

Vermont Social Equity Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes—September 9, 2021

Tom Nolasco calls to order meeting at 3 pm.

Attendees

Advisory Committee Members:

- Nader Hasim
- Ashley Reynolds
- Xusana Davis
- TJ Donovan

VT Cannabis Board:

- Julie Hulburd
- Nellie Marvel

NACB:

- Tom Nolasco
- Gina Kranwinkel
- Geoffrey Gallegos
- Deneka Scott

2 members of public

Minutes recorded by Meggan Hau, National Association of Cannabis Businesses.

Tom Nolasco, from National Association of Cannabis Businesses (NACB), made introductions to Advisory Committee members. Gina Kranwinkel and Geoffrey Gallegos, also from NACB, will be heading this subcommittee and introduced themselves.

Introductions were made by Advisory Committee members: Nader Hasim, Ashley Reynolds, Xusana Davis, TJ Donovan.

Public Comments were noted and are provided on the 'discussion guide.' Members of the Vermont public were notified how to submit comments via the [CCB website](#). It was noted that the attending public will be allowed to comment during the last ten minutes of this Public Health meeting. The CCB will also hear public comments during their Friday meetings.

Review of public comments- equity and inclusion priority, vacating all marijuana convictions, focus on BIPOC, cohorts, consider more public meetings around social equity with experts (Ex- M4MM and The Last Prisoner Project.)

The Sub-Committee moves on to the discussion guide/deck shared on screen. Discussed the purpose of the Social Equity Subcommittee and reviewed the areas of Act 164 and 62 applicable to this topic.

The NACB Sub-Committee moderators Gina Kranwinkel and Geoffrey Gallegos shared considerations for qualifications for social equity licensees, differentiating between social equity and DEI (diversity, equity and

inclusion), challenges that will need to be addressed, creating two pathways of Social Equity and DEI, defining Disproportionately Impacted Area (DIA) H414, upcoming priorities, etc.

Notable comment(s):

*Ashley Reynolds- Are we looking at a residency requirement for licensees? If we can't create a perfect scenario to right the wrongs, then what? Getting information from our constituents, I find we really need to look at expungements and make sure those people's voices are heard. It's a big issue, I'm glad Vermonters are putting this on the top of the list. Not like other states that have legalized, I want to make sure we are including real Vermonters.

*Gina Kranwinkel- The committee will have to consider 'Do we want to put a residency requirement on it to ensure funds are allocated to people in Vermont?' We need to discuss how we help the people injured by war on drugs.

*Nader Hasim- Vermont has rapidly growing minority population especially in Wyndham County. Give some good consideration on what residency requirements will be, as it will impact BIPOC people.

*TJ Donovan- Agree with complexity of this. Be broad and as inclusive as we can. Disappointed to hear, fund only has \$500,000 in it. Access to capital is a big part of this. We will need to discuss that. Appreciate what you laid out, and remedy to address the harm. DEI could be more inclusive to create a pool of applicants. Vermont is a complex place and I want to make sure everyone has opportunity to participate in this. Expungement issue- 1 oz or less right now? Yes- automatic. You can get any possession amount can be expunged if you apply.

*Gina Kranwinkel- need to work with state banks- subsidizing a loan instead of just giving out a grant. I have a couple of ideas that will make it interesting way to be able to help social equity licensee. We will think outside the box and that's what is great about Vermont.

*Xusana Davis- Feel good about Social Equity and agree with a lot of what was said. I have hesitation on residency requirements. Some people left the state due to being targeted. As for funding amounts, I believe government at all levels have money. We need to feel it and not just do low cost or no cost things.

*Geoffrey Gallegos- Challenges to think about: people got sued over this, saying it's unconstitutional and court will have to review it. Identify what communities mean? Geographical location? Group of people? Cannabis prohibition timeframes to focus on: people affected between 1970-1994, 1994-2010, and 2010-present

Suggested next steps:

Defining social equity for Vermont, consider licensing fee initiatives of "reducing or eliminating licensing fees," and determining social equity applicant/candidate parameters and requirements.

Public Comment Period:

Tom Nolasco opened the floor for public comment at 3:45 PM and reminded members of the public that they can submit comment via in the room (if in attendance) or can submit in writing to:

<https://ccb.vermont.gov/form/publicinputform>

Julie Hulburd noted that are no public comments from the people in the room.

Notable Comment(s):

*Tom Nolasco- With regard to residency requirement, consider one reason is to keep out the MSO's (Multi State Operators). When Geoffrey and Gina talk about constitutionality of programs, there is straight language from some states that a social equity program. Also, when trying to remedy past discrimination, courts did not

accept data or evidence from other states. What is data is out there to define social equity applicant and DEI section? Need to have evidence to back it up.

*Gina Kranwinkel- We do not have a DIA report, but the CCB and other groups are looking for reports and data. If anyone has any, please send it our way.

Adjournment:

Following closing thoughts/comments, Tom Nolasco asked for a motion to adjourn. Subcommittee member TJ Donovan seconds. Meeting is adjourned at 3:55 pm.

Next Social Equity Sub-Committee meeting is Monday, September 13 at 3 pm ET.