



COLORADO
Department of Revenue

Specialized Business Group—
 Liquor & Tobacco

Physical Address: 1707 Cole Boulevard, Suite 300 Lakewood, CO 80401
 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 17087 Denver, CO 80217-0087
 Fax: 303-866-2428

Liquor Advisory Group
 Meeting Minutes
 April 6, 2023

Seat	Representative	Attendance
State Licensing Authority	Executive Director Mark Ferrandino <i>Department of Revenue</i>	Present
Arts Licensee	Andryn Arithson <i>Newman Center for the Performing Arts</i>	Present
Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police	Chief Dave Hayes <i>Town of Estes Park Police Department</i>	Present
Colorado Counties, Inc.	Vacant	
Colorado Municipal Clerks Association	Colleen Norton <i>Littleton Municipal Clerk's Office</i>	Present
Colorado Municipal League	Tara Olson <i>Town of Breckenridge Clerk's Office</i>	Present
Colorado State Patrol	Captain Joseph Dirnberger <i>Colorado State Patrol</i>	Present
County Sheriffs of Colorado	Division Chief Todd Reeves <i>Jefferson County Sheriff's Department</i>	Present
Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce	Loren Furman <i>Colorado Chamber of Commerce</i>	Present
Hard Cider Industry	Eric Foster <i>Colorado Cider Guild</i>	Absent
Brewery (Large)	Bob Hunt <i>Molson Coors</i>	Present
Local Brewery (Small)	Karen Hertz <i>Holiday Brewing</i>	Present
Law Enforcement Representative	Chief W.J. Haskins <i>Glendale Police Department</i>	Present
MADD	Executive Director Fran Lanzer <i>Mothers Against Drunk Driving</i>	Present

Seat	Representative	Attendance
Off-Premises Retailer (Large)	Kris Staaf <i>Albertsons Safeway</i>	Present
Off-Premises Retailer (Large)	Sara Siedsma <i>Kum & Go</i>	Absent
Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)	Jim Shpall <i>Applejack Wine & Spirits</i>	Present
Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)	Edward Cooper <i>Total Wine & More</i>	Present
Off-Premises Retailer (Small)	F. Seyoum Tesfaye <i>Franktown Liquors</i>	Present by Proxy Chris Fine <i>Colorado Licensed Beverage Association</i>
Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer	Gonzalo Mirich <i>Jimbo's Liquor</i>	Absent
Minority Owned On-Premises retailer	Veronica Ramos <i>The Electric Cure</i>	Present
Local Spirituous Manufacturer	Stephen Gould <i>Colorado Distillers Guild</i>	Present
National Spirituous Manufacturer	Joseph Durso <i>Pernod Ricard USA</i>	Present
Restaurant Licensee	Dana Faulk Query <i>Big Red F Restaurant Group</i>	Present
Restaurant Licensee	Sarah Morgan <i>Martinis Bistro</i>	Present
Restaurant Licensee	Andrew Palmquist <i>Number Thirty Eight</i>	Present
Tavern	Erika Zierke <i>Englewood Grand</i>	Present
Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue	Andrew Feinstein <i>Tracks Denver, ReelWorks Denver, & RiNo Art District</i>	Present by Proxy Kevin Preblud <i>EXDO Group Companies</i>
Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue	Don Strasburg <i>AEG Presents</i>	Present
Local Vinous Manufacturer	Juliann Adams <i>Vines 79 Wine Barn</i>	Present

Seat	Representative	Attendance
National Vinous Manufacturer	Anne Huffsmith <i>Nakedwines.com, Inc.</i>	Present
Wholesaler (Malt)	Yetta Vorobik <i>Crooked Stave Artisan Distribution</i>	Present
Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituuous)	Fuad Jezzini <i>Maverick Wine Company of Colorado</i>	Present
National Wholesaler	Andrew Quarm <i>Republic National Distributing</i>	Present

