

Whatcom County Business and Commerce Committee
Meeting Notes
July 17, 2023

Voting Members Present: Casey Diggs, Sarah Rothenbuhler (Committee Chair), RB Tewksbury, Clark Campbell, Brad Rader, Troy Muljat, Chris Trout

Voting Members Not Present: Ryan Allsop (Committee Vice Chair), Pam Brady, Pete Dawson, Debbie Ahl, Paul Burrill, Dana Wilson

Nonvoting Members Present: County Councilmember Kathy Kershner, Port of Bellingham Executive Director Rob Fix, Whatcom County Executive Satpal Sidhu, City of Bellingham Mayor Seth Fleetwood, CJ Seitz, Dr. Barry Robinson

Nonvoting Members Not Present: Small Cities Representative Jori Burnett, Eva Schulte

Public Present: County Council Member Barry Buchanan, Brian Heinrich, Lynn Giuliani, Dan Dunne, Deputy County Executive Tyler Schroeder, Kim Lund, State Senator Sharon Shewmake, Port Commissioner Ken Bell, Anna Robbins, State Representative Alicia Rule, Andrea Ruback, Braden Gustafson, Chris Sullivan, Darby Galligan, Derek Long, Emily [did not submit full name], Guy Occhiogrosso, Hannah Ordos, Hollie Huthman, Ivy Ndambuki, Jasmine Fast, Jessie Everson, Lance Calloway, City of Bellingham Councilmember Michal Lilliquist, Mindy Pelton, Rob Lee, Skip Williams, Kori Olsen

July Agenda

Introductions / Administrative business / Comments welcome from the Public (5mins)

- Committee Chair calls meeting to order
- Committee Member Introductions
- Approve June 2023 minutes
- Invite all attendees to participate along with Committee members during Q&A sessions

Review of Implementation Plan for Whatcom County Justice Center

- Whatcom County Councilmember Kathy Kershner (20 mins)
- **Q&A** (10 mins)

Existing Capital & Operational Funding for Whatcom County Justice and Social Services

- State Representative of the 42nd District Alicia Rule (20 mins)
- **Q&A** (10 mins)

Sub Committee-Policy Topic: WA State Cannabis Report, Potential Alternative Funding Source

- Gina Stark, Port of Bellingham Economic Development Project Manager & WCBC Sub-Committee Chair (10 min)
- **Q&A (5 mins)**

Sarah Rothenbuhler: We're going to get started. We'll talk really slow as we get started, we have a few people coming on in. Thanks for being here for the July Whatcom County Business and Commerce meeting. There are agendas on the table for the people that are here in person. And thank you so much for everyone here in person and in Zoom. We just really appreciate your time. We will start with having committee members do their introductions. And do you want to start, Gina?

Gina Stark: Gina Stark. Bellingham Economic Development Division.

Kathy Kershner: Kathy Kershner, Whatcom County Council. Representative to the Whatcom Business, Commerce and Advisory Committee.

Barry Buchanan: I'm a guest today. Barry Buchanan.

Alicia Rule: Alicia Rule, state representative.

Satpal Sidhu: Satpal Sidhu. Three in a row. Oh, my goodness. [Laughter]

Sarah Rothenbuhler: We have a lot of quality people, right? We're very fortunate.

Troy Muljat: Troy Muljat, Committee Member.

Rob Fix: Rob Fix, Port of Bellingham.

Casey Diggs: Casey Diggs. I help manage Boundary Bay.

Dan Dunne: I'm Dan, I'm nobody, just here.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: But hopefully a committee member next meeting.

Dan Dunne: Hopefully, yes. I put my name in the hat, so we'll see what happens.

Tyler Schroeder: Tyler Schroeder, deputy executive to Whatcom County. Joining the group as the agenda item.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And we have on Zoom.

Clark Campbell: Clark Campbell. President of Gear Aid. Calling in from southern Oregon.

Seth Fleetwood: Seth Fleetwood, Mayor of Bellingham.

CJ Seitz: CJ Seitz for Higher Ed, Western Washington University.

Skip Williams: Skip Williams, City Council, Bellingham.

RB Tewksbury: RB Tewksbury, the Pacific Northwest Chapter of the Internet Society.

Barry Robinson: Barry Robinson. Whatcom Community College.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: I think that's everyone. Kori, you are a big part of this. Do you mind introducing yourself?

Kori Olsen: Hi, my name is Kori Olsen. I'm with the Port of Bellingham Communications and Economic Development project manager. Thank you.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: I'm Sarah Rothenbuhler with Birch Equipment, member and chair. So we now will move on. I think we do have quorum. This is the part where we remind everyone, please, if anyone has any thoughts, any questions, anything to say, please join in. You do not need to be on the committee to participate. We appreciate everybody here and love to hear your thoughts and your brilliant ideas. So now we will get started with an update on the Whatcom County Justice Center.

Barry Buchanan: Yes, absolutely. I'll go first. I think we're in the mode now where this has now gone, it's going to the ballot. So we have a number of rules in place that county resources have to follow. This is considered a county resource as it's an advisory committee. I spoke with legal last week. We haven't got all the guidelines and the framework and the statements that need to be made at the beginning of each meeting if you're dealing with the Justice Project. But I can tell you what the basics are. You can't promote nor oppose a ballot measure publicly in a public meeting. So, for instance, this morning at the Incarceration Prevention Reduction Task Force, without the guidelines and talking to legal more, I was very careful. And so today I think what we're going to give you is more of a history and what's in the ordinance, but we want to limit discussion on, Yeah, that's a great thing. Let's vote yes. We got to kind of definitely make sure we don't have those kinds of comments.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: You will be letting us know what actually is going to be on the ballot?

Barry Buchanan: You will, yes. You'll see that. I brought a few slides and Tyler can jump into and Kathy. I'm going to go through the history and then I'll turn it over to Kathy.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And we're not a group to give our opinion much anyway. [Laughter] But we'll try to refrain. Thank you for the reminder.

Barry Buchanan: Yeah, I just want to be mindful of that. Okay. So the Whatcom County Justice Needs Assessment Implementation Plan has been a long, long process. It's been going on roughly for five years, with a kind of a two-year break for Covid in 2020 and 2021. But all spent creating the needs assessment— and I can't say next slide because I got the controls. Or do I?

