

Commonwealth of Massachusetts



STEVEN J. HOFFMAN
CHAIRMAN

CANNABIS CONTROL COMMISSION

101 FEDERAL STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

TELEPHONE (617) 701-8400

CANNABIS CONTROL COMMISSION PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

December 5, 2017 10:30 a.m.

Minihan Hall
19 Staniford Street
Boston MA

COMMISSION MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Chairman Steven Hoffman
Commissioner Kay Doyle
Commissioner Jen Flanagan
Commissioner Britte McBride
Commissioner Shaleen Title

COMMISSIONER MEMBERS ABSENT: None

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT: None

LIST OF DOCUMENTS:

1. Presentation: <https://www.mass.gov/files/documents/2017/12/05/120517-Commission-Meeting.pdf>

Chairman Hoffman started the meeting at 10:30 a.m. He said there will be some interesting presentations today, and began with a status update on funding. Last week, in informal session, the Legislature approved the funding the Commission requested. He said the Commission put together a budget for September 1, 2017, when the Commission got started, through the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 2018. The total is \$7.5 million.

The \$7.5 million approved is broken into two different pieces; \$5 million, which includes all operating funds, including staff, space, and out of pocket expenses, and two of three technologies the Commission needs to develop – the seed-to-sale and licensing technology. The funds are sitting on the Governor's desk awaiting his signature. He has 10 days to sign after the appropriation approval. As for the \$2.5 million for the revenue tracking technology, Administration and Finance determined the best way to fund it is through the Department of Revenue.

The original funding of \$2.3 million, the supplemental funding of \$2.7 million and the DOR funding of \$2.5 million amounts to the \$7.5 million the Commission requested. There are no subsequent appropriations requested this fiscal year. The Commission has what it requested. The

Chairman thanked everyone at Administration and Finance, DOR, the Governor, the Speaker, the Senate President, the Chairs of Ways and Means, and Commissioner Flanagan and Executive Director Shawn Collins for helping with the process.

The Chairman highlighted the Commission is holding first round interviews for the Director of Communications and the General Counsel. He thanked Mr. Collins for leading the interview process. By the end of the day, the Commission will post two additional, previously discussed and approved job postings for Chief Financial Administrative Officer and Chief Technology Officer. The application deadline for those positions will be December 22.

As of last Friday, the Commission posted RFPs for the technologies they are developing, seed-to-sale and licensing. The Commission is putting together a list of topics they need to talk about and debate by tomorrow. After that, the Commission will come up with a structure to assign topics and sequence conversations they will have. The Commissioners have scheduled five days of meetings because they do not know how long it will take to get them done. They are hoping to get them done by Friday, December 15. All of the major policy decisions they have to make will be on the agenda for one of those five days will be debated and voted upon. The Chairman said December has been an intense month. He thanked Commissioner Doyle and Commissioner McBride for drafting the framework of the regulations and most of the regulations themselves.

The Chairman said the Commission is not in their new office yet while technology issues are worked out, so they remain working in One Ashburton.

The Chairman introduced the agenda, including the core presentations from the subcommittees in the following order: Industry, Market Participation, Public Health and Public Safety. Each subcommittee has prepared slides. He thanked those who served on one or multiple subcommittees.

Chris Harding, Commissioner of Revenue introduced subcommittee members Michael Latulippe, Commissioner of Agricultural Resources John Lebeaux, Shanel Lindsay, and Jaime Lewis. The Industry subcommittee received a series of questions from Commissioner Doyle and split them into four working groups. They deliberated for more than a month. In addition to the Industry group's seven members, five more volunteered to join the team. Commissioner Harding chaired the group, and served with Ray Berry, Commissioner Lebeaux, Jaime Lewis, Shanel Lindsay, Kim Napoli, Norton Arbelaez, Michael Latuilippe, Michael Dundas, Mary Ann Pesce, Horace Small, and Lydia Sisson.

Commissioner Harding ran through the group's meeting schedule. All of the Industry Subcommittee's recommendations were unanimous, except for one, which will be discussed later. Shanel Lindsay started discussing packaging standards and protocols. The idea was to use the current DPH standards and regulations as a starting point, feeling those provide required information that patients and adult users want to see, including the concentrate of the cannabinoids, the serving size, and the like. She said the one thing that wasn't included that they thought should be were MIPS, infused products, should disclose what kind of cannabis material is used to produce that product. The example of this would be whether the product was created using distillate versus something like kief versus resin or BHO.

First, the idea is to educate the consumer. There are many people that are not aware of what the different types of cannabis material are and part of the job is to educate that consumer. The group also felt it was important on the business side for producers to be able to distinguish different types of products that may be different levels of quality. In their appendix are draft regulations based on DPH regulations that do include the other caveat. One other thing the group adjusted from the DPH regulations is related to the fact the industry is no longer vertically integrated. The group made it more clear where the responsibility would rest when it came to packaging and packaging requirements. It naturally seemed to fall that the end retailer, consumer-facing, would be responsible for the ultimate packaging regulations, not on the cultivator, except in the case of infused products where the processor would have the responsibility. That seemed to make sense to the group. Commissioner Harding noted the appendices will be posted to the website.

Commissioner Harding introduced Commissioner Lebeaux to discuss cultivation. Commissioner Lebeaux started discussing what measurement should be used for tiers, number of plants, canopy, or another measurement. The working group spent a lot of time analyzing various possibilities and finally determined the fairest way should be based on square footage of the cultivated space. The easiest illustration would be a bench where annual growing takes place, generally a nice rectangle giving the length, width, the square footage, similarly outdoor growing, establish the number of square feet. The group thought that would be the best way to go and cultivation should include all stages of growth. It would include propagation space, cloning space, and the actual growing of the product – lump that all into the definition of cultivation. The group was also asked on recommended system of measurement, what the dividing line on each tier should be. The working group thought all types of cultivation space should be considered similarly – indoor or outdoor, greenhouse, hoop house, combinations thereof – because folks are going to grow in different ways. The simplest way to handle that is to include all similarly. As far as tiers, the question was what should the dividing line for each tier be. The group looked at some of the other states and looked at modeling after Washington and Colorado. They presented four tiers up to 1,000 square feet; the second tier being 1,001-5,000 square feet; the third tier 5,001-10,000 square feet; and the fourth tier being 10,001 and up. The group did not think it was in their purview to decide the top limitation, so they suggest every 5,000 square foot, the fees are going to be portioned out, should be an additional consideration. The working group did put out a number as far as fee structure. Fees should cover the cost of services, whatever the Commission decides those services are going to be.

Commissioner Lebeaux said relative to craft cooperatives, the working group didn't see any reason to keep them small, even if at the outset they will be. The subcommittee talked about existing agricultural cooperatives in Massachusetts. They pointed to Ocean Spray, to Agri-Mark dairy cooperative, and came to realize both those cooperatives started incredibly small and since evolved into very large business operations. They saw no need to prevent that possibility from occurring. So, the group doesn't believe there should be any barriers as far as size, so they can be at any level. The group did point out that craft cooperatives, if it has multiple growing locations, actually could cost the Commission more to administer and inspect, and that might need to be acknowledged in any kind of fee structure. Overall, the group recommends the Commission doesn't create additional barriers from full participation from farmers and small businesses, as called out in the statute.

Commissioner Lebeaux discussed requirements for record keeping by marijuana establishments and procedures to track marijuana cultivated, processed, manufactured, delivered or sold by marijuana establishments. The working group believes all growers and associated organizations (i.e. labs) need a seed-to-sale tracking system – a system for tracking/technology that should be non-proprietary publicly available to ensure that all growers have access to the application in order to allow information sharing. The cost of that system should not be prohibitively expensive for any cultivator. They also suggest the requirements should mimic the current medical regulations for all producers. Along those lines, they believe the Commonwealth should immediately re-initiate a competitive bidding process. Chairman Hoffman said the Commission accepted their recommendation on that and no comment on the other recommendations yet.

Commissioner Lebeaux continued regarding standards for licensees to operate under, using the existing medical model for all cultivation to ensure the outdoor standards match medical for product safety and develop best agricultural practices for indoor and outdoor cultivation. The group couldn't get into any great detail as far as agricultural practices. The Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources (MDAR) does not provide guidance to farmers, if the farmer wants to know the best way to grow a tomato, they do not go to MDAR. They go to UMass Extension. Unfortunately, UMass Extension is a federally funded entity and will not be providing those agricultural recommendations. It would not be surprising that the Commission would ask MDAR to do that, and it can and shall if asked, but it would need to develop that program.

Relative to testing, Commissioner Lebeaux said the working group believes the Commission should not lower any requirements for any class. They suggest medical marijuana testing requirements by DPH should be used as they are supported by years of research and stakeholder collaboration. They should be applied to all adult-use products, and the various departments and stakeholders should consult on this. Commissioner Lebeaux acknowledged he was challenged by several potential growers who felt that was overly onerous. The group's response was they think at the outset, the Commission needs to have full consumer confidence in the product. They did not want anything to compromise the industry. The group recommends all cannabis product producers shall be subject to the Commission's final testing requirements, so as product moves through the processing phase, testing should continue. The group also identified various existing agricultural regulations at the federal and state level that are applicable.

Commissioner Lebeaux said MDAR will consult with growers, state agencies, universities, and other stakeholders regarding best management cultivation practices that should be encouraged. They particularly see a need relative to solid waste disposal, whether it be compost – which MDAR shares the responsibility with DEP or any other solid waste disposal that is in DEP's purview – energy use, nutrient management, etc.

