

## Vermont Compliance & Enforcement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes – Sept 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021

### Board members in attendance:

- James Pepper, Chair
- Kyle Harris

### 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:

- Jen Flanagan
- Gina Kranwinkel
- David Huber
- Wendy knight, Department of Liquor and Lottery

4 members of the public

Minutes recorded by Ashley Manning.

Tom calls the meeting to order at 2:00.

A motion to approve 09.27.21. was approved.

Kyle Harris would like to continue today's discussion on retail enforcement.

Kyle Harris stated he would like to end with outdoor security.

Wendy Knight discussed the DLL's strategy on how they Lead with education, assumption that regardless of license holder, their role is to educate them on the regulations as business support and as customers. DLL has the infrastructure and expertise to assist the cannabis industry.

For compliance and enforcement within alcohol they are looking to ensure staff had training, license is visible, observing and ensuring licensee is complying with laws and rules in place. While compliance and enforcement is law enforcement personnel, all of the work does not need to be done by law enforcement, being that most of the work is education.

Question from Tom Nolasco to Wendy Knight for all the other agencies, can you comment on how DLL is operating capacity wise and if they can absorb the new industry without additional resources?

Wendy knight stated the DLL is not stating that they currently have the capacity to take on cannabis, they will need more personnel, they are currently understaffed and in the process of recruiting within the compliance and education will be starting recruitment for law enforcement for 1 position. Being that they lead with education, it does not need to be a law enforcement officer.

Kyle Harris moved on to show the language to present to the DLL and Agency of Ag on what cannabis enforcement would look like and needed from the departments.

Ingrid raised the question on what kind of training would be required and costs of those training for the DLL and Agency of Ag agents for cannabis enforcement.

Kyle asked for a consensus on the language on retail enforcement.

recommendation is approved by the sub committee.

Kyle Harris switched gears to outdoor cultivation security.

Tom gave summary on outdoor cultivation security.

Jen Flanagan gave overview of what Massachusetts has done, any outdoor cannabis is considered a limited access area, which leads to limited exposure of those to who are not needed.

In Massachusetts, cannot be seen from the street, if you can see the plant its considered open. Other states if you cannot adhere to security requirements can be reviewed by the police chief. All waste must be accounted for as well.

Cary Giguere no specific requirements for hemp at this time from the state, but many are using 8ft chain link fences, security cameras, some with hired guards.

Cary Giguere, interesting dialogue for the home grower,, out of state out of mind, can grow in your yard as long as its not visible from the street, where do we draw the line between commercial and home grow?

Kyle Harris recognized that license holders will take their own measures due to insurance requirements, how far do the regulations need to go?

Jen Flanagan answered Kyle Harris that the board has to determine what is necessary as a minimal standard for security an outdoor grow. There is a minimum standard the insurance will mandate as well.

Tom Nolasco added that when Mark Gorman and him spoke with the Vermont League of City and Towns and with what Wendy just mentioned, they also want the Board to give them guidance and directions. Those are two countervailing concepts that are present not only in this committee but in all subcommittees. So he would like to hear from Tim Wessel on what the towns want.

Tim Wessel stated that the frameworks needs to come from the state otherwise towns may not be able to deal with it or not deal with it well, do not create an unfunded mandate.

Jen did not see any outdoor security alternatives and that camera, fencing and codes were enough.

Kyle Harris addressed How was fencing defined?

Jen, mass has language of the type of fencing, commercial lock and key code spelled out in the regulations, cannot be viewed with binoculars and drones.

Cary Giguere addressed the strain on local law enforcement because of cannabis's high valuable.

Ingrid Jonas states that from a state police standpoint it would be frustrating to respond to theft calls if the security cameras and security protocols were not in place to start.

Ashley Reynolds addressed that lights are great but the plants do not want the light.

Jen Flanagan stated motion sensor lights or night cameras would be a solution.

Kyle stated that he would like to continue the conversation on Monday and address indoor cultivation security on Monday.

Kyle asked for a summary and comparison of indoor cultivation security for Monday and for Tom to scope out sub bullet points for outdoor security.

No public comment

Meeting adjourn at 3:01