Gina Stark: Yeah you should, but I can do the page. There you go.

Barry Buchanan: Oh, there it is. Okay, so. It was a community led process that we put together. We had a justice project planning team. Deputy Executive Schroeder, myself and then the two co-chairs of the Incarceration Prevention Reduction Task Force, Jack Hovenier and Steven Gockley. We had a stakeholder advisory committee that was 39 people, many elected, but there were 20 people from the community with different kinds of lived experience and experience in their careers. We had focus groups with priority audiences. That was people with lived experience. The BIPOC community. The lived experience was both those who had been incarcerated and the families of those that had been. Then we did a lot of community surveys and interviews, which gave us a lot of the data that we had in the report. We did two town hall listening sessions, one back in November of '22 and then one just this last May. And then the Incarceration Prevention Task Force was kind of the overriding, kind of the guiding, steering element of the of the Law and Justice project. So we came up with three overlapping categories of the

needs assessment. So systems are things like competency, restoration, prosecutorial systems, courts. We had services which are those behavioral health services, substance use disorder services, supportive housing services and the things that go into caring for our population. And then facilities both in the community and in the jail.

So we had a jail and then we had those facilities associated in the jail and out in the community as well. The scope of work was actions and projects that advanced the 16 needs and recommendations that came out of the needs assessment. So now we're moving to what we call the implementation plan where the planning group and a lot of folks got involved in taking those kind of North Star attributes that came out of the needs assessment and develop that into an actionable implementation plan. We were looking at things that were in the 1-to-3-year time frame. You know, something that we could jump right on. So, some of those projects that came out of this ensuring oversight, accountability and transparency increase the access to behavioral health services, build facilities needed to promote public health and safety, and expand the capacity of programs that reduce incarceration and re-incarceration and then make those system changes I mentioned earlier with local and regional and state and federal partners. And State Rep Rule is here today to talk a lot about the state on working together on this project.

We have 15 specific actions in five categories. We established a JPOP committee, that is Justice Project Operations Planning. That is within the Incarceration Prevention Reduction Task Force and the Law and Justice Committee. It will be a subcommittee. There will be a finance advisory board that will look at the performance of the bond and, you know, financial things relative to the project. And then we'll be collecting data to measure the progress towards our desired outcomes and developing a data dashboard that will be readily available to the public. Address workforce shortages and behavioral health. That's a big item. I sit on the board of the North Sound behavioral health, and that's a big, big topic of conversation there. Building systems to facilitate communication and coordination and then increase the capacity of some of those existing programs like GRACE, LEAD, community paramedic and other community-based treatment and support services. Building – this is the one that Representative Rule brought \$9 million to the county for a 23-hour crisis relief center. It's a behavioral health urgent care that's open all hours, seven days a week, and the stays there are up to 23 hours and 59 minutes. It would work in conjunction with the crisis stabilization facility or the Ann Deacon Center for Hope that is out at our Division campus. So those two would work in tandem. Build a new jail and a behavioral health treatment center. We would have those kinds of services within the jail. And of course, we'd be building a jail, and the council has opted through a vote to build that facility out at LaBounty and Ferndale. Identify what additional facilities are needed to support. So that's an ongoing work in progress. Ensuring people leaving detention and treatment have transportation and a safe destination to avoid relapse.

So that could be supporting housing, other reentry services that we're looking at providing, as we're saying in number 11. And then number 12 is to maintain and expand supporting housing for people with behavioral health and a history of incarceration. System changes: continue to make changes in the court systems as far as some prosecutorial diversion programs that are available. And we're talking about how that might be implemented. Expedite access to competency restoration services. This is a big item. This is where folks are determined not to be competent to stand trial by the courts. And they ordered to go through competency restoration. And they are trying to get beds down at Western State Hospital to get to get that that treatment. And right now, the waiting list varies. It was up to a year for a while, to six months. But it's a long time. People sit in our jail waiting for restoration that wouldn't need to maybe even be there that long because their sentence would be not as long as what it took to get restored. So that's something I took very seriously and created a workgroup specially to work on that. And we're looking at through the state level and regional through the North Sound BH-ASO. Advocate for a state waiver to allow use of Medicaid funds to pay for medical and behavioral health services for incarcerated individuals. These are

actions for year one. I think I'll let Tyler and Kathy take it from here. So these are actions for year one, including but not limited to. Tyler.

Tyler Schroeder: Yeah I can take that on a little bit more. During this process there was a lot of discussion about how much investment into these actions was the county going to make in support with the state's funds as it relates to behavioral health and that balance between behavioral health and incarceration. And so in June, through a dialog with the County Council as well as the cities, was a recognition of what steps could we take sooner rather than later on some of the other behavioral health actions. And a lot of that was because the financial model of this would be to prioritize about six years, 4 to 6 years of the sales tax to the capital construction of the new jail facility. So during that 4 to 6 years, how do we help support the behavioral health expansions? And so what we wanted to do was recognize early actions that the administration will be bringing forward to county council and working with the task force and the Commission to establish. And so there are two committees that we talked about, the Justice Project Oversight and Planning Committee, but also we're going to be looking at using general funding forward with criminal justice informatics specialists to start the data collection and dashboard work, looking to use the behavioral health funds to address the workforce shortage in behavioral health services.

There's a lot of improvement that needs to happen in that area, and it's probably a little bit beyond just our local fund. We'll need some support as well as it relates to workforce shortage, but it's more of a regional and statewide issue, but then also build systems to facilitate the communication and coordination. One of the efforts that happened earlier in this year was a trip to Nashville, Tennessee, to look at their jail facility. Also their coordinated behavioral care center and their connected crisis stabilization facility. And that all was done by one behavioral health care organization. So they were really able to coordinate the data in between those that were incarcerated as well as those that were in the behavioral health facilities and made a better connection. And so we want to work with our local organizations to make that connection and better coordination between those organizations. There is also the existing diversion programs. And I think when we say diversion programs, we're really talking about the investment into GRACE or Ground-Level Response and Coordinated Engagement to department. The ART team or Alternative Response Team, as well as our LEAD team, the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion.