Commissioner Harding introduced Jaime Lewis to discuss licensing. Ms. Lewis said one of the first questions or issues the working group had was the method of which marijuana establishments may serve both patients and adults from a single location. The group voted unanimously to recommend the Virtual Separation of medical and adult use marijuana should be done at the point of sale. All patrons who enter a dispensary that retails both medical and adult use marijuana must either display a valid government ID certifying that they are over the age of

21; or a valid Massachusetts Medical Use of Marijuana Program card (patient or caregiver). At the point of sale, all co-located medical and adult use marijuana establishments will be required to possess and operate software capable of tracking and distinguishing sales for adult use and medical patients. She said another issue is whether a registered patient age 18-20 being onsite of a Retail Marijuana Establishment run afoul of the Chapter 55. The group concluded there is no necessity for registered qualifying patients under the age of 21 to be on the premises of a Retail Marijuana Establishment that does not offer Medical Marijuana. Where facilities are coexisting, anyone between the ages of 18 and 21 can be onsite because it is deemed a medical marijuana facility as well as a recreational marijuana facility.

Ms. Lewis said the next question is whether there be minimum standards for energy, environmental, and waste disposal standards tied to the licensure and renewal of marijuana businesses? The group recommended adopting at minimum the DPH waste disposal standards as identified in the current CMR regulations and energy and environmental standards as well as meet municipal requirements.

Ms. Lewis described the next issue as should the regulations specify minimum safety standards for specific types of hydrocarbon solvents and extractions? These are for the oils made, the distillates, vapes and shatters. The group is recommending that the Commission follows the standards with the National Fire Protection Association's guidance on extractions. As of a year ago, they issued their national fire code and added in specifically things around extraction facilities and cultivations. They should be approved nationally around 2018, sometime this summer.

Ms. Lewis said the group came across another issue: outside the 3 primary licenses contemplated in Chapter 55, what other types of cannabis related businesses should be licensed? The working group believes the Commission should adopt the proposed amendments for the 105 CMR that relate to Independent Testing Labs, so again another theme that they're seeing. There is already testing protocols in place on the medical side that should be adopted over to the recreational side. Then the department can move forward in terms of adjusting those as they see fit for the different areas.

Ms. Lewis highlighted another recommendation: all ancillary businesses that come in direct contact with cannabis should be licensed by the state. Those are going to be transporting or storing or doing any sort of distribution of the product. All employees should be subject to the same registration and training requirements for similar situated marijuana establishments. They also recommend adopting a licensing and regulation structure similar to Colorado's Transporter Licenses. They have a pretty robust licensing and distributing process in place. These licenses are valid for 5 years. A licensed transporter provides logistics, distribution, and storage of marijuana products. A transporter may contract with multiple businesses and may hold another marijuana license. They must have access and use seed-to-sale tracking to distribute the product.

Ms. Lewis said the group recommends ancillary businesses that do not come in direct contact with cannabis (the training organizations, business start-ups, CPAs) may register with the CCC and receive an accreditation so as to protect Massachusetts consumers and businesses from predatory entities as defined. They suggest the Commission sets up an accreditation process but

that they would not need to go through the robust licensing process because they're not directly touching the product.

Ms. Lewis added that the group recommends the CCC should maintain a comprehensive list of those registered and accredited with the CCC, as well as a list of businesses found to be predatory to the consumers and businesses, so it's a better business sort of process for the state. The working group also recommended accreditation/registration for ancillary businesses that do not come into direct contact with cannabis (i.e. the training protocols and business start-ups) should be optional.

Ms. Lewis said one of the issues the group also came across was the creation of standards performance expectations for the benefits of employees, patients, and consumers. She said this is very similar to a TIPS or serve safe program. The CCC should adopt a statewide program similar to what is in place in Colorado right now: a Responsible Vendor Program, which is geared specifically toward the cannabis industry. The program must be approved by the CCC. Employee participation in this program is mandatory, but an employee may elect to attend in person, or via internet. Employers may offer their own in-house training in place of the Responsible Vendor Training, as long as it meets the minimum standards as set by the CCC. The group recommends the CCC approves the Responsible Vendor Programs and also allow the employer to do their own internal training as long as it meets the benchmarks that the department would like to see for training. This is geared specifically to make sure the RMDH, instead of dispensing the product, are educated enough to make sure that they are educating the consumer on the safeties and use of the product specifically.

Ms. Lewis said the working group recommends new employees must be certified within 90 days of hire. The fee for the test will be paid by the employer, so there should be no fee to the employee. Each individual certification lasts for 2 years – very similar to ServeSafe and TIPS – and is portable with the employee, so the employee can take this with them and use it for the two years. Ms. Lewis said another recommendation was that the vendor training applies to all employees involved in the selling or handling of marijuana products. Administrative employees and others that do not come into direct contact with marijuana or marijuana products are not required to take this course, and the program is designed to bolster industry-wide safety, security, integrity, and transparency of standards.

Ms. Lewis said the group also recommends adopting the updated 105 CMR with the modifications for the adult use industry as well. The group highlighted a couple things they thought would be nice to apply to the recreational industry: the registration of Marijuana Licenses; the operational requirements for Registered Marijuana Dispensaries; inspections of the Registered Marijuana Dispensaries; the grounds for denial of initial application for registration; and grounds for denial of renewal of application; and other sections as identified by the subcommittee.

Commissioner Harding thanked Ms. Lewis and introduced Michael Latulippe to discuss social consumption. Mr. Latulippe said he worked on this subject with Horace Small from the Union of Minority Neighborhoods. This is a very complex subject so they wanted to take it very seriously. The working group ended up looking at the package store model as old fashioned and

basically the consumer really wants an outlet, a place to consume cannabis and do it safely. They also took into account the Cole Memorandum which specifically states that they would like cannabis to not necessarily go home with children, or be around children, and by having these onsite facilities, the need for some parents to go home with the cannabis themselves would be alleviated as it would allow them to consume it onsite and it also alleviates the issue of interstate trafficking between tourists coming to the state, requiring them to buy large quantities of cannabis could cause for some problems. By giving them a safe place to consume, it could potentially resolve that issue regarding interstate trafficking.

Mr. Latulippe said when they were developing their recommendations, the Commission can see in the appendix that he actually drafted some recommendations, but he does not know how to write regulations and he is not an attorney. Mr. Latulippe said one of the primary questions Commissioner Doyle asked the subcommittee was, “what limits should be placed on consumption per individual?” The working group found serving size limitations were easiest, basically because there are no tracking and confidentiality issues by trying to limit purchases of that sort, and allows for the largest variety of onsite consumption business models, which ensures maximum revenue for the state and the retailer. Serving size is innovative because they have seen in other states the price of marijuana drop precipitously after it’s legalized and that can cause problems in terms of tax revenue and it can also cause problems in terms of helping small businesses, co-ops, crafts potentially get into the market.

By allowing serving sizes in these on-site or social consumption facilities, they basically ensure that the maximum amount of value is extracted from the product, analogizing it to wine sold in a restaurant versus a store. In a sense, the serving size limitation is really innovative in the sense that it could potentially alleviate some of the market problems that have been seen in other states that have been dominated by package stores. Another aspect of the recommendation is the commission should develop state limits on serving size as well as the maximum amount of servings allowed per immediate use package.

Mr. Latulippe said the next recommendation, which the Deputy Commissioner of Revenue abstained from, is the Commission should implement a daily maximum exposure up to 0.35 ounces (or combination equivalent) in onsite retailers based on current Department of Public Health laboratory protocols. This was abstained from because the Deputy Commissioner realized that 0.35 ounces is quite a bit of cannabis in grams, about equivalent to about 10 grams of flower. That equivalence in edibles is very, very high. It would not be a limitation on purchasing the marijuana product, but essentially be a warning mechanism for consumers that TIPS-certified bud tender, or whoever is serving the individual, that they are starting to reach their daily maximum exposure. The exposure limit is based on heavy metals, contaminants, molds, and other contaminants that are tested before, so it’s not necessarily saying the cannabinoids are dangerous, it’s saying the cannabis plant and the contaminants within it reach a dangerous level when the consumer consumes more than 0.35 ounces a day, or equivalent based on the current laboratory protocols.

Mr. Latulippe said he would refer to the Department of Public Health for any potency limitations, but the working group voted on was to implement a maximum exposure limit for onsite facilities. Onsite retailers would want to notify the consumer if they were going to consume more than they

should and it's also good policy in dealing with communities, particularly a community that might be averse to a marijuana facility, for them to know there is at least some limitation on the amount of marijuana purchases at these onsite facilities could make some city officials feel a lot more comfortable.

Commissioner Harding offered a clarification. He said if one did an analogy of alcohol, it's not a matter of whether an individual got intoxicated by drinking six bottles of whiskey. It's the exposure to what the whiskey was stored in. It was in a wooden cask and it leached in a bunch of things and if you consume that much, now you're exposing yourself to solvents, heavy metals, etc. That's really what this was focused on.

Mr. Latulippe thanked him for clarifying, and moved on the working group's recommendation dealing with siting problems. He said having worked in the medical marijuana industry for a long time, he realized the difficulties of siting marijuana establishments. The recommendation says the Commission should set how many servings are allowed per immediate use container but allow municipalities to raise or lower that limitation to suit their own public health and safety concerns. Allowing the state to set some guidelines and have municipalities work through it gives them some choice, and he feels like when communities have a choice, they feel a lot more open to letting something into their community. When you have something like a concentrate, something like 0.1 of a gram, basically put a limitation and say maybe we don't want consumers consuming more than 0.5 gram of concentrate in one immediate container at what time, or they could lower it to 0.2 of a gram per immediate use container. That's why the group figured it would give some negotiation to the actual applicant and the municipalities, letting them work out what is right for their community might be the breaking point of whether this is going to be sited or denied by the community.

