

## Vermont Compliance & Enforcement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes,– Sept 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021

### Board members in attendance:

- James Pepper, Chair
- Julie Hulburd
- Kyle Harris
- Nellie Marvel

### Advisory members in attendance:

- Ingrid Jonas
- Cary Giguere
- Ashley Reynolds
- Tim Wessel

### Sub committee members in attendance:

- Tom Nolasco
- Mark Gorman
- Ashley Manning

### Additional attendees:

- David Huber – Enforcement of the Agency invited by Cary Giguere who Helped Stephanie Smith with delivering hemp regulations.
- 3 members of the public

Minutes recorded by Ashley Manning.

Tom Nolasco calls the Board to order at 2:00pm.

Introductions of NACB subcommittee members and Advisory members.

Tom Nolasco discussed an overview of compliance & enforcement priority items for early consideration by the subcommittees.

- Model local ordinances and fees
- Seed to sale tracking (systems)
- Retail compliance
- Indoor cultivation
- Outdoor cultivation
- Enforcement

Tom Nolasco asked Tim Wessel's views about how to approach Model Local ordinances and fees.

Julie Hulburd advised that she has put together a survey for municipalities which will be a tool used to determine local ordinances and fees.

Tim Wessel addressed There is a lot we do not know from the existing legislation but we assume there will be local cannabis commissioners. The towns that do have 1% optional tax, such as Brattleboro will benefit directly from 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of all cannabis sales.

The municipalities are going to be relying on the fees to offset the work by town clerks from local enforcement to traffic problems, police, fire safety, etc.

Tim Wessel: Will the fees going to be enough to cover the costs?

Tim Wessel: How will it impact zoning?

Tim Wessel: There will not be an analysis addressing the true cost for implementing the new adult use program.

Tim Wessel: In regards to Local taxes and fees they rely on the state for guidance due to limited local resources.

Tom Nolasco: The market analysis will help formulate local recommendations

Next, Tom Nolasco addressed cultivation

Ashley Reynolds, addressed where enforcement is needed and asked how priorities will be determined?

Tom Nolasco replied that priorities were determined based on deadlines specified in Act 164

Cary Giguere brought up that Act 164 states that municipalities be given oversight for retail but not other licenses.

Tom Nolasco addressed Stephanie Smith for cultivation regarding current medical market as a foundation but need we need to address how the Act defines small cultivators, pesticides, labeling, facility visits, and other issues which are specified in the materials provided.

Seed to sale was discussed.

Ashley Reynolds asked: Who is going to be handling enforcement?

Tom Nolasco answered: Act 164 does direct the board to utilize other strategic partnership for enforcement. VT Hemp has its own licensing and enforcement, and posed the question: What other agencies have those capabilities or could the CCB create another team for enforcement?

Kyle Harris answered: what a relationship would look like between the agency of Agriculture and the Department of Liquor and Lottery. Kyle suggested after we have the market analysis we can invite them into a meeting and ask them do a presentation on inspection, enforcement and facility inspections to determine what it would take to incorporate cannabis into their current inspections.

Stephanie Smith: Municipalities have authority for local control with zoning laws, regulating signage and controlling public nuisances.

Cary Giguere: does not feel he is the expert to set local cannabis fees, but a portion of the tax collected on the sale of the cannabis products needs to go back to the municipalities to support their added responsibilities.

Tim Wessel: the current local fees do not cover what municipalities spend on alcohol administration and enforcement and cannabis fees under the new law will not be sufficient either.

No public comment was made.

Motion to adjourn by Tom Nolasco at 2:59