So those are all programs that we, the county and the city have invested into in the last couple of years. And we want to continue that capacity growth and we'll be able to utilize some of the sales tax to accomplish that capacity growth, but also some of the other existing revenue sources. Council member Buchanan hit on it earlier. We will be moving forward with the crisis relief center and start designing and construction of that prior to the construction of the new jail. And so that will start this year as we receive the grant from the city or excuse me, from the state to accomplish that. That project likely would be located at Division Street next to the crisis stabilization. And there are some other opportunities there at that site for behavioral health campus that we can talk further into. And then using the behavioral health fund to accomplish transportation services from people leaving jail and treatment and then also just being connected throughout. So those are all kinds of actions for this year so that we can show the commitment to not just the jail but also to the behavioral health services and expand those moving forward.

Casey Diggs: Question.

Tyler Schroeder: Yeah, sure.

Casey Diggs: How big is that facility going to be over?

Tyler Schroeder: Yeah, that's a good question. Currently, the Ann Deacon Center for Hope is 32 beds. It's 16 beds for chemical dependency and 16 beds for mental health. I think the vision of those are a little bit more because it's less than 24 hours. So it's a little bit more on site health insurance from doctors and clinicians. And the one that we saw in Tennessee and similar in King County, it's actually kind of chairs, 20 different chairs in a location. So it could probably hold somewhere between 20 to 30 individuals for that 24 hour period. They would have some accessory services in that location. But I think that's the idea. I don't know if Representative Rule has more thoughts, she did a lot of work in getting that allocation.

Alicia Rule: And I think if I may, it will depend on how we want to do it. So that's wide open and we can learn from others who have done successful models here.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And would that facility or that service ever be available at the LaBounty site?

Tyler Schroeder: So that's the balance between co-locating and locating on a campus, it's still open to kind of conversation and where and how best to accomplish it and is kind of a moving part. But I think there is some coordinated efforts on the Division Street with the crisis stabilization, which is our kind of 72-hour facility, but is not being yet utilized as well as it could for law enforcement drop offs or for emergency service drop offs. They just don't have the space and the operational capacity to accomplish that. So I think the idea is instead of utilizing those services for individuals that are in behavioral health crisis on the streets of Bellingham or others, instead of trying to take them to jail, let's take them to a spot that they can get the service that they need and that that service is probably more expertise on chemical dependency, on mental health crises. So you really build that campus location at Division to be that behavioral health campus because you would have less than 24 hours at this crisis relief. You would then have the Ann Deacon Center of Hope, which is like, you know, 72 hours and could have a coordinated connection door from those two facilities. And then a longer-term vision that we haven't yet defined is with the construction of a new jail on LaBounty. The alternative work center, which is located there on Division, becomes open for maybe another behavioral health campus. And you would really have kind of three points of work on those that are in crisis that doesn't have to do with.

Barry Buchanan: Yeah and that was a model we saw in Nashville where they were very close together, the crisis center and the stabilization center. And they said they couldn't really do it effectively without that connection. So I think it's important to have that.

Tyler Schroeder: At the same time, I'm sure there will definitely be work to define what type of behavioral care center is at the jail.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: It probably is a yes and.

Tyler Schroeder: Correct. Everything about this conversation is.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And relieve some pressure on the emergency ward too.

Tyler Schroeder: Yes! So the one item in the implementation plan is build a new jail and behavioral health center because those are connected at the moment.

Barry Buchanan: So this I just threw this in here just to show you kind of the difference in the three scenarios of cost. The civic center was the highest. It was a vertical, obviously a vertical facility that was \$270 million, \$704 a square foot. Irongate, to put a jail there was still a vertical design and it was at \$170

million. And then, of course, LaBounty was down at \$137 million. So it was quite a difference in those three scenarios in costs.

Kathy Kershner: So let me just say on that too, Barry, that the cost to build the building is not the cost to run the center. The jail is the biggest cost over 30 years. And so horizontal design is a much more cost-effective way to run it because you can have one set of staff monitoring two floors if it's designed appropriately. You've got eight floors. You've got to have a set of staff on each one of those floors. And then if you need to expand, you can't do it. It's much more expensive to expand on a vertical design than it is horizontal design. That's what that's what a council decided with a vote to take LaBounty.

Barry Buchanan: Yeah.

Kathy Kershner: So all the way around.

Dan Dunne: Question How much can we bond for? Two tenths of a percent? Does that get us. . . ?

Tyler Schroeder: 13 million.

Dan Dunne: I'm saying five years here. We're going to give you 10% every year and exchange. Somebody will give us money. \$100 million, \$200 million, whatever. We can do that to build something. Do we know what that chunk of money is going to be? So look at this. Do we have \$150 million to build something? Do we have \$500 million to build something?

Barry Buchanan: So here's a graph that shows the expenditure allocations. So the top or the green, I can't see because Kori's, it's allocation to small cities, but the blue is—

Gina Stark: Oh sorry. I was trying to grab it. There we go. Okay. If you want to go back. Thanks. Very sensitive. That was you should be able to go back one button to push up.

Barry Buchanan: It's not doing anything.

Gina Stark: You should be able to go back one, Barry. Should be able to hit that previous.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: It's the next one the second one down.

Gina Stark: Right there.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Go all the way to the top. The second one. That one.

Gina Stark: Sorry, I'm blind as a bat. Well, we'll eventually be able to see.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: You read, and I'll see far. [Laughter]

Barry Buchanan: The blue shows the county implementation plan contributions. So that's the darker blue that goes up the second line under the top. And then the jail itself is the lower one. You can see in the first four years from 2024 to 2029, first quarter is actually six years. There's more put into the jail itself. That's a strategy around paying the bond down with the help of the small cities, paying into the into that. And then you can see it. It shifts dramatically at 2029. And the resources are there's much more resources for the services. So it's kind of a phased approach. Tyler?

Tyler Schroeder: Just some additional numbers to that, right? So the 0.2% sales tax would collect about 13.8 million every year.

Dan Dunne: So then we can use that. I mean, it's kind of like getting a loan or anything like that. Well, \$13 million a year, you give me \$100 million now.

Tyler Schroeder: Yeah. A lot of the times I've been talking about it, it's just like in theory, it's just like your normal house mortgage.

Dan Dunne: So what's that larger dollar? What can we borrow?

Tyler Schroeder: So \$150 million at 4.5% over 30 years. For 9.2 million, you could borrow about 150.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Yeah. And where are you finding that 4.5%? That we can look into.