Mr. Latulippe said the working group recommends the Commission should monitor and audit cash transactions through a tamperproof lockbox point of sale. This has to do with the fact that the Commission might be licensing smaller businesses to sell marijuana than would normally in any other state and we really need to prove to the federal government that we have this under control. By having a tamperproof lockbox point of sale in these facilities to monitor the cash transactions, we can sleep at night and he thinks the Department of Revenue would like to sleep at night knowing the taxes are being paid and we are controlling, monitoring all of these cash transactions. The next recommendation says the point of sale systems within these retailers should warn the onsite retail agent when a consumer is approaching their daily maximum exposure limitation. That could be just simply the budtender telling the consumer, "you are approaching your daily maximum exposure limit." He said if they are not showing signs of intoxication or were purchasing cannabis for their friends at the facility, the bud tender at that time could make the choice whether or not to keep serving the consumer.

Mr. Latulippe said the next slide has to do with how should these limits be monitored. Confidentiality is extremely important and the statute does not allow the state to collect any information but the age of the consumer. The group's recommendation is that onsite consumption retail agents should be trained in detecting impairment in consumers so that they can cut anyone off who is becoming visibly intoxicated, similar to how bar tenders manage

alcohol intoxication. In essence, beyond the maximum exposure limitation and serving size limits, then the agent has the ability to further limit them if they obviously are intoxicated.

Mr. Latulippe said the next issue was what routes of delivery/ types of consumption should be allowed on site. They recommended tiered licensing, similar to how alcohol is managed with wine and beer and hard liquors already for bar establishments. This tiered licensing type would include inhalation, ingestion, and dermal application, as well as one onsite retailer license that would encompass all types of onsite marijuana consumption. This should be done similar to how alcohol licenses are regulated with combinations of wine and beer or hard alcoholic liquors. There are so many businesses possible in terms of consumption of marijuana, they don't want to limit it to just inhalation, as for instance, in massage therapy, there are places that want to incorporate dermal application of marijuana product. If a variety of license types are delineated, municipalities have choice, so if a municipality was comfortable with dermal application, but not with inhalation, the license applicant could go for just the dermal and potentially get approved by the municipality. Obviously there will be municipalities that want to engage in all types of consumption as well.

Mr. Latulippe introduced the next issue: is smoking allowed, how do you protect employees from secondhand smoke? There are already a lot of smoke-free laws in Massachusetts. The recommendation is that the Commission should develop strong air quality, odor control, and filtration requirements for designated smoking areas within onsite consumption retailers. He would envision that would be filtration, carbon filters, there is a variety of ways.

He has seen it out in California where they have these lounges, that you really don't even see smoke in the air because the air is filtered so well. That is one way the Commission could prevent employees from being exposed to secondhand smoke. The working group also suggests the Commission should utilize any relevant language in 105 CMR 661.00: Regulations Implementing M.G.L. c. 270, § 22 as a guide when developing regulations to protect employees from secondhand smoke.

Mr. Latulippe said the next recommendation is that the Commission should prohibit employees from the handling of machinery or kitchen equipment within an onsite consumption space contained inside an onsite consumption retailer, essentially prohibiting employees who could be exposed to secondhand smoke. There is conflicting evidence that secondhand smoke can intoxicate individuals, so the group recommends playing it safe and preventing any employees from handling heavy machinery or kitchen equipment if they're going to be around any vapor whatsoever.

Mr. Latulippe said the next slide deals with what should municipalities' role be in governing social consumption. The working group recommends the municipalities' role is similar to how municipalities regulate any other establishment. The issue here is really broader municipal control could lead to bottlenecks, and municipalities regulating out the possibility of these businesses. Narrower municipal control risks inflaming municipalities against these businesses coming into their community, so the group thought by simplifying things and making it very similar to how they already regulate marijuana will really ensure a faster rollout. By

giving the municipalities by some sort of incentive to license them – some communities would rather have a dermal or yoga facility, as opposed to having a large package store.

Mr. Latulippe said the next recommendation is the Commission should develop guidance for municipalities on developing short term event permits for offsite consumption similar to an alcohol consumption permit given by a municipality. This was an issue raised by the Mass. Municipal Association and others. He wants to distinguish the difference between onsite consumption and offsite consumption. Offsite consumption would be weddings or events or things of that nature that would generally managed by a municipal authority in terms of a day-permit, versus onsite consumption that is some type of retail establishment that is able to sell marijuana to be consumed immediately by the consumer. They should be regulated differently to some extent and bring-your-own-cannabis events could potentially be considered offsite consumption.

Mr. Latulippe introduced the next slide and issue: what elements should be considered at the state level. He recommended that the Commission should develop a minimum threshold for a business to apply to become an onsite consumption marijuana retailer. The working group proposes that these businesses can apply to become an onsite consumption marijuana retailer in cases where at least 51% of the business will be marijuana sales. They also recommend the Commission provide a framework for special exceptions possible for clubs, hotels, restaurants and any other applicant the Commission feels is appropriate. The minimum threshold requirement in the tobacco regulations is the model. It basically says as long as 51% of your sales are marijuana-related, the Commission has enough incentive to license you to become a marijuana retailer. In some cases where there is a veteran's club or a hotel or restaurant where potentially 51% is a bit high for them in terms of marijuana sales, the Commission can basically have those exceptions so those facilities can also allow onsite consumption.

Mr. Latulippe moved on to the next recommendation from the working group: the Commission should develop parameters for a tamperproof lockbox point of sale system that carefully monitors all retail transactions and can only be audited by the Commission and other state agencies per Massachusetts General Laws. He said that goes into what has already been stated, which is the Commission really needs to track and control transactions, in particular cash transactions for smaller retailers that the banks might not be comfortable banking with. He wants to make sure there is a system that's secure, that's safe, to prevent intervention by federal authorities.

Mr. Latulippe said the working group also recommends the Commission should develop reusable packaging standards and cleaning standards for onsite usage. This is another innovation he believes that will help prevent children from getting access to small packages, and prevent environmental waste from having these small packages show up on the streets of municipalities, but it will really allow the glass community here in Massachusetts, which is very large, and other associated groups, participate in the industry in a big way by providing reusable packaging that can be used in these onsite facilities. The community already has a long history of using pipes and glass bongs and things of that nature, there is now dab rigs which are related to concentrates, and there is even inserts that they've developed, which inevitably looks like an immediate use container, so developing those reusable standards and cleaning standards really makes sense.

There's a wide range of reusable packaging that could be used in these facilities, and he doesn't want to limit it to just smoking, just ingestion, dermal. The reusable standard will transform things in many ways because they will not be leaving the facility. One of the concerns he heard from one of the advisory board members, Mary Ann Pesce, was that children get a hold of these small packages, but if the packaging is not allowed to ever leave the facility, it will never get in the hands of any children. He said even in terms of joints, they have glass filters they can put in, those glass filters will need to be returned before they leave the facility. Essentially those reusable packaging standards will resolve a lot of the concerns in terms of public health and safety.

Mr. Latulippe said the next recommendation is along the same lines: the Commission should develop Strong Air Quality and Ventilation Standards as well as employee protections based on tobacco bars and existing businesses requiring ventilation. We already have a whole host of air quality laws, so we should definitely make use of that when developing anything for these onsite facilities. The next recommendation is that the Commission should work with experts and other stakeholders to develop onsite consumption retail agent training standards to detect impairment. The working group recommended the Commission should develop law enforcement impairment standards for OUI and also require OUI warnings and educational materials within onsite consumption retailers. He believes there is a committee that's going to be working on this issue, and he would defer to them in terms of OUI, but they could recommend the sort of education and warning materials which he thinks is already in alcohol establishments.

Mr. Latulippe said the next issue is the minimum essential components of social consumption regulations that need to be addressed initially in order to have a functioning program. He said their recommendation goes through what has already been discussed, essentially retailer license categories and fees, the education of the staff, the Maximum Suggested Daily Exposure based on lab protocols, security, training to detect impairment, guidance for municipalities on what they can request of applicants and what they can prohibit, the serving sizes as well as per onsite use package requirements, point of sale system with revenue tracking, law enforcement and public safety guidance, and labeling menu. Reusable packages are not going to have labels on them potentially, so the group is suggesting instead that the labeling occurs on the menu before the consumer actually purchases it. That way they won't have to require extreme amount of labeling on such a small package. He added public health limitations and inspections – some of these places might have food served and things of that nature, so we need to incorporate inspections for public health. He said the group also recommends air quality and filtration standards, prohibition on some equipment that might be dangerous to the public safety such as blow torches. He said concentrates can be consumed using an electric nail, so blow torches are not necessarily essential. It is a crème brûlée-style torch and he thinks it might make most fire safety people jump out of their skin to know that people are using it, so some prohibition on equipment might be important. The group also recommends disposal/recycling requirements and inspections and providing guardrails for professionals and licensed businesses so they don't lose their license allowing onsite consumption.

Mr. Latulippe moved on to the next issue: what types of existing establishments and businesses should be considered for on-site facilities. He already went over this recommendation, which is

all cannabis used in these facilities should come from the regulated market, and it's not limited to adult use cultivators—also manufacturers, cooperatives, or medical marijuana treatment centers that are co-located. Essentially these onsite retailers could purchase their product from any variety or assortment of different cultivators or manufacturers. The next recommendation is that the Commission should require reusable containers for onsite consumption retailers to alleviate any environmental issues, children home access, and state to state drug trafficking concerns. It's important to note that the craft cooperative, which will often have less than 1,000 square feet of space, are going to need to charge the maximum amount of value for their product in order to thrive and expand their business, so by basically ensuring they can sell to these onsite consumption retailers, we will ensure they get a high price for their product.