- I. Opening Remarks, Attendance, and Agenda Review
- II. Adoption of Meeting Minutes
 - A. Adoption of [Minutes from March 2, 2023 Meeting](#)
 1. No amendments.
 2. Motion to adopt by Colleen Norton, seconded by Joe Durso.
 3. No objection to approving the minutes.
 4. Minutes are adopted.
- III. Overview of LAG Large Group Meeting and Work Group Reports
 - A. Each of the work groups has met, and the groups respectively put a lot of thought into the issues that were previously identified by the LAG as topics of discussion for the work groups. Today, each of the work groups will report on the discussions they had in those first meetings. Feedback is invited from the other LAG members.
 - B. The facilitators will use the definition of “consensus” from the [LAG Charter](#); it is defined as general agreement that’s shared by all the people in the group on an optional idea or recommendation, that all participants can support or abide by it at a minimum, and to which they do not object. In other words, “consensus” is a recommendation or idea that everyone can live with.
 1. Votes will be taken by roll call around the room - any notes on why someone objects will be taken and included in the final report.
 2. The facilitators clarified that options for voting are yes (falling under level 1-3 in the LAG Charter) or no. An abstention or otherwise not taking a position on a proposal/topic will fall under yes - can abide by.
 - C. Group members asked whether all proposals (regardless of level of consensus) will be included in the report. LED clarified that everything will go into the report so it is fully clear what all was discussed, topics of discussion and objections will be recorded.
- IV. Regulation of Retail Operations Work Group Report
 - A. Review subgroup discussion from March meeting
 1. [Regulation of Retail Operations Subgroup Minutes - March 16, 2023](#)
 2. Additional input from LAG members
 - a) It was noted that there was additional discussion about increasing the \$2,000 purchase limit for on-premises retailers from an off-premises retailer from \$2,000 to \$5,000, though no formal proposal was made.

3. Minutes unanimously approved.
- B. Proposal 1: Remove Mandatory Christmas Day Closure from Statute
 1. [Subgroup Proposed Topics for Voting by LAG](#) - As presented on April 6, 2023
 2. Additional input from LAG members
 - a) It was questioned why this came up as a topic to be addressed by the LAG. LED explained that they have received multiple complaints from retail liquor stores, especially when retailers sell on Christmas day and receive an administrative action. It was noted it will still be a matter of business choice whether to shut down that day or to remain open.
 - b) Subgroup members noted this was an item of easy agreement and other retailers such as restaurants were not prohibited from being open on Christmas.
 - c) It was also noted that retailers may also wish to celebrate other religious holidays and having a state-mandated closure on one specific holiday is odd.
 - d) It was clarified that the proposal as presented to the General Assembly would include the context of the conversations around a topic, the existing statute, why the group decided to modify the language in a certain way, and then a recording of the vote taken by the LAG.
 3. Vote: Proposal PASSED
- C. Proposal 2: New Statute to Allow Off-Premises Retailers to Offer Educational Classes
 1. [Subgroup Proposed Topics for Voting by LAG](#) - As presented on April 6, 2023
 2. Additional input from LAG members
 - a) Suggestion was made to require a licensee to retain records of the tracking system discussed in the proposal for somewhere between 30-90 days to allow for inspection as needed for public safety purposes.
 - (1) Clarification was made that the tracking was intended to track the number of samples someone was consuming at an educational class to prevent overservice. Retention requirements could be overly burdensome for retailers. LED clarified that other laws applying to serving someone visibly intoxicated would still apply to educational classes.
 - (a) Suggestion made to strike “public safety priority” and include text reading “prohibit educational class members from participating in any tasting events on the licensed premises to limit possible overconsumption”
 - b) It was noted that the subgroup discussed prohibiting a retailer from charging per drink, though allowing a fee for the overall class and the educational content provided.
 - c) Suggestion was made to add a requirement that the instructor or presenter of an educational class have taken responsible vendor training.
 - (1) It was noted that if an expert were to come in to provide a class, they might not necessarily be responsible vendor trained (ex. an expert from France on french wines).

- (2) Suggestion was modified to instead read that the retail licensed establishment will be responsible vendor trained/certified, not the educator.
 - d) Suggestion was made to remove the word “nominal” in front of a fee, as it was a very subjective standard.
 - (1) Word was removed from proposal.
 - e) Concern was raised over which licensees are able to pay for the beverages offered during an educational class. It was noted that there is currently a statutory requirement that all costs associated with a tasting must be paid for by the retailer offering the tasting.
 - (1) LED asked if this language could potentially be addressed in rulemaking. Members expressed openness to this approach.
 - (2) It was noted that the ability for an instructor to bring their own alcohol for tasting outside of the three tier system would be helpful.
 - (a) Concerns were raised about outside alcohol coming onto a licensed premise. There would need to be tracking in order to prove there are no issues of undue influence.
 - (b) Additional concerns were raised about an instructor leaving unaccounted for alcohol on the licensed premises after the educational class.
 - (c) It was noted that this could be a separate issue and is already being addressed in the Marketplace Structure subgroup.
 - f) Tasting limits or serving sizes were contemplated. Public safety concerns were raised around individuals consuming samples for 60-90 minutes and then potentially driving away. There was disagreement over how this would be any different from a patron consuming several drinks at a restaurant and then driving away.
 - 3. The LAG decided to send this proposal back to the Retail Operations subgroup for additional amendments in line with the full LAG discussion.
- D. Proposal 3: Soft Close for Last Call
- 1. [Subgroup Proposed Topics for Voting by LAG](#) - As presented on April 6, 2023
 - 2. Additional input from LAG members
 - a) LED commented that issues surrounding serving sizes at last call might be better addressed in rulemaking to give industry and the Division greater flexibility to implement additional restrictions as the need arises through the rulemaking process.
 - (1) Concerns were raised that this flexibility could lead to a rapidly changing landscape for licensees. Addressing these issues in statute would be more stable.
 - b) Concerns were raised over what time a potential drink limit would go into effect and associated operational challenges for licensees trying to enforce such a requirement. It was noted that due to these operational