Dan Dunne: Yeah, it sounds like a great number.

Rob Fix: We just looked into bonding and we're 3.7 to 4.5. So that's a real number there.

Tyler Schroeder: They're tax-free bonds. And the way Rob said that, right, 3.7 to 4.5, we want to be conservative. So we took 4.5 and a higher number because we want to be conservative in those financial models. Right? So then the idea with this discussion, first, 4 to 6 years is to try to pay down that amount that we need. If we were to build a \$150 million jail facility, let's use that 4 to 6 years, which is 13 million a year between the city and the county. Use that to pay it down, have a lower bond payment moving forward on the construction of the facility, which frees up the rest of the sales tax for behavioral health, criminal justice programs and support to reduce incarceration.

Kathy Kershner: That is all in the implementation plan.

Tyler Schroeder: Correct.

Satpal Sidhu: Yeah. I think that the most unique thing this time around has been the work with the small cities, not all the cities, including Bellingham, the most unique part is the first part. That gives us a \$50 million gift which keeps giving for next 25 years. That's what we have been able to do this time to make it possible if we just have a straight line. Because what happens when you tax \$100, county gets \$60, cities get \$40. That's automatic by the state law. Sales tax. But we have to work with the cities to see what is good for overall community. So what they are doing, they are giving up their 40% for six years, saying we'll just give it all to you. I proposed, I was the council member that proposed at that time! Nobody bought this idea at that time. But we've been able to negotiate with them. That's why we will go get the bond, \$50 million less. And then you see the light blue line going straight. Then it becomes like a house mortgage. It's fixed. The dollar becomes cheaper and cheaper, but our payment is still the same. And our tax collection will keep going up. With inflation and everything else, right? So just imagine that. And the cities did agree that after six years they will still contribute some part of their money for behavioral mental health which benefits everybody. So everybody looked at how we can benefit the community over 30 years, not in the short term. I think that's the uniqueness of it. And second thing I want to emphasize again what Kathy just said, that if you look at it will be \$1 billion over 30 years operational cost of the jail.

I said many times that we get free jail if we save 10% on the operations cost because that's \$100 million. You know, the cost of jail. You get all the money back if you save 10% on your operations. So that's why we were able to work with the council and many groups, because when it's a small group, you can have that discussion that going to LaBounty is the best option for all of us, not that initial business. The operational cost will be less than a vertical jail. It's always because you have people on 1 or 2 floors and then have to have another people on that floor. If everybody is there, we know that that kind of savings are possible. So that is another point that if you look at 30 year stretch of this financial deal, we get a very good deal and we get all these services which were otherwise not possible. The two previous proposals had \$30 million over 30 years for behavioral health mental health services. So that's kind of forced us to start thinking back in 2021, 2022. Even when the process didn't start, what can we do to make these finances work better for the community? And only key was we have to make good for 30 years. You cannot make models initially to convince people, keep it low, this and that. And that's where I think credit goes to the cities. I just want to acknowledge everybody. And that stranger is sitting here and he was a big part of that because Bellingham is a big partner in this tax deal.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: This is wonderful. It will be nice to hear how many beds we're aiming for.

Barry Buchanan: So this is just a little bit about the about the ordinance and I'll let Council Member Kershner talk about that.

Kathy Kershner: So the ordinance that was passed last Tuesday by the council includes much of what we've already discussed, and it's a 2/10 of 1% sales tax increase. It's \$0.20 on every \$100 spent for Whatcom County residents and visitors to Whatcom County who spend the money here. They're going to help us build the jail and provide services as well. So the ordinance incorporates the implementation plan that we've been talking about with the 15 goals. Go ahead.

Kathy Kershner: Oops. Wrong way.

Barry Buchanan: That's the end of the line. Okay.

Kathy Kershner: So I wanted to talk a little bit about a couple of things that we haven't mentioned yet. There's a lot of questions about what happened to the 2004 sales tax that was passed by voters. And we've incorporated that into the ordinance with descriptive language on exactly what did happen to it. It collected \$72 million between 2005 and 2022, about 4 million per year. And that money has been spent for a minimum security and custody operations center. And that's what we commonly refer to as Division Street. City Jail credit, new jail project funding, jail controls, debt service and minimum-security jail funding. So all of that money has gone into our public safety fund in order to support the jail facility that we have on division and then also our current jail that has had to have copious amounts of money poured into it to keep it operating. It's the intent of the council to continue to dedicate that one tenth of a percent to construction and operations of a new jail, including jail based behavioral health services. So that's the intent of the council.

It's written into the ordinance. And if people have questions about that, we wanted to make sure we addressed it up front. I wanted to also just say that when we negotiated this ordinance, it was collaborative effort. So everybody's voices, including the, I don't know, 1000 people that Barry has met with over the last year, his 39 member Stakeholder Advisory Workgroup. That's all the subcommittees and all the people that were involved in that, all those voices, all the voices from the public and then the voices from the council and what council members were hearing were all brought forward and put into this ordinance. There were compromises made. Nobody got everything they wanted. But I think everybody

gets something they want. And the bigger picture is that we have a failing jail. That is a huge risk to our community and we have to do something about it. And so this is the council's effort to put to the voters our best plan with the most collaborative efforts, I think, that the Whatcom County Council has had in many, many years, I'll say that.

Barry Buchanan: On something this big? Yeah.

Kathy Kershner: Something this big. The cities came together as executive Sidhu said. And what they're asking for is they will give us they want to give us all the money because they're also interested in having a functioning jail with services. They want to get that going. And so they're going to give us all of their portion of the sales tax for 6 years. They've asked that booking restrictions be minimized or eliminated because they're struggling as well. And they're in the cities. It's not the small cities. It's all the cities. And they want to see they want to see progress made on that. There is a potential sunset clause in the ordinance, and that is that after 30 years, the bond is paid off around 2055. The council at the time can consider retiring one tenth of the 2/10 percent, and that will be in the ordinance. So the concern about will this go on forever, there's an option in here for that to be sunsetted. And I think that is all I wanted to touch on that we haven't already talked about. Can you think of anything we haven't hit?

Barry Buchanan: No, I think that I think you did a great job, Kathy. I think the point to take away, too, is the collaboration and the public transparency and just how much of an effort was made to engage the public in this process. So which is a lot different than what the past two measures did. So.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Capacity?