Mr. Latulippe said the working group also recommends the Commission should keep financial barriers to entry low for obtaining one of these licenses and to ensure local level interest. He said there is a real problem trying to get small businesses and equity applicants feel included in this process. Keeping financial barriers low for small retail licenses will help out, and the group voted that the Commission should give priority retail licenses to applicants that are proposed for areas of the state heavily impacted by the drug war.

Mr. Latulippe said the final recommendation from the working group is the Commission should not require small gatherings of adults within onsite consumption retailers to acquire a special event license. He said the retailer is already managing state and local compliance so events under the maximum capacity of the retailer should not require special attention from the state. What the group is saying is since the retailer is already serving cannabis legally, and abiding by all local and state guidelines, that an event that takes place inside the facility should not really require any special treatment from the state or state license. It could be something as simple as a small networking gathering inside the cannabis bar, essentially at that level, the local compliance authorities, if anything, want to be involved, but the working group suggests, since everything is already being managed, as long as it's under the maximum capacity, it wouldn't necessarily be engaging something outside what the retailer would normally be doing, that those events do not necessarily require a special license. Commissioner Harding said that concludes the Industry Subcommittee's recommendations and they are included in the appendices that will be available online.

Chairman Hoffman thanked Commissioner Harding and asked the other Cannabis Control Commissioners if they had any questions for him or other subcommittee members. No Commissioners asked any questions. The Chairman noted the Cannabis Advisory Board is not disbanded once they've made their recommendations. They are going to come back and ask for more help, but they are grateful for their hard work and have a lot left to do based on their recommendations. Commissioner Harding said he had a great subcommittee with lots of thoughtful conversation. They didn't always agree, but in the end, they agreed on the recommendations. It was a great educational process for those that don't come from the industry.

Chairman Hoffman said the next subcommittee is Market Participation and introduced Shanel Lindsay to speak. Commissioner Title requested that the next subcommittee face the audience.

Ms. Lindsay introduced a few of the Market Participation subcommittee and noted their statutory mandate which revolves around ensuring participation in the industry, and that applies to women, people from various minority and marginalized groups, and veteran-owned businesses are mandated, also extending to providing recommendations on local agriculture and growing cooperatives. Ms. Lindsay chaired the subcommittee and introduced the members who served, including Ray Berry; Commissioner Lebeaux; Kim Napoli; Horace Small; Lydia Sisson; Tessa Murphy-Romboletti; Nichole Snow; Henry Thomas III; and Matt Allen.

Ms. Lindsay said the subcommittee spent a significant portion of their time on listening sessions, including sessions in Roxbury and Springfield. They felt it was incredibly important to listen to the constituents when it came to the issues about ensuring access. She made note that when they are going through the recommendations, that many of them are specifically tied to testimony they heard from people, regarding these certain issues of access and inclusion.

Ms. Lindsay went through the statutory mandates related to their recommendations. There is a broad mandate in the law that the Commission develop policies and procedures to promote and encourage full participation in the regulated marijuana industry by people from communities that have been disproportionately harmed by marijuana prohibition. When looking at the mandate for the subcommittee and minorities and marginalized groups, you can't look at cannabis prohibition and not look at marginalized groups like people of color and people from lower economic areas. She said when talking about "harmed by prohibition," we're talking about physical, geographic communities and we're also talking about segments of individuals, those who have been harmed by prohibition—whether being arrested or many other harms that stem from prohibition with regard to education, housing, opportunity, access, finances. She said there is also another provision that relates to tax revenue and programming, tax revenue being used for programming related to restorative justice, things like jail diversion, workforce development, technical assistance to enter this industry and mentoring services.

Ms. Lindsay noted prioritized review will be given to applicants for business licenses who demonstrate experience or business practices that promote economic empowerment in these communities disproportionately impacted by prohibition. She said there is a segment of the law that requires the Commission in instances where they determine evidence where there has been discrimination or barriers to entry, it requires the Commission to adopt diversity goals that ensure meaningful participation by these different businesses, including minority business enterprises, women business enterprises and veteran business enterprises. She said there is also specific statutory mandates ensuring that farmers and businesses of all sizes, are represented in the industry. That includes creating a schedule of craft cultivator licenses that ensure access across the industry.

Ms. Lindsay noted another portion of the statute that allows for the creation and issuance of different, additional classes of licenses, including limited licenses for cultivation, processing, manufacturing, possession, storage or other related activities that the Commission would deem fit. Ms. Lindsay introduced the subcommittee's recommendations, starting with the issue of harms of prohibition: how does the CCC achieve the statutory mandate of mitigating and correcting the disparate harms of prohibition? She said when the subcommittee looked at the issue, they were attacking different pieces and aspects of the statutory mandate and found at the

end of the day, many of the issues are overlapping and interwoven. She felt the fact that they were coming at these issues from different angles and different expertise, they were able to have a unanimous vote on all recommendations and they are submitting their recommendations as a package.

Ms. Lindsay said their first recommendation is the Commission should consider weaving this requirement to encourage full participation in every aspect of the licensing and employment process. When the subcommittee was at their listening sessions, one of the overarching themes was the continued harm that people are still encountering from prohibition and the fact that we have not seen any type of participation in the current medical system for people that have been harmed by prohibition. This recommendation really gets to the heart of us recommending the equity and being aware of correcting the harms that are occurring and have occurred to our neighbors and our community members, that that be really the lynchpin of the statute and the underlying recommendations that are coming from the statute.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation is specifically not to employ standards for licensure or employment that have been shown to exclude people from communities that have been harmed by prohibition. The subcommittee is talking about any type of automatic exclusion for arrests or convictions. She said they do have evidence that has prevented access. She said there is a provision right now on the medical side that prevents anybody with felonies from being involved in the industry, even working on the ancillary side of the businesses, or laboratories, which will now be regulated. The subcommittee is urging the Commission to stay away from that type of activity because they have seen that it is harmful to communities that have been previously harmed by prohibition. Their other recommendation is that the Commission should push the legislature to appropriate money based on the provision they talked about earlier, tax money being dedicated to programming for restorative justice, jail diversion. One of the things the subcommittee heard most often was that it's very clear the cannabis industry is going to be a very, very lucrative industry in Massachusetts. At the same time, the harms that have existed in communities are essentially festering sores that have not been addressed. It is important from the outset to get money appropriated to correcting this so we are not faced with hypocrisy that exists, when you continue to have people suffering while other people profit.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation is creation of a loan fund to assist affected individuals in starting and maintaining local cannabis businesses, again access to resources. The subcommittee sees this as an underlying data that comes out in Massachusetts about folks from different economic groups, different races, having different standards of wealth. One of the things we need to do when talking about any marginalized group is empower those folks, but also the financial backing to achieve and sustain a business. The next recommendation would be for the Commission to use tax exempt bonds to promote business growth and development. Another recommendation would be priority for community residents for those particular licenses that are located in those areas that have been disproportionately harmed, again, ensuring and fostering economic empowerment for those residents, by those residents, in order to improve those areas.

Ms. Lindsay said the subcommittee recommends a formation of a technical assistance

authority, or the support of current authorities. One theme the subcommittee had, whether talking about correcting harms from prohibition, or about women or veterans or any other marginalized group, there are already groups doing very good work on these issues in Massachusetts. There are things that are specific to cannabis and the Commission may need to provide guidance on that, but when it comes to technical assistance and support, the Subcommittee thought it was absolutely appropriate to support organizations that are already doing this work, and thought what was necessary was technical assistance and support to aspiring applicants related to things like application writing, business plans, all the basic formation and general business support that's needed to start and sustain a business.

Ms. Lindsay said the subcommittee also recommends providing incentives to licensees for hiring from communities that have been the subject of disproportionate impact or making sure that individuals are included by requiring or incentivizing business to do that. The subcommittee certainly thinks that providing a carrot to businesses is appropriate, as well as considering the requirements there.

Ms. Lindsay moved on to the next recommendation: creation of a community board. She said the Subcommittee heard this at listening sessions, and encountered this at their meetings. She is proud the subcommittee all individually met with a lot of different people, different business owners, different community members, when it came to all these different recommendations. They thought having a designated community board that could be a sounding board for all these issues and could have a consistent conversation, and keep that conversation going, with the Commission would be very helpful. They thought that neighborhood associations, elected officials, members of the government, the Commission should be encouraging public-private partnerships as well. The community boards would be designed to reach areas that the CCC wouldn't naturally or organically reach.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation mirrors the language from the statute, that the CCC should work with the supplier diversity office and any other relevant agencies to develop training programs, including recruitment of affected individuals to become licensed in marijuana related businesses; development of workforce training for affected individuals; to enter into marijuana related businesses; creation of employer training to attract affected individuals into the workforce; and outreach to groups focused on empowering affected individuals, including consultations with state agencies and providing education and training opportunities.

The next issue the Market Participation Subcommittee dealt with is how should the CCC prioritize review and licensing decisions for applicants for marijuana business licenses who demonstrate experience in or business practices that promote economic empowerment in communities disproportionately impacted by prohibition? Ms. Lindsay said to tackle this issue, they spent a lot of time looking at different equity programs around the nation. They also looked at the current landscape that exists with the businesses that would be also getting priority from the medical side, and looking at what kind of the landscape will look like beginning on July 1. She said understanding that we are behind the ball, when it comes to access and inclusion, and certainly when it comes to correcting the harms of prohibition, the Subcommittee's first recommendation was that their economic empowerment licenses should be granted on a 1:1 basis with other licenses.