- challenges, the Retail Operations subgroup came to a consensus that they did not want to address container or drink sizes.
- c) Several changes to proposal language were suggested.
 - (1) Amending language to make it clear that alcohol service must be completed by 2am, though an establishment may stay open and patrons can consume beverages until 4am.
 - (2) Adding additional language allowing local licensing authorities to give businesses the option to stay open until 4am (opt-in for local authorities).
 - d) Law enforcement representatives expressed concerns around staffing. Overnight shifts are scheduled around bar closing time and moving that closing time would affect call load throughout the day. This proposal could have a significant fiscal impact, for example, if staffing needs to be increased to have DUI enforcement out for longer.
 - (1) It was noted that the “soft close” was designed to prevent a flood of people leaving after a 2 am traditional last call and instead allowing slower dispersal. There was disagreement regarding whether extending the close would actually have that effect or any impact on impaired driving.
 - (2) It was also noted that it would be challenging to manage drunk driving with local control only. There needs to be some ability for coordination of law enforcement efforts to keep roads and communities safe.
 - (3) There was disagreement between law enforcement representatives around the benefits of this proposal. There was disagreement on whether it would serve to mitigate drunk driving and/or also reduce disturbances and/or fighting that may come with asking drunk patrons to exit right at 2am.
 - e) It was noted that most other states across the country have a hard close of 2am or earlier. It was further clarified that these times may represent the latest time period alcohol may be served and not necessarily the time a licensee must close and have people off the premises.
 - f) Concerns were raised over the lack of incentive for a business to stay open without alcohol sales and whether the proposal will achieve the stated public safety goals. It was clarified this proposal was not meant to incentivize businesses to stay open longer, but to provide another avenue for businesses if they so choose.
 - g) Concerns were raised over the ambiguity in the use of the phrase “last call”.
 - h) There was discussion over whether patrons should be allowed back into a licensed establishment after exiting after alcohol service is closed. If an establishment chooses to stay open past 2am, allowing additional patrons in for food service is another way to make staying open feasible for a business.

3. Proposal 3 - Updated Language
 - a) Amended language was proposed to the group in response to concerns raised during discussion (amended language in red):
 - (1) Amend the existing statutory language under 44-3-901(6)(b)(I), C.R.S., to give businesses the ability to be open until four a.m. with last call ~~completed beginning at or by~~ **around** two a.m. At the time of last call, consumers would be allowed to place one final drink order and then finish their drink inside the establishment until closing no later than four a.m.
 - (2) **Add subsection (II) the on premises licensee may remain open between the hours of 2 a.m. and 4 a.m. on any day of the week.**
 - (3) **(III) Between the hours of 2 a.m. and 4 a.m., customers may continue to consume an alcohol beverage purchased prior to 2 a.m. on the licensed premises.**
 - (4) Statutory language would prohibit businesses to sell or provide alcohol after 2:00 a.m.
 - (5) Additional statutory language will provide the Liquor and Tobacco Enforcement Division with rulemaking authority.
 - (6) **Statutory language would allow discretion to municipalities to require on-premise licensees to close prior to four a.m.**
 - b) A motion was made to refer this proposal back to the Retail Operations subgroup, due to the significant number of edits.
4. Vote #1 - Refer Proposal #3, as amended, back to subgroup for additional revision - Vote FAILED
5. Vote #2 - Proposal #3, as amended - Vote PASSED

V. Licensing Subgroup Report and Topic Discussion

A. Review subgroup discussion from March meeting

1. [Licensing Subgroup Minutes - March 23, 2023](#)
 - a) Minutes unanimously approved.
2. Additional input from LAG members
 - a) There was a question about fees and whether the Licensing subgroup had put any thought into consolidating fees in addition to license types. Subgroup members expressed that conversation is likely to come later, once the subgroup lands on any centralized license types or associated add-ons.