Kathy Kershner: And so, yeah, I was going to hit on that, Sarah. So within the ordinance and the plan, we are creating a formula that will help guide how big this facility will be. Rather than picking an arbitrary number based on arbitrary data we are working with, I know that Tyler is working with the small city mayor, no, I shouldn't call him that, Mayor Korthuis — sorry about that — to develop a formula that we can use that that takes all of the anguish out of deciding how big this thing is going to be or how small or is it going to work when you.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Do we follow, Nashville, and what other communities have done? Is that where the formula comes from?

Tyler Schroeder: Yeah, there's a lot of national standards that it looks into. You know, they'll use booking, population growth, different types of.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And being at a border, is probably additional factor?

Tyler Schroeder: Yeah, correct. Yeah.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Mayor Fleetwood has a comment.

Seth Fleetwood: Oh, thank you. I was just — earlier when we were looking at the graph about money coming in, in the out years after we've helped accumulate a fund to pay down the bond amount, there's going to be approximately \$5 million annually to the cities based on population. And the city's going to be getting about 80% of that or around \$4 million. And so I'm going to recommend to our council that we dedicate half of that income or more to the behavioral health portion of the needs that are identified in the

needs assessment. So I just want to point out this is the means, passing this tax is one of the important means by which we will have dedicated funding for the behavioral health aspect of it.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Do we have any more questions or comments or can we have our State Rep Alicia Rule talk and then we might have questions on the Justice Center in general when both speakers have gone? (agreements)

Alicia Rule: Okay. Thank you. From the state perspective, I think it's really important that we understand at a very basic level, the short and the long answer is when it comes down to the facilities for incarceration, that is not something that the state is able to fund. However, it's also important to understand that there are monies available in almost, I might say, every single one of those buckets that we saw in this presentation. Outside of that. So as we move forward, building systems that support people. So remembering that when we talk about incarceration and behavioral health, we're talking about humans that sometimes will be in one space and then another space. And if we're doing it well, we're helping those systems to work seamlessly together. From the state level, each one of those projects, buckets and systems that have been well thought through in the prior presentation, there's many available and attached for that. So we can think about moving forward with our facilities, our capital facilities. It's difficult to remember what isn't here yet, but we know that allocations have already been made for buildings such as that behavioral health urgent care center. But also we have inpatient 30 day complex behavioral health needs building coming in. We've got the wellness center at Lummi Nation coming in. And then the other the other connection to be made here is that we have a good head start on a lot of programs here in Whatcom County because we did the pilots. So we already have all of the big stuff that's coming from the state policy and funding wise or at least available. We've already got seeds in the ground for the ART program. You know, the Alternative Response Team program and GRACE and LEAD so we can then, you know, work together from the state and county level to be able to leverage funds with these tax dollars in all of those further behavioral health spaces.

So, you know, it depends on what the legislature does in future years. But it is my hope and of course, commitment to ensure that we continue working toward building out systems of care that are more comprehensive than they are now in the behavioral health space. But we know the money is allocated even now and the interest is there to do so. And state level funding is available for some of these operational costs that we're talking about. What our budget writers at the state like to see, is they like to see the local community coming and asking for money that's lasting dollars. And so this what I'm seeing here in this presentation is telling us that that will be a great position for the local community, county elected officials to be able to leverage those dollars. Well, and we really love that, right. We want to be able to work together to take our local dollars and, you know, double them, triple them whatever we can do to bring those projects and the services back here to Whatcom County. So I think that's important to think about strategically how these things to work can work together and how the state then is going to be able to help us move forward with some of the operational challenges that we have thinking forward for the behavioral health workforce, issues that we know are big challenges. We have two additional master's level programs coming on board in the state of Washington. That's Washington State University and Western Washington University. That's a really big deal because it means that at that graduate level, that master's level, professional level, we're going to be maybe, I don't know, maybe even doubling capacity in that area.

But we also did some shifts at the state in the workforce arena around just the scope of practice. So that should open up some opportunities as well. In addition to the GRACE and LEAD program, we know that we have one more tool, the Peer Navigator program that is possible. So that could also be one other way that we might be able to decide that we want to work with expanding behavioral health workforce. So I

think, you know, the presentation that you saw here today is really strategically positioned well to work with what's already been happening at a state level, and that's in all of those areas, both capital as well as the operational piece. So, you know, together they work hand in hand to deliver new systems of care. And I think that is a beautiful thing. Speaking of the collaboration that's happened here on the County Council, thinking about how locally and state and even federally we can put those pieces together. That's how we're going to do this. So I'm pleased with what I see. I think we can expect that there is state money available specifically for our future goals for behavioral health, but also for housing, for wraparound services, for, you know, all of those things are bundled into the budget that we just passed at the state level. When people are reentering that, you know, whether they're coming in or coming out of the justice center, they have to have the proper services. There's money available. We just have at the county level will go after it.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Thank you. Any comments? Any questions?

Lynn Giuliani: I have one. I've not been here before, and I'm so incredibly impressed with the work that you've all done. I just have a question. I do consulting and training for businesses. What will be your communication plan to the to the average person in Whatcom County so that they can understand all the beautiful work that you have done, and appreciate this from the big picture. I just know, you know, the John Doe that goes to work or maybe drives the bus or does daycare. Will they understand how intricate and how much work has gone on behind decision to add 2% sales tax? Because so many times we just look at, you know, what happens to me and so might there be a plan to really tell this story? Because this story is so deep and so beautiful.

Barry Buchanan: There is. And, in fact, it's been an ongoing plan. I don't know if— were you here at the beginning of the meeting?

Lynn Giuliani: I was not.

Barry Buchanan: I had to announce that we have to be careful of communication about the actual ballot measure itself, because can't use public resources to either promote or deter a development. So we're very careful of that. But we have had a consultant on board now for over a year called Pyramid Consulting that has done work with the Incarceration Prevention Reduction Task Force as its customer. And what we've done been able to do is we've been able to kind of parallel some of the justice project work and communicate that before we sent the ordinance to the council for a final vote. And that's been going ongoing now for quite a bit. So they using social media platforms, they're using editorials too. Seattle editorial. They've done editorials here in Whatcom County. So the answer is yes. But we do have to be mindful of that, promoting the ballot measure, using county resources, because that's against the law.