The Subcommittee also recommended the economic empowerment license be on the same standing or have the same structure as other licenses. Ms. Lindsay said the idea has been floating around to have the licenses be different, that they should be required to be nonprofits, and the Subcommittee is steadfastly rejecting that separate but equal approach. She said there is a need for these businesses to be competitive, to be able to attract investment, and ensuring that they are on the same par as the other licenses is critical to that. Their other recommendation with regard to prioritization is that the Commission should consider the different standards for equity permits that have been implemented in Oakland, San Francisco and Los Angeles when crafting these. She said these cities have taken on this challenge and spent considerable resources crafting these systems. The Subcommittee urges the Commission to take best practices from these when looking at what will work for Massachusetts. For example, in Oakland the requirement is that an equity permit applicant and general permit applicant be tethered and go through that process together. The benefit for that is that what we've seen is that equity applicants who would absolutely never have been able to make it through that process have been provided with the resources that they needed in order to be successful. On the flip side, she said there was some concern about ensuring and maintaining independence of econ licenses and also abiding by the requirement that not more than one licensee can own or control more than three dispensaries. Ms. Lindsay says she is sure there are some very good segments there and what the Subcommittee liked from these different frameworks were not only the parameters and requirements they put in place for people to apply and qualify to be equity applicants, but that generally the systems were requiring general applicants to provide resources and support to equity applicants, so they urge the Commission to look at that and see how that could be accomplished here in Massachusetts.

Ms. Lindsay moved on to issues relating to women, minorities and veterans. The Subcommittee's first recommendation is that the committee should begin working immediately with the supplier diversity office to create standards for accreditation or registration of minorities. Ms. Lindsay clarified when the Subcommittee is talking about minorities, they are talking about a couple of different groups: people of color (POC), women, veterans, indigenous people, and other marginalized groups. They are urging the CCC to work with the supplier diversity office to create a standard of accreditation or registration that would identify these businesses. Not only would it be helpful in collecting data for the ongoing mandate that the CCC keep track and correct if they don't see full market participation, it would also be helpful when providing incentives or putting requirements on businesses to ensure their workforce is diverse.

Ms. Lindsay said the Subcommittee also recommends the CCC should develop or support a mentoring program in which experienced entrepreneurs are paired with vetted entrants. In that way, they can provide support, gain that valuable insight, because we know that in this industry, just like any other, information, access and support is essential to success.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation they have is similar to what they saw in the harms of prohibition section. The CCC should engage the legislature to develop a fund out of which qualifying businesses, who but for finances, would qualify or be able to pursue licensing, may receive funds for legally required business expenses (whether that's security, training, testing, etc.). She added there was a strong feeling from the group that the CCC should identify where these funds should come from, whether it be fees or taxes or some combination of the two.

Ms. Lindsay said the Subcommittee also recommends the CCC should develop a multilingual website that serves as a primary resource for minority-owned businesses. One thing we've seen happen over and over again is the lack of information. People who are having trouble accessing the market in a vulnerable position when it comes down to partners or who they're working with or being taken advantage of so the Subcommittee thinks it's very important for the Commission to develop a website that would serve as a resource for these businesses that would have information on not only the underlying law, but also all these additional benefits we're trying to provide: access to capital, grants, loans, anything that would help the business succeed there.

Ms. Lindsay added the Subcommittee thinks the Commission should consider a requirement that Marijuana Establishments assign a liaison to the local community Veteran's Agent as well as groups that assist other minority business owners or potential employees to assist in linking them to partners, to employment opportunities. The Subcommittee's next recommendation is for the CCC to work directly with veteran's support agencies and minority owned business-focused groups to post and alert of employment opportunities, Ms. Lindsay said. Also, to work with radio stations and other media outlets, although we have seen some resistance there, she thinks that underscores the need for this information to be pushed out by the Commission as much as possible.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation, which will seem familiar again, is the formation of a technical assistance authority, to assist aspiring applicants, and to provide incentives for licensees for hiring from minority groups. The Subcommittee recommends the term "minority" includes POC, indigenous people, women, veterans, and any other individual with a qualifying characteristic covered under Chapter 55 and "minority owner" means a licensee with at least 51% or more of ownership as a minority.

Ms. Lindsay introduced the recommendations on farmers on craft cooperatives. She said the main issue here is how does the CCC meet the mandate to promote and encourage full participation in the regulated marijuana industry by farmers and businesses of all sizes? She said the first recommendation is for the Commission to license craft cooperatives. They feel it will create broader economic participation, benefit to growers and farmers in the Cannabis industry and it will help small retailers be successful as well. Another recommendation is that the Commission should develop additional small business licenses for manufacturing, production, and onsite consumption, that is accessible to small business proprietors. Again, when the Subcommittee was having listening sessions, over and over, from so many very different types of individuals, with plans for many different types of businesses, the overarching concern that they heard was the lack of access for small business owners in the current system and a cry for a path to become legitimate under the new framework.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation was to develop a fee structure for cooperative licenses that's accessible to farmers and cooperative producers. The recommendations will look familiar from the previous committee, because they adopted the recommendation – that's the benefit of having some industry members on there, again not recreating the wheel in certain instances –the Subcommittee thought it was very important to have different tiers, and what they like the most was there are small tiers and they thought that not only should this concept of

tiering be applied to the cultivation side of things, but also this underlying point that fee structure should be commiserate with the size of the business and the underlying maintenance required by the state there, but really looking to foster and allow a pathway for small businesses.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation is that cooperatives, mirroring the industry side of the committee's recommendation, that cooperatives should be allowed to participate in any producer tier. There was an understanding that with many, many grow facilities or locations, or additional size may result in additional fees. They also recommended not to create additional barriers for full participation from farmers and small businesses. Ms. Lindsay said the thought here is that when we are looking at the current system for adult use, the way the system is structured naturally, because it is one where everything is vertically integrated, is that many of the regulations and the rules are with large scale production or transportation in mind. What they heard from small business owners is the barriers they were facing there should not be part of this new, non-vertically integrated system, especially if we want to ensure there is full access from small businesses, and one of those rules and regulations, as an example, surrounding delivery requirements. Right now, two people are required on every delivery, there are requirements of weighing, there are requirements of randomized routes, there are many different requirements that really, when those were being promulgated had in mind large scale transportation from a cultivation facility to a retail outlet. Considering the opportunities and advancements in technology, there is an opportunity to have electronic inventory and other things that can provide that same standard of security without providing hurdles or barriers for small businesses.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation is that where seed-to-sale tracking systems are required, that they be accessible to growers and cultivators of all sizes and that they not be prohibitively expensive. The Subcommittee also has come to learn of several innovative methods for doing seed-to-sale tracking that may be able to generate revenue from advertising and other things, and they urge the Commission to look at any alternatives that would provide additional funding to support some of these initiatives that are being suggested, but that would also provide open sourced or easy access for small businesses.

Ms. Lindsay said the Subcommittee's next recommendation is that co-ops should include either multiple growers on multiple sites, or multiple growers in one location. She thinks this recommendation flows right into the next one, which is they've been approached by potential cooperatives, and people that are interested in that space, and they found there are many different methodologies and structures that a co-op could take. They think it is important that the Commission create rules that allow for each of these structures to exist. They think it's important that the co-ops have the autonomy to choose what structure would work best for their members, including whether or not they want to provide ancillary services, or other things that would allow them to pool their resources and have that access. They think the market will play out with the best models so long as there are reasonable rules surrounding the cooperatives that come out from the Commission.

Ms. Lindsay said the Market Participation Subcommittee's last section deals with recommendations surrounding the mandate that businesses of all sizes be involved in the industry. The issue there is how does the CCC meet that statutory mandate of ensuring that businesses of all sizes having opportunity? The first recommendation mirrors both a

recommendation they shared earlier about ensuring full participation from women and veterans and minorities, because again those minority groups or marginalized groups, most often the only pathway forward for those groups is a small business, and so what the Subcommittee recommends here (referring to slide) mirrors the recommendation from the Industry Subcommittee that the Commission should issue onsite consumption and limited use licenses. Some of the examples that we saw from the testimony that we had were things like yoga studios, massage therapy studios, onsite consumption bars, wellness centers for every segment of the demographic—whether it be elderly patients, mothers, it runs the gamut—coffee shops and bistros, art galleries, all varieties of classes and the like. They made sure to say “including but not limited to,” the idea is to provide a pathway for these people, for small businesses, who desire a significant segment of their revenue to come from cannabis or cannabis-related activity.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation is the Commission should develop some minimum thresholds for a business to apply to become an onsite consumption or small business license. Some of the things they were discussing in their group were things like residency requirements. She said there was a lot of discussion about residency requirements and what form and shape that those could take. There was certainly some concern about not making a requirement too long, that it would not allow some great business people, and people that could give back to our community, to be involved. While they didn’t have a specific timeframe to give, what they thought was that the Commission should consider things like requiring a specific length of time, but also allowing people to qualify based on residency and potentially a couple of different categories, whether it was length of time over a specific period of time, for example in the equity system in Oakland the requirement is 5 of the last 10 years, or something similar to that. They also think that requiring a segment of the team to be local could do that, because they want to ensure that investment fund or influences coming from outside our state are also partnering with people locally, because again, they saw this being a major problem when looking at access of the current system, the current medical system that we have.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation is that the commission should provide exceptions for clubs, hotels, restaurants, again, this mirrors the Industry Subcommittee, they really want to provide a pathway for businesses and people who are part of the community that have established themselves as new business owners and so we don’t want to be excluding folks, so there should be some mechanism where the CCC should be able to provide some exceptions there, and the Subcommittee thinks it’s incredibly important that the Commission create social consumption or BYOC licenses with low barriers to entry, in addition to licenses that would allow people to use cannabis within the function of their business, like a massage therapist.