B. Topic Discussion: consolidation of on-premises license types

1. Facilitators asked if consolidation by use of premises or business purpose is a good approach. No objections were expressed.

VI. Marketplace Structure Subgroup Report and Topic Discussion

A. Review subgroup discussion from March meeting

1. [Marketplace Structure Subgroup Minutes - March 16, 2023](#)
2. Additional input from LAG members
 - a) It was suggested that, at a minimum, a courier license should be put in place for common carriers delivering alcohol beverages direct to

consumers. The responsible party under current law would be the shipper (an out of state winery, for example) and it was argued that making the courier the responsible party would address many of the public safety concerns around underage delivery or delivery to intoxicated individuals.

3. There was discussion amongst the group regarding how to move forward with the topic of direct to consumer shipping.
 - a) A proposal was made that the LAG vote on whether the direct to consumer shipping conversation should continue or the Marketplace Structure subgroup should move on to other topics.
 - (1) If the group votes to move on, perhaps a specific group could do a study to look at DTC in other states, articulate pros and cons, and survey Colorado consumers to see where public support is to determine legislative viability.
 - b) Another option would be to suggest a three-year pilot program allowing direct to consumer shipping for beer and spirits to determine impacts on public safety, tax revenue, etc.
 - c) A proposal was made that the Marketplace Structure subgroup continue having the direct to consumer shipping conversation but focus on details that would make a potential proposal acceptable for more parties, such as quantity limits.
 - d) It was suggested that the discussion around DTC shipping be tabled for the time being, with the understanding that the discussion could be revisited as time permits later in the LAG process.
 - (1) Proponents of DTC shipping can continue to have conversations with interested parties (within the confines of open meetings requirements) in order to bring a proposal back to the LAG at that later date.
 - (2) The final LAG report will include the DTC conversation (including pros and cons, points of concern, etc) even if no formal proposal is recommended by the LAG.

B. Review of Proposal #4 - Wholesaler Trade Shows and Vote

1. Discussion and voting on proposal #4 was tabled until the May LAG meeting due to time constraints.

VII. Public Comment

- A. Ainsley, DISCUS: We do have some studies that we commissioned on consumer interest in this [direct to consumer shipping] issue. 80% of consumers nationally believe that spirits should be able to be shipped directly from distillers to their homes. As a consumer, if I can go downstairs and purchase a product from the liquor store near my home, I'm not going to spend the time or wait 5-7 business days to ship something to my house. It wouldn't make sense for me to do that. It really is an effort to grow the pie because, for example, I travel a lot to different distilleries in different states. I was just in Illinois and tasted a lot of great products that I could not get home. I know that happens in Colorado too, my friends come to visit and I take them to all these great distilleries but they can't take those bottles home. If my friend is able to go home and say "actually, I had this

really great Colorado product, can you carry it in your store?" it builds the retailer, wholesaler and distiller revenue stream and that is really the end goal.

- B. Molly Steinemann, CML: I want to express my appreciation for the language that was added to allow municipalities to have some say over extended hours. I would encourage this group to consider an opt-in proposal for municipalities rather than an opt out. That way, if our municipalities determine there's enough public appetite and law enforcement resources available, they can move to opt into the extended hours rather than having that be the statewide approach and asking municipalities to walk it back.
- C. Chris Fine, Colorado Licensed Beverage Association (Proxy for F. Seyoum Tesfaye at 4/6/23 meeting): I have a hard time understanding why direct to consumer shipping is even an issue being discussed. When the Liquor Advisory Group was convened, there was a clear understanding that anything that was addressed in the November 2022 ballot initiatives would not be discussed. That would include nothing as it relates to increase in licenses, nothing as it relates to the rollout of wine in grocery stores, and nothing as it relates to third party delivery. It was mentioned that it is a stretch to equate direct to consumer shipping to third party delivery, but if you were to ask John Q Public they would think it is the exact same thing. It is still a third party that is taking alcohol from a responsible, liable, person to a member of the public. They don't care if it's FedEx, UPS, Instacart, whomever, it is a third party. Third party delivery, which is essentially what direct to consumer shipping is, was voted down in 56 out of the 64 counties last fall. What legislator is going to pick this up and say this