Tyler Schroeder: It's meetings like this to though, right, just as it relates whether or not you oppose or don't. It's just fact based information about what is in the proposal and it's talking with community members and then having community members talk to their friends and their family that may vote in the future about where to go with it. But we're not here to say support or oppose. We're just here to give back that information. And then that message hopefully will get carried out throughout the community.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Lynn, if I'm — correct me if I'm not asking this right, this is really hard. I'm almost sweating trying to stay in the rules right now — (laughter) If a person was for a Justice Center and all the amazing work that has gone on and wanted the information to be more available because they hadn't heard much detail, what is that game plan going forward?

Barry Buchanan: There is a campaign committee that has taken the work on now to promote the actual ballot measure. So I would say some conversations with that group would be probably in order.

Kathy Kershner: And we're also gathering interest in who wants to write the pro and con statement for the voter's guide, which will be important as well.

Barry Buchanan: Yeah, there's that.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: How would one get involved with that? The writing? Or how would one volunteer or make themselves available

Tyler Schroeder: On the pro and con committee? Yeah. So the pro and con committee on the 24th of July, so the next Tuesday's council meeting, council will be considering who would be a part of the pro and the con in the in the pamphlet.

Barry Buchanan: We would get you the email that went out.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Include it in the notes?

Barry Buchanan: Yeah, there is a call for that.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Okay, that would be great. Thank you. Great question.

Lynn Giuliani: Definitely pro.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Even though we can't give an opinion. So is there any other comment or question? Ken, you been awfully quiet. What's going on? [Laughter]

Ken Bell: First of all, thank you for your work. I'm still curious how we get a free jail after 30 years. Didn't quite grasp the rationale behind that. And I'm not sure we can actually say that. And it's going to be a great day after 30 years. No. Thank you again for a lot of good work. Tyler, thank you for your help. And that guy in the corner.

Brian Heinrich: Thank you.

Ken Bell: You have no idea what I just said. [Laughter].

Brian Heinrich: I don't.

Ken Bell: Thank you anyway. (laughter)

Sarah Rothenbuhler: All right. Since we've got the Justice Center all related resolved (laughter Thank you for all the amazing work and information. We can move on to the next topic. I've asked Gina... there's a lot of dollars being spent on cannabis and related taxes.

Gina Stark: It was a great presentation, Councilmember Buchanan, but what I want this one. And everybody can see my email. Sorry about that. The mouse must be running out of batteries. It is not liking me today.

Barry Buchanan: That's what happened when I had problems.

Gina Stark: So bear with me as I as I fight with this mouse here. There. There we go. So I did just a little bit on our cannabis tax, which was very, very interesting. If I could grab our friends here and make them a little bit smaller and who do we get to stare at right now? We're going to stare at Mayor Seth. Okay. It's funny, it grabs it grabs whoever.

Tyler Schroeder: No connection with cannabis. (laughter)

Gina Stark: No, no. No. [Laughter]

Gina Stark: So actually, in our state, as many things, it started off as an initiative. Washington State, we're actually very unique in that a lot of our laws begin as an initiative. And it became effective in 2012 and it legalized possession use in the commercial sales of non-medical cannabis for people over the age of 21. And it set the excise tax at 25% for the sales of each level of the cannabis. So that was the marketers, the producers and the processors and the retailers. And that's significant because that's not how it is as of today. Then it established the dedicated cannabis account and it required a very specific allocation for the tax revenue of the cannabis. Then in 2015, the Legislature said, wait a minute, wait a minute, let's change this. Let's increase the amount of tax of 37% at the time of the sales and added the allocation of the tax revenues for cities, towns and counties. And we'll talk a little bit about that in later in the presentation. And then what it did. Is it established that in the RCW at 69.50.554, which covers all the tax and fees for the revenues are allocated. Okay. I'm sorry, it's a little small, but I wanted to kind of show you how the cannabis licenses are allocated. As you can see, the big blue, that's the producers and the processors. And in 20 as of 2022, there are 889 producers and processors in the state of Washington and quickly followed up by retailers. There are 481 retailers in Washington state and then there are 168 producers, and then there's 235 processors. And then the little ones are cooperatives, transportation and then researchers. So you can see they break it down that there are producers and processors. So they do both. And then those that are just processors. So it's quite a bit.

Gina Stark: And then next, I'll show you guys. So in 2022, the total amount of revenue collected is \$515 million, and it breaks it down. That \$157 million went to the general fund, \$264 went into basic health and then \$20 million local government. And then we have the Health Care Authority is next, the Department of Health. So you can see a lot is kind of health but in different aspects of health. The state patrol, the Washington Liquor and Cannabis Board. So that's you know, that's the administrative and the ones that do the oversight and the licensing and then 1.5 in other. So this is kind of how under the RCW is distributed to counties, cities and towns. 1.5% where licensed cannabis retailers are physically located and then 3.5% to counties, cities and towns per on a per capita basis. So it's actually a total of 5%. And then they kind of parse that 5% out. 1.5% where retailers are physically located. So if you are a city, town or county and you don't have a retailer— and there are some actually in our county that do not have a retailer— so they don't capture that 1.5% at all. And then the 3.5% is in based on your per capita in that county.

And then I know this is busy and, but wanted to kind of try and get this so that you guys can kind of see how it's allocated. So you can see at the top there's that 5%. So if you have that \$25 million, right, allocated and then the 1.5%, there's the \$7.5 million and it goes to town A, you can see how they kind of allocate that out and the formula. And so how that town would then eventually get \$150,000. So you can see how it formulaically would get to a city based on their retailer. And then on the other side, you can see at a 3.5%, if you have that \$17.5 million, how it would be allocated on a per capita basis and how you

could see if you have a really small town on a per capita basis, if they only have like 4% on a per capita basis and accounting, how much they would get. And then if they are, let's say, a larger 30% of the per capita basis, how much that particular city or county would get. I know it's a lot, but then I wanted to give you guys this next snapshot here. Distribution of cannabis revenue, on a retail basis. So as you can see, again, we have some, some towns in our county that don't have retailers, so they captured 0% of revenue or as opposed to our Bellingham and Blaine, Ferndale, how much revenue they were able to capture. And again, this is all for fiscal year 2022. So it's as you can see, it's not, you know, little old Nooksack, you know, got a whole \$2000. You know, it's not a big giant kind of moneymaker here. This is an annual retail sales and sales per capita. So in fiscal year as on a compound basis.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: So there's no King County on there but Snohomish County's almost 800 average population.