Ms. Lindsay said the next recommendation is that the CCC should not create additional barriers for full participation. Again, they’re talking the example of the delivery guidelines, but really looking through each provision that comes over to have that inquiry, is this going to frustrate the mandate of ensuring that small businesses are involved.

Ms. Lindsay said the last recommendation in this category is that being mindful that many municipalities still have a way to go in understanding how cannabis can be beneficial to them. She said certainly there are many groups working on the private side of things to provide that education, but in the meantime, there may be small business owners that are attempting to have

cannabis establishments in municipalities that have enacted some sort of ban. And what the Subcommittee would ask is that the Commission think carefully and try to create as many pathways as possible that wouldn't trigger that 20% restriction, and to consider that when thinking about how we can best ensure and promote business development from small business owners.

Ms. Lindsay thanked all the members of the Subcommittee for putting in this hard work, and taking the voice of the community and distilling that into some recommendations for the Commission. Chairman Hoffman asked if any Commissioners had any questions. Commissioner Doyle had a question in the section dealing with farmer-cooperatives, recommendation no. 2. She noticed that it recommends developing small business licenses for manufacturing, production and onsite consumption, but package store-type retailers was not there. She didn't know if that was an omission or intentional.

Ms. Lindsay said that wasn't intentional. The Subcommittee also believes that the traditional retail model should be extended to small businesses as well. She thinks the mind frame they were in was looking at what wasn't already in the queue. She also mentioned they have an appendix to submit as well. It's pretty voluminous but it's the different studies, permit programs and materials the various Subcommittee members have been submitting along the way.

The Chairman asked Ms. Lindsay to submit it to Mr. Collins and added that the presentation today will be posted. He asked if any Commissioners had further questions. They did not. The Chairman suggested the Commission take a break at 12:20 p.m. and reconvene at 1 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 1p.m. Chairman Hoffman said the next Subcommittee to speak would be Public Health, chaired by Jaime Lewis.

Ms. Lewis said the main focus of the group was to focus on the public health and safety and a few key issues – marketing and advertisement, potency, packaging, labeling – and they broke off into sub-work groups to tackle each of these areas. The members of the subcommittee included Michael Dundas, Horace Small, Nichole Snow, Michael LaTulippe, Associate Commissioner Lindsey Tucker, Dr. Alan Balsam, Dr. Sharon Levy and Chief John Carmichael. She said they had people coming from all different areas, doctors, patients, they had some really robust conversations during their meetings and met seven times.

Ms. Lewis said the recommendations have been divided into sub-topics they worked on. For issues related to packaging and labeling, most of the Subcommittee wanted consistent labels for both medical and adult use. With the first recommendation, she said they are recommending the Commission consistently produce a label that is both mirrored across medical and adult use, so to keep that label as similar as possible, because it would be very helpful for the consumers to understand the products that they're consuming and what these labels mean to them. Specifically, she said the Commission heard earlier from Ms. Lindsay's group, including requirements for a list of solvents and chemicals used during extraction process; define bright colors precisely, understanding it might be difficult for owner/operators to understand what defines bright colors that are prohibited to use; the CNB should work with the Department of Public Health to review testing variance process on THC testing of MIPs in other states,

particularly Colorado. Ms. Lewis wanted to highlight the per batch testing that's required or will be required in the state will be very costly especially for MIPs manufacturers, so in the state of Colorado they allow for a variance process, which means if you have the same SOPs and the same products going to market with the same cannabis, you go through a series of tests, through those series of tests, if you meet your mark on the THC per milligram, meaning you have to meet that 10 milligrams for the State of Colorado, you get signed off on this variance for one year and you're not required to test for the THC of those, and that can help owner/operators out, it can be very expensive almost \$450 per test. For small craft manufacturers, this is something they recommend the department look into. Also, marking or stamping edible products where practicable to indicate the edible product contains THC. The practicability of the marking and stamping is something the Commission should take into consideration in the sense that not all products can be marked or stamped. The state of Colorado set forth practicable and impracticable products that could or could not be marked, so chocolates obviously can be, liquids cannot be. It's not aimed to limit products that can't be marked or stamped, the intent is for those products that can be marked, for the safety of them being left out on the counters.

Ms. Lewis introduced issues related to potency. The Subcommittee recommends the Commission should work with Department of Public Health to determine whether there is a need for the limit on potency. There were recommendations brought by Dr. Sharon Levy in regards to limiting overall THC, both those recommendations we had on the floor for a vote did not pass, so the advisory group had not actually come up with a recommendation for a limit. She said they do think there should be some consideration and the Commission should look into what that limit would be. She said the group recommends the CCC consider inclusion of other cannabinoids for both labeling and testing of the products, so not just the THC, but the CBN, the THCA.

Ms. Lewis moved on to issues related to products. The Subcommittee recommended the Commission require all products be approved prior to coming to market. This was voted not unanimously by the working group, but it's something they are recommending that the department move forward with approving products before they come to market. She wanted to highlight that because that was a very robust conversation, the last bullet on the slide. She added when we think about maintaining the ability for patients to receive discounts, there was a lot of conversations and concern for the product availability for medical marijuana patients once recreational goes live. There have been conversations from other work groups that have come up to say 51% or X amount needs to be sold, their recommendation that they came up with is now that adult-use marijuana is available to adult consumers, but RMDs should supplement costs for discounts that should be provided to the patients at a lower cost. The recommendation would be to allow some sort of mandate for those that want to maintain their medical marijuana license, to keep watch out for making sure they adhere to what she refers to as the compassion program but it's actually the hardship program that has been set forth for the Department of Health. The working group couldn't come up with a definitive amount or to say you if you are a medical or recreational facility doing both uses that you would have to hold a specific amount of product. There has been a lot of concern brought up in their Subcommittee around the concerns for the product being available for the medical marijuana patients with recreational coming up.

Ms. Lewis said issues related to marketing and advertising was a very simple one. The recommendation was brought by Mr. Dundas, an owner/operator currently in the medical

marijuana program. She said that he asked and it was voted unanimously that the Commission adopt all the regulations currently in place for medical marijuana for their marketing and advertisement. She said it is very restrictive for what is being recommended or suggested for the recreational side as well. Key things they would like to see are to prohibit marijuana operators from use of medical symbols or claims around the medicinal values of their product in their marketing and advertising. Other things, too, are to require an analysis of marketing materials to ensure equity across communities with no unintended concentration of materials towards any certain community, with the goal of preventing or eliminating microtargeting. She said this is stuff they have seen done very similar in other communities around alcohol and tobacco.

Ms. Lewis moved on to related issues to public health around funding. The working group had one of their meetings scheduled with a few presenters to come in, a gentleman from the Department of Public Health, a toxicologist, Dr. Staci Gruber from MIND, and others came in as well and presented to them. She said there is a great need for research around cannabis right now currently across the industry nationally, as well as in the State of Massachusetts. They had a lot of conversations around funding. She is not going to dive into each recommendation on the slide in the sense that they are well thought out and are more specifically around marijuana use disorders as well as funding and research that can be done on the health effects of cannabis, both positive and negative health effects, and that funding to come from the Commission or she would suggest from the industry to fund it or however the funding would go forth.

Ms. Lewis moved on to the next recommendation related to clinician education and highlighted access to high-qualifying training programs so that they can develop expertise to adequately counsel their patients across the lifespan on the health effects of marijuana use. Doctors are very limited in what they can and cannot recommend in terms of cannabis still being federally illegal. Dr. Sharon Levy helped the group draft a recommendation from the clinician's education piece that's going to be very helpful in the State of Massachusetts.

Ms. Lewis highlighted related issues to poly drug use. This really centers around the social consumption piece. She said Mr. Latulippe worked very avidly on this as well as the other group he worked on with the industry piece. The recommendation is the Commission should develop an education campaign with the Department of Public Health designated for home users on the amplified effects of combining cannabis with other drugs, tobacco, and alcohol. She said this was a running theme, in the sense that even for social consumption facilities, they should not be allowed to sell alcohol or tobacco on site. And, then work with the Department of Health on the education piece so that consumers are aware that anything mixed with alcohol is a bad idea, but especially cannabis.

Ms. Lewis relayed the next recommendation: the Commission should work with the Department of Agricultural Resources and the Department of Public Health on developing laboratory testing and pesticide standards for outdoor greenhouses. She wanted to highlight this recommendation because it came up in an earlier discussion on the Industry group and there has been a lot of discussion in the groups she's been sitting on, around the pesticide protocols for what's in place currently under the medical marijuana side of it. They do think there should be some attention to what this means for outdoor and greenhouse cultivations, specifically because the microbials are very hard to pass at the state level right now with indoor manufacturers and it might be even a

little harder to pass for those on the outdoor greenhouse side. She said another related issue is co-located Marijuana Establishments must maintain sufficient inventory for sale to Registered Qualified Patients. She said that is another recommendation to be sensitive to the supply and demand for medical marijuana patients. The Subcommittee recommended the Commission should develop occupational standards and safety guidelines in coordination with the Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development for employees working with all types of marijuana establishments. She said this one will be exceptionally interesting, especially with the open consumption that we'll have, social consumption and what that means for workers in those facilities.

Ms. Lindsay said she was not going to read through each recommendation under related public health issues, social consumption because Mr. Latulippe did the work on this as well in the other group, but she highlighted the last bullet on the slide as being the most important one to the Public Health working group: the Commission should develop standards to protect employees from exposure to cannabis. There was a lot of concern around what it means, in terms of social consumption, what it means to employees being on site and working in those facilities.

