes our business today. So we will adjourn the board caucus meeting and meet tomorrow in our regular Board meeting. Thanks, everybody.

Meeting adjourned at 11:03am.

Minutes approved this 8th day of June, 2021.



David Postman
Board Chair



Ollie Garrett
Board Member



Russ Hauge
Board Member

Minutes Prepared by: Dustin Dickson, Executive Assistant to the Board