Gina Stark: Yes

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And then like if we go to the far right for the fiscal year 2022, if we're looking at Skagit, is that 26 in total? Is that \$26 million in total sales?

Gina Stark: Yes.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: And then Snohomish is \$142,000 in total sales.

Gina Stark: Yeah. And Whatcom County was \$43 million in sales.

Tyler Schroeder: Okay. We've got 194 sales per capita. Because that's not the amount that sales tax revenue is.

Gina Stark: No.

Tyler Schroeder: That's gross.

Gina Stark: Yeah. So no, because I think we said that Whatcom County got for '22.

Tyler Schroeder: \$335,000. Yeah. Gross about \$1.9 million since 2015.

Gina Stark: Yes. And that and that it gets funneled to the to the health care.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Because there was for basic health for the state too. If last year there was \$515 million in taxes collected then \$264 went to basic health. And it's so concerning as a business owner, it just seems like that disappears. Where does the basic health taxes collected go? t you hear no, that is that's a small amount which.

Gina Stark: Yes. So let me get to this next slide. So I thought that this was really, really timely. So the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee, known as JLARC. So they keep track of all the legislative accounts. They're currently reviewing all the expenditures of the CBA, which is the cannabis account that is set up. And they're doing a study of all these accounts that I just mentioned earlier in this presentation. And where are those revenues going and how are they being used and are they being used in a good way? Right? Like what are their purposes? And again, a part of that does include the cities and the counties. So they're essentially doing an audit of these accounts. Are they being used to the best of their

purposes, of their intent? And so that study is due to the legislature in December. And I don't know, Representative Rule or Senator Shewmake, if you know about this and want to speak, speak to it. But it seems very timely. December is not that far away that this study will be delivered to you all.

Alicia Rule: We'll look forward to seeing it. I appreciate the work they do.

Gina Stark: Yes. And then the Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board, they do an annual report on these various taxes. So these taxes are being watched very carefully and reviewed very closely. And there's a whole special division that just looks at this.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: That looks like we're spending 12 million just on watching, reviewing and collecting the taxes...Barry?

Barry Robinson: I was just putting in a plug in for Whatcom's Bachelors in Social Work program that we're starting up this fall. I'm just throwing that out there. We're going to help try to fill some of that behavioral health needs in the community.

Gina Stark: Thank you, Barry.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Yeah, Appreciate it. Thank you. And I don't know if anyone has comments on this with the cannabis being such an impact on our community. Does anyone have any questions?

Barry Buchanan: On the 481 retailers, is that a physical retail location? I know a lot of retailers have multiple locations, so there might be there's less operators that open operate multiple. Yeah.

Tyler Schroeder: I would just— the one slide that recognized where that tax revenue goes was an interesting one, just as it relates to state revenues and local jurisdiction. Right. So local governments was \$20 million out of \$500.

Gina Stark: Yeah. It was a very small piece of the of the, you know, that was like \$515.

Tyler Schroeder: And I think it was even a smaller slice. They made a state law change in '15. Yeah. The cities and the counties fought for that improvement, just to get to \$20. Before it was much less than that. So that was an improvement at the time. And then I'm assuming some of that state revenue gets allocated out through specific grants to the county as well to be used for school-based prevention and other stuff as well.

Alicia Rule: So the question I think will be when we look at that JLARC study, exactly that. If it's being funneled through the state, what is it looking like for our local community? Are we getting our fair share of that?

Gina Stark: Yeah. And when I talked to JLARC, that's one of the things they say, they were going to look at each specific city and county to try and nail kind of on a more granular data, kind of understand how they're going to be used.

Alicia Rule: So if we know the end outcome is we want to do prevention services for children with this money, then maybe it doesn't really matter if it's funneled through the state or the county or the city, but as long as it lands here in our community, that's what we want to keep them accountable for. So I look forward to that study. It'll be good.

Barry Buchanan: So, Gina, are there partners in that study conducting it or?

Gina Stark: It's just JLARC.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: All right. Any other questions or comments? Sure appreciate it Gina. That was a lot of good work. Anything else?

Since we are done early, can we brainstorm on solving our highway system?

Our highway system was created, when you talk to the old road contractors, we're informed that our highways were built in the 50's with a 20-year life span to get us to into the 70s where more expansion would be needed. My business alone has 50 trucks and semis on the highway system from the Washington Canadian border to Oregon. And traffic is tough. We tried to track the DOT accident reports. And we can't find anything representing what's really happening on our highways as far as accidents and delays. We regularly track our drivers on an hour and a half drives, taking four hours to get there mainly because of accidents and in the summer also construction. We did out grow our highway system in at least the 80's and are far behind on maintenance. I know we've been putting so much into our public transit systems in the Seattle area. Is there anything that we can finally do about the road systems from Seattle to the Canadian border? Well, really, the whole I-5 corridor, in Washington?

Sharon Shewmake: Do you mean maintenance or driver behavior?

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Beyond that, we need more lanes. The lanes were built to get us to the 70s and our population has grown tremendously since then. Road behavior, that's probably something that can always be addressed. But how do we get more lanes?

Alicia Rule: Yeah, I'm not sure about the more lanes, but the lanes that we have are in dire shape. And also we have some supports that we've been presented with that tell us about the road maintenance, but also our bridges. Our bridges need some clear attention. Yeah, I don't have a magic answer for you other than yes, this work needs to be done.

Sharon Shewmake: Yeah, we put a lot of money into this and the Move Ahead Washington package. And so the problem is that right now WADOT is just so focused on trying to get the culverts before the things like we have an obligation here and that's all the mess that you've heard about before. You know someone comes in, the Supreme Court told us we have to do that. It's the right thing to do, but we're also legally mandated to. And so that should be wrapping up like '29, '30 and there could be opportunity for a new package. This would definitely be, I mean, this is a big change. And like the last packages we got things like Thornton Overpass or potentially we're looking at raising elevating Slater Road. So it doesn't flood and Lummi Island doesn't become a double island. And Lummi Reservation doesn't become an island. So that that kind of work is going on. There is also an I-5 study. I don't know if it includes so much our part. Some of it's that other parts of I-5 are also falling apart—

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Yes, the whole West side is falling apart.