Ms. Lindsay moved on to another recommendation: the Commission should work with the Department of Public Health to develop appropriate materials for within marijuana establishments where cannabis is consumed to detail the dangers of driving under the influence, penalties, designated drivers, as well as how to contact transportation services like cabs and ride-sharing services. She said that was the key piece was having ServeSafe and TIPS programs in place, for the RMD agents to go forward and be trained on how not to overserve someone, but that the same thing needs to fall on the other side for consumer education, so the consumers know you are not allowed to operate a vehicle after X amount of hours consuming a product. Also, she said the Commission has a heavy lift on trying to educate the consumers on how to educate consumers on the effects in terms of what an edible can do to you long-term as well as smoking. Smoking hits you much sooner, the edibles could take 45 minutes to an hour, or potentially an hour and a half before you feel the full effects of that, so what does that mean for driving pamphlets, in terms of what we need to tell consumers in regards to when they can be operating heavy machinery, equipment or driving vehicles.

Ms. Lewis said again, related to social consumption, the Commission should work with the Department of Public Health to develop appropriate materials where cannabis is consumed. She said she keeps highlighting this because although she's in favor of social consumption, it's never actually been done successfully. Denver was the first to pass a city ordinance to allow for open consumption, but really are inventing a new sort of industry here with the social consumption piece and highlighting what it means to make sure the consumers have places to safely consume the product, what overconsumption looks like, but also the distribution of that product and the effects that it has on the employees and the workers inside those facilities where that secondhand smoke is taking place.

Ms. Lewis said, again, on social consumption, the Commission should establish per transaction sales limits for marijuana, concentrates, edibles, and beverages so that the total does not exceed one ounce or its equivalent. This recommendation came up through a series of conversations in the work group in terms of what it meant for direct distribution of the product to the consumers

for open consumption versus what they can just purchase at any retail location. She said they're asking the Commission to look into, very similar to what they have in bars, in the sense that you can't get more than 2 shots at the same time in the state of Massachusetts, there is a limit on the overall shot consumption that you can have onsite. This needs to be taken into consideration for the limits on the direct sales for open consumption at these facilities in terms of what it means for over serving, specifically around that edibles piece because it does take a long length of time for that edible to effect people and it effects people differently.

Ms. Lewis reiterated there were a lot of recommendations mirroring the themes she has been talking about: the need for consistency with the packaging and the labeling, so consumers and patients understand unilaterally what they mean; things to take into consideration are the nutritional panels and the serving sizes and what those looks like; the funding for the research so we can in fact say what the potency limit would be for different people; there is a huge need for research and there was a heavy undertone in the work group around education and making sure accidental, unintentional ingestion of this product, making sure consumers now how and where to store their edibles out of the reach of children so there is no accidental ingestions, and then there is the intentional use of this product by those who are not legally allowed to use this product, so adolescents. There was a huge discussion around making sure there is enough research in place, that we get the materials out to those between the ages of 16-25, around what it means to use and consume cannabis, because during their working groups and all of what they sat through, they did have a constant thing going that it does affect your cognitive thought and that cognitive thought is being developed between the ages of 16-25, so all in terms of education around that should be geared towards that demographic. She said they did a lot of work and had a lot of discussions around education, consumer safety, and proper packaging and labeling, that all follows in line with that.

Chairman Hoffman asked if there was any appendix to the presentation. Ms. Lewis said she emailed the presentation and the voting, because they were not all unanimous. Chairman Hoffman asked if the Commissioners had any questions for Ms. Lewis. Commissioner Title said she heard a lot in the presentation about the concern that there is an adequate supply for patients. Other than requiring that dispensaries maintain their hardship or compassion program. She asked Ms. Lewis to talk about other options that might have been discussed on the committee even if they didn't ultimately pass.'

Ms. Lewis said there were conversations around limiting it, saying a certain percentage or poundage had to be available at all times for medical marijuana patients. She said the issue is the supply and demand. She would suggest the Commission does not limit a whole bag, licenses that are specifically focused on the cultivating and manufacturing of the products on the recreational side because that will help your supply issue out in the sense we are limited on the products we will have for the recreational side just because we are already limited on what we can have on the medical side, so those would be the first in line to go forward. The subcommittee couldn't come up with a set number. She doesn't know if it's a number, but if you do hold a medical marijuana license and a recreational license, you do have to have some available product available for those on that side. Mr. Latulippe said the number that was discussed was 35% because the current medical marijuana applicants can transfer up to 35% of their product to another dispensary in cases of crop failure. He said that was a number they felt was already seen.

He asked Commissioner Doyle for clarification. Commissioner Doyle said she doesn't think that number's right. Mr. Latulippe said well the Subcommittee liked 35 percent. Ms. Lewis said really the conversation came up that there is a concern. She said this is a conversation they couldn't get to a solution on. She believed they would turn it over to the Commission to say that this is an issue, but in her mind it's just an emerging industry. Dr. Balsam asked the Commission if the issue has popped up for the Commission. Chairman Hoffman said it's something the Commission has heard pretty much every public listening session. The Commission is not going to offer any suggestions right now but they are quite aware that it's an issue that needs to be addressed. Ms. Lewis said not limiting any licenses in the short run, it won't solve the issue for July.

Chairman Hoffman asked if the Commissioners had any other questions. They did not. Chairman Hoffman thanked the Subcommittee and said they gave them a lot of work and a lot of good thoughts to help them with the work. He reiterated just because the recommendations are over, it doesn't mean the Cannabis Advisory Board is disbanded. Ms. Lewis said that's good to hear because she was a little concerned about what the Commission is going to do with all the recommendations, and she is around to help.

Chairman Hoffman introduced Matt Allen to speak on behalf of the Public Safety and Community Mitigation Subcommittee. Mr. Allen introduced the part of the statute that relates to the Subcommittee's charge. He said they were relegated with looking at public safety and community mitigation, including recommendations on law enforcement, property, business and consumer issues. They chose to look at community mitigation as a whole, while property in their mind considered zoning, and they were also very concerned that with the implementation of medical marijuana, with concerns coming from the Mass. Municipal Association, that we really devote a lot of thought to mitigation, and put property under that subheading. Mr. Allen, as Chair of the Subcommittee, introduced the other members including Andrea Cabral, John Carmichael, Kenneth Halloran, Julie Jacobson, Michael Latulippe, Kim Napoli, Henry Thomas, and Tessa Murphy-Romboletti. He noted they had three folks with law enforcement background including Mr. Halloran who is with the State Police, Walpole Police Chief Carmichael, as well as Ms. Cabral, former sheriff and former Executive Office of Public Safety head. The Subcommittee met four times.

He said the font on the slides are small but the Subcommittee also turned in a document with the recommendations. They looked at general themes, then tried to narrow it down to specific recommendations. The general themes included that Massachusetts should become an example of best practices around the country. As heard from these other subcommittees, there is a lot of great thought that's gone into the regulations in the medical marijuana program specifically around security for dispensaries. He said there is a lot of questions coming from municipalities, looking for guidance, so they will get into that. Law enforcement as well needs guidance on how to enforce the law. They looked at enforcement. They talked a bit about the Cole Memo, the advisory that came out of the Obama Administration. They're not sure how long that will remain in effect, but certainly if it's rescinded, the principles therein offer a good roadmap for where enforcement should be concentrated for law enforcement, mainly preventing access by youth and diversion to other states, as opposed to going after lower level violations. And, as heard from

some of the other subcommittees, they are hopeful that the regulations do not create unnecessary burdens for people hoping to enter into the market, and of course, consumers need education.

Mr. Allen said when it comes to business, the first issue is to make sure there are procedures in place to prevent diversion. Again, they pointed to the medical marijuana security regulations. The reason they're including these, although they have already been drafted, to indicate to the Commission to say they put a lot of thought into this, in saying the medical marijuana regulations are strong, they're not trying to say they didn't put a lot of thought into them, but rather they don't have a lot of recommendations on this front because they're already pretty thorough in the medical marijuana program, including safeguard security measures (there has to be encryptions to make sure the keys are safe), rules on transportation, mandated reporting when there is diversion, employee ID cards, frankly he thinks most Commissioners and the audience here are familiar with these so he did not want to spend too much time on this. They are included as an appendix in their recommendations. He said adopt those security provisions and we're going to be in good shape.

Mr. Allen said the audience already heard a little bit about Colorado's Responsible Vendor Program or some equivalent, TIPS would be the equivalent in the alcohol industry, where servers are training on how to recognize inebriation and their responsibilities when serving customers. He said this goes back to theme of regulating marijuana like alcohol, they think the same procedures and trainings are appropriate for cannabis consumptions. He said they thought it would be helpful to have communication. This was a general theme that came up in community mitigation, business, and law enforcement, just that good communication between municipal authorities and business owners, and stakeholders at the community level, definitely makes for more productive relationships and can minimize any issues in the long-term so, it would be helpful if the cannabis establishments and the police departments establish a liaison designated to stay in touch with one another. He said the Commission is also going to need new regulations for outdoor cannabis cultivation since that's not addressed in medical marijuana. Again, going back to not having unnecessary barriers for entering into the market, this is something as well that came up during the market equity discussions, they realize those concerns as well as our subcommittee's, including not having excessive licensing fees, not having excessive requirements on how much capital should be on hand. He said it's important to note when the medical marijuana regulations were drafted, which required applicants have \$500,000 in capital, that was to make sure because these establishments would've been providing medicine that could be potentially lifesaving in some cases, that the state ensured that those who actually got applications had some guarantee that they'd be up and running. That should not really be an issue here with recreational use. Again, the Subcommittee is looking for assistance, especially for businesses that have lack of funds to meet security requirements is their sole barrier to entry. They think alternative safeguards might be appropriate as well, alternative security safeguards. You can imagine those medical marijuana regulations, they're looking at an industrial sized grow. If you're growing thousands of pounds of marijuana there is going to be more of a need for cameras and security guards, and those kinds of safeguards, whereas if you're a yoga studio that has an ounce on hand, you don't need as much security. He asked the Commission to keep that in mind even as they look at the medical marijuana regulations.

Mr. Allen said another business recommendation was something the Commission already heard about in the first portion of the presentation, which was allowing ancillary businesses to receive accreditation from the CCC. He said that is not up on his current slide but the Industry group talked about the Commission playing a role in preventing some predatory services from taking advantage of consumers or new business owners.

Moving to law enforcement, Mr. Allen said there is a need for education. They want to make sure that law enforcement agents understand their responsibility under the new law. Again, going back to the laws to regulate marijuana like alcohol, they think it's appropriate that there is an enforcement wing under the CCC, or outside of the CCC, that's similar to what Colorado did. He said it could be someone at the Alcoholic Beverages Control Commission.

Mr. Allen said municipalities and law enforcement are interested in, going back to how we enforce alcohol laws, there is compliance checks. There is shoulder taps. There is agents who can go in and make sure folks are being checked, their IDs are being checked, so something similar here would be appropriate. And, place of last consumption reports, similar to what's done with alcohol, if there is a bar where people are continually being overserved, when someone is prosecuted for OUI, they can be asked where they got their last drink. That gives law enforcement the ability to go back and make sure that establishment is following the rules about not overserving, and part of that goes back to something the Subcommittee discussed, there should be a progressive penalty structure, so we're not looking, we have to understand that these are businesses similar to alcohol establishments, want to have a positive impact on the community while offering services that consumers need. *[Inaudible]* If there is one of those place of last consumption reports, that doesn't mean the establishment should be shut down. That means progressive penalty structure, for instance if someone is overserved with alcohol, could be the servers need to be retrained through the TIPS program, so that could be similar with cannabis establishments. So, if someone is served and there ID is not checked or there is some diversion, retraining and lower level penalties should be the first form of enforcement.

Mr. Allen said the Subcommittee talked about data collection. They want to find out what the impact of the law is, or the impact of consumption is, if there is an increase in consumption, so we can't really do that without data. They also want to make sure that as the law is implemented, we don't see the continuation of disparities in enforcement and we can't do that without collecting data on arrests or prosecutions and use. It would be really great if the CCC took a lead on asking local law enforcement agencies and the Executive Office of Public Safety to collect that data. Some other issues they addressed in discussions were a regulation that employees cannot hinder Cannabis Control Commission agents when they're visiting some of these establishments to look at compliance; penalties for OUI should be posted like they are in bars so consumers are aware of those penalties; coming up with list of acceptable IDs, similar to IDs that alcohol establishments use to establishment that somebody is of age; don't sell to intoxicated people; and they have a draft regulation they didn't approve because they didn't come up with final language at their last meeting, but they will share it with Mr. Collins. It was suggested by some law enforcement stakeholders that a working group of law enforcement be put together to continue advising the process. That being said, the rest of their recommendations were unanimously approved.

Mr. Allen said community mitigation is where they had a lot of questions. Mass. Municipal Association asked for clarity on many issues. Two of them are on the slide; they're looking for language, for example zoning language, that could be used on local ballot initiatives. He thinks what municipalities want to avoid is unnecessary court cases. He doesn't know to what extent the CCC has the ability to advise municipalities, but certainly turning to the Attorney General and seeing if the AG would be willing to weigh in, he thinks with medical marijuana they saw some hesitance on the part of state agencies to give opinions that might not hold up in court so certainly that's an issue, but any assistance the Commission can provide a municipality would definitely be appreciated. There was also some need for clarification because some of the municipalities may have gone through the process to ban some establishments before learning there were many other kinds of businesses that have store fronts. There could be edible producers, there could be growers that don't sell, and so they may want to go back and revisit that and really no idea how to do that, would like guidance on that front. Mr. Allen said they also have very clear marching orders when it comes to alcohol about what the local rule is in approving licenses or inspecting establishments. They would like the same clarity when it comes to cannabis. And, we would be the Cannabis Advisory Board, so these are boards that don't have any regulatory authority, but really a clearinghouse where local authorities and business owners and other stakeholders can basically communicate and offer advice to the municipality. He cited a couple other questions: can temporary moratoriums – if a municipality passed a moratorium but they haven't yet drafted the bylaw, does that moratorium still apply? Can temporary moratoriums allow them to reject applications in June 2018? Mr. Allen believed Mass. Municipal Association submitted these questions in writing. Chairman Hoffman said the Commission is aware.

Mr. Allen said what the Subcommittee heard from the Mass. Municipal Association is a lot of support for trying to get new businesses off the ground. They emphasized the request for clarity was not an effort to increase moratoriums or bans, but really them wanting to do their jobs without worrying about those lawsuits down the line. Mr. Allen said one thing that came up was the signoff letter or mechanism. The language that was initially used in their discussions was the Mass. Municipal Association asking for the inclusion of letter of opposition or non-opposition of support. They talked about how that might not be appropriate because with medical marijuana those letters of opposition or non-opposition became a way to ban dispensaries even though they were not intended as such in the application process. With this new law, there are mechanisms in place if municipalities wish to ban establishments, so we don't want to add another layer that could result in a ban, so we took that language around letters of opposition or non-opposition and changed that to a sign-off mechanism. What that means is we just want communication between the establishments and the municipal authority, so if the cannabis business is going to locate in the municipality, there should be a mechanism to show they actually notified the authorities. Mr. Allen said he already went over the next recommendation on the slide.

Mr. Allen touched on looking for local authority. He said again, the Boards of Health this is a little different than alcohol if there are edibles producers, Boards of Health would have some local regulation when it comes to restaurants or other producers of food, so that might apply to edible cannabis producers. He said there is a lot of examples when it comes to tobacco and alcohol retailers for best practices – everything from environmental impact to training of personnel, engagement with public health authorities. He said they put much more detail in their

full document of regulations. He moved on to more community mitigation. He said the Subcommittee spent a lot of time talking about the host community mitigation payments as well. He said the law says it could be up to 3%. Chairman Hoffman clarified for five years.

Mr. Allen agreed. He said that much is defined in the law, but going back to the implementation of medical marijuana, there was a sense that the dispensaries were not really in a fair bargaining position when trying to negotiate these mitigation agreements with host communities because they really had a need to secure approval to locate in that community. It became almost a political issue because for these business owners to push back and try to connect mitigation payments and mitigation measures to real costs, a lot of them were afraid to have those discussions because they didn't want to basically tick off the local authorities, and that may have placed undue burdens on local dispensaries, so mitigation is important. He said we've seen across the nation that when dispensaries or marijuana establishments have good relationships with local municipal authorities, when there is good communication, when community stakeholders are able to voice their concerns before the establishment is sited, when there is a process for them expressing their ongoing concerns, the businesses are generally able to address these concerns and develop a productive relationship in those about unintended consequences do go away in the long term, so positive relationships on the community level are important. The need for community mitigation discussions should be taken seriously, but at the same time, any guidance the CCC can offer about what constitutes reasonable mitigation I think would be helpful to small businesses who in the past have felt they didn't have a lot of leverage to have a discussion about what the real consequences to the host community will be. Mr. Allen said another question that came up from municipalities was looking for language on one-day licenses for festivals, farmers markets, and that's already come up. They don't really know what to do.

Finally, Mr. Allen said the Subcommittee looked at consumers and talked about the need for educating consumers but they have less recommendations. One of the overarching themes is that for the system to be successful and the illicit market to be undermined, there have to be products that consumers want available at the establishments. That was taken up by some of these other subcommittees. What they're concerned about is mainly education. When it comes to OUI, they talked about that a lot. It's an important issue but not one that's not necessarily appropriate for our Subcommittee to delve too deeply into because there is another commission established specifically to look at OUI. That being said, public education on the dangers of OUI, how to avoid it, dosages, we heard this from the Public Health committee, the difference between consuming edibles and smoking marijuana, how to comply with the law, all of that kind of education is going to be helpful to avoid negative consequences, unnecessary prosecutions. He said that could be achieved through, on the web, also thoughtful placement of education materials at the point of sale, and finally they thought consumers should have a channel to report issues, and municipalities should as well – whether there is a product that seems unsafe or some other kind of safety issue in the establishment, or concern an abutter has about noise around the dispensary, people loitering, underage sales – there should be avenues for consumers and the general public to report those concerns to the Commission so they can be addressed.

Mr. Hoffman commented on the picture of the group at the end of their slide. Mr. Allen said that was their final meeting right here at this table. He thanked the other members for their participation. He said the group had a lot of productive discussions and a lot of patience with the

difficulties in scheduling their meetings sometimes. He said he appreciated all their contributions and emphasized the process, hearing everyone's voice is very important, if any individuals or organizations represented differ or have disagreements with the final recommendations to submit that information to the Commission. However, he said, by and large, they were pretty much unanimous.

Chairman Hoffman asked the Commissioners if they had any questions. They did not. Chairman Hoffman thanked Mr. Allen and the Subcommittee for their hard work. He said the Commission has what they need to parse their list of issues to discuss next week.

Chairman Hoffman said at that point there is no new business he was not aware of at the time the agenda was posted. The Commission's next meeting will be Monday, December 11, 2017 at 10:30 a.m. in the public meeting space in the Mass. Gaming Commission offices at 101 Federal Street. They will have a posting of this by Thursday, but he will not commit to having a specific agenda posted about what topics they're going to cover. They will discuss the regulations Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday until they are done. He adjourned the meeting at 1:50 p.m.