

Vermont Compliance & Enforcement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes – Oct 7th, 2021

Board members in attendance:

- James Pepper, Chair
- Julie Hulburd

Advisory members in attendance:

- Ashley Reynolds
- Cary Giguere
- Tim Wessel

Subcommittee members in attendance:

- Tom Nolasco
- Mark Gorman
- Ashley Manning

Additional attendees:

- Jen Flanagan
- Gina Kranwinkel
- 1 representative from DLL

Some members of the public

Minutes recorded by Ashley Manning.

Tom calls the meeting to order at 2:00.

Tom starts the meeting with addressing the summary of the power point presentation NACB (NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CANNABIS BUSINESSES) created regarding options for outdoor cultivation security.

Mark Gorman addressed the need for fencing for Vermont and that they are common around the United States. Mark Gorman continued to review the power point of other alternatives for outdoor security.

Gina Kranwinkel addressed that the small cultivators' security recommendations may be different than for larger cultivators. 3 options for recommendation were made.

Ashley Reynolds is not in favor of recommendation of 1 or 2. She stated recommendation 3 protects the small cultivators. She stated that she supports the idea of the evaluating after the first year.

Tim Wessel gave his opinion that it is not unreasonable to have security cameras and motion sensors, but asked if the police are expected to respond to these calls? Tim Wessel asked why would we not impose security measures vs a free for all? Recommendation 3 seems reasonable.

Cary Giguere stated that we were trying to address the concerns of everyone, someone needs to be onsite if you are growing at home and they need to have a physical presence near harvest. He feels

recommendation 3 is scalable and it puts the honest on the grower on what they can afford and that if a grower does experience theft, then the next step would be for them to take a security measure.

Ashley Reynolds stated that leaving it up to the farmers would be the best option and that we should put more trust in our farmers and our community because they know the risk. Recommendation 3 she is in favor of but remove the chain link fence in non-highly populated areas.

Tom Nolasco stated that this perspective is coming from the opposite side of what is being stated by NACB, we have an ethical duty to protect and to not have a fence would be a radical departure compared to other states.

Tim Wessel stated that lack of fencing would assume that stealing cannabis is not theft.

Gina Kranwinkel noted that a private property or no trespassing sign might be an option.

Jen Flanagan stated that in Massachusetts they saw that this plant has a value and we had to think of the good and bad and did require security for all license types except for home grows, so having a base level of security was important. Recommendation 3 would be most palatable, and fencing was the basic level of security required and felt that motion sensor lights is a deterrent from any kind of theft. If there is going to be theft, the costs are going to be to the towns, but we do not know because the industry is not there yet.

Gina Kranwinkel handed back to pepper

Chairperson Pepper addressed Tim Wessel about an update on local issues.

Tim Wessel stated that with the help of The League of Cities and Towns he is setting 4 tiers for municipalities so they know what they are dealing with and that he will forward to Julie Hulburd by next Wednesday.

Chairperson Pepper addressed Jen Flanagan to talk about what Massachusetts did in terms of retail security.

Jen Flanagan addressed that retail security's premise is to protect the products, the employee, and the facility. There is a little bit of enhancement to prevent loitering, securing all entrances and exits, securing the product so that diversions and theft is avoided, the facility is well lit, alarms systems in place, having limited access areas, no one can see product from outside the building and duress alarms that go straight to law enforcement. Massachusetts wanted to make consistency regardless of license type, so this applies to all indoor grows, outdoor grows and retail. Taking those general steps would ensure the product, facility and employees are safe.

Chairperson Pepper asked Jen Flanagan if there was a rationale for waving 1,000sqft security requirements in Massachusetts?

Jen Flanagan stated that if you have basic security, it is ok, from micro to large grows there would be a difference in security and wanted to provide those options to the small grows.

Mark Gorman asked Jen Flanagan if micro brews, distillers liquor stores have this kind of security requirements, is there a sense of fear because this is new?

Jen Flanagan stated that the public did not comment, and they did not compare it to alcohol because they are dealing with a federally controlled substance and showed the landscape across the US and since Massachusetts was the first on the east coast, they wanted to be ready for anything that could happen.

Tim Wessel addressed that the alarms that go back to police dept, that this is time and taxpayer money and there is no support from the state of Vt to financially support the municipalities.

Ashley Reynolds noted that their alarm alerts the owners first not the police

Ashley Reynolds stated that their insurance requirements cover the facility and the people in it but not the product. She has a separate policy for product liability insurance which does cover theft.

Public comment

Taylor Carpernet of Gaston weed company stated that for fencing, it should be a requirement for all, even the 1,000 sqft which is over \$200k in finished product and there are going to be a ton of 1,000sqft grows and it would be challenging to regulate. Fencing would give an easy way to regulate, in recommendation 3 I suggest increasing the fencing. 9a

At 3:00 a motion to adjourn was approved.