Sharon Shewmake: Yeah, there's a lot of really difficult and expensive work that needs to be done there. The other part of this too, is WADOT is at capacity in terms of even if we could get, you know, \$1 billion package, we don't have the people to do this work. So when we looked at the move ahead package, what we did is there is money for preservation and maintenance. I really advocated to push this up some because preservation is cost effective and we keep building new lanes that we can't always afford to

maintain if we aren't putting that money in preservation and maintenance, which I think is just really important. But also that is a big difficult ask. It would come with a new transportation package. And I think that we will be having that discussion. We just got to get through these injunctions.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: It scares me to hear 2029. It's just like our justice center, we've been in crisis. Was that built in the 80s late 80s, our jail? And we heard in the late 80s that the design wasn't working. We're doing it again with our highway system because we're in a safety crisis.

Alicia Rule: I think what's frustrating probably for the business folks in the room, too, is just that we know that, as you mentioned, Senator Shewmake, it's just so much more cost effective to be able to get on top of it. So, you know, we need to prioritize this.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Is there anything we can do, the committee to help propel this.

Sharon Shewmake: Advocate for any transportation package. And it's going to look different from the other ones we are starting to see as we go forward, as we switch to electric vehicles, which are great, they're lower cost. But the way that we pay for roads is with a gas tax. And so we've got to figure out some innovative ways to do that. We talked about a road usage charge. I only support a road usage charge if it's on EVs only. I don't think gas powered vehicles should pay the gas tax and a road usage charge on top of that. I don't think that's fair. But giving political cover for that discussion of what do we do going forward? How do we think about electric vehicles, changes in vehicle propulsion, and how do we also think about maintaining our transportation system, I think one of the nice things about the transition to electric vehicles is there even if you even if you were to double the gas tax, it's still cheaper to drive an electric vehicle per mile than it is a gas powered electricity is just a lot cheaper and it's a lot more efficient. And so if people were paying the same amount per mile to drive, you'd be bringing in a lot of transportation revenues and so there is that opportunity to modernize our system that I think is a good thing.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: I just worry thinking we solve this only with the technology piece. Right now, regarding electric vs diesel and our construction equipment, what we see happening with batteries / electric landfills, mining, electric it doesn't feel environmental. Technology is coming. It just it worries me because we in our business see the efficiency of the gas engine over, less impact on the land and the environment than we do with electric and batteries. But in the meantime, we're so tax weary, we're tax exhausted. There's that cap tax. There's the gas tax—where does all the gas tax go now, and what that is doing for our transportation package, because I thought that's kind of what the original plan was. Where does the cap tax go? It sounds like that's generating a lot more money than ever anticipated. So maybe we could capture some of that because in Whatcom County we've been crisis in a few different areas. And thank God we have all these amazing people that are advocating for us in Olympia and locally. So thank you. We just had a little extra time. Spontaneous topic but no one was talking.

Sharon Shewmake: If you ever want to sit down with transportation budget about it, I'm down.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Okay, Thank you. That's wonderful.

Kathy Kershner: And maybe advocating for the federal dollars from the Inflation Reduction Act.

Ken Bell: I'd like to see that presentation. Just because I've got concerns about infrastructure. I don't know how we're going to put the infrastructure in to do an electric move forward.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: We need a yes and- again. (agreement)

Ken Bell: I think we need to hear that. I think all of us need to see something on how we're going to make that happen. How does that infrastructure get built? How much are we going to allocate to that? Because we need more lanes and all we're doing is building chargers. That doesn't relieve congestion you're talking about. I don't think anybody understands the impact of a business on when you have a truck in traffic for three hours longer, that's, you know, 300, 400 bucks an hour that you're wasting on the road. That's a huge impact. And that's not being addressed while we're building infrastructure for electric buses. What's the difference in cost between an electric bus and a diesel bus? What's that infrastructure going to cost to electrify the entire bus system? So I really— you know, whenever you look at me that intently, something happens. So I really do want to know what that all looks like because it's a bigger picture than we're getting here. And I'm worried.

Sharon Shewmake: PSE is doing some incredible work on this.

Brian Heinrich: Yeah, If you want to coordinate some sort presentation, I'd be happy to present on what we're doing from a from a grid perspective.

Ken Bell: A big picture view is really what we need from how this can play together. Because we hear about electrification and I don't see the grid coming into play. I don't know how much it's going to cost us as a ratepayer. All of those are questions that I have.

Alicia Rule: I think those are pertinent questions. They're timely questions. I know that I have plans to head in August to a national conference, the National Conference of Environmental Legislators, where that is one of the key topics. So we're not alone in this question. It's a federal question. It's a state question. It's a local question. And we can learn from each other and we can build on that. I've been in some conversations with the Canadian government as well. When we look at building out this infrastructure, and our grid, we've got to be able to work together, right? Like all of this question that you're worried about and I think is a shared worry comes with work. And so we just what we need to do is we need to bring our partners together and we need to continue to, you know, really push assertively to look for answers to these very legitimate and valid questions of how do we do it. We know we have to do it. How do we pay for it and how do we make it all work actively on the ground?

Ken Bell: The problem is we've got the gas pedal to the floor. Is the road even out there? We could be Thelma and Louise. Without having those answers. So how do you. How do you have the pedal to the metal until you know the answer to that? And yet we do.

Alicia Rule: I'll let you know in August.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: Yes, September meeting?

Ken Bell: Can PSE work that fast? (laughter)

Brian Heinrich: We can now.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: That is great. Thank you, everybody. Thank you so much for being here. Really appreciate it.

Gina Stark: And if you have not signed in, please remember to sign in on the sign in sheet. It's required by the county. So thank you.

Sarah Rothenbuhler: All right. And committee members, anybody that I haven't reached out to, any meeting topics that you'd like to see for the next few months, please let me know. Just shoot me a text. Give a call. Thank you, everybody.

Next meeting: Monday, August 14, 2023 11-12:30pm
Hybrid Meeting - In-person encouraged and Zoom option available

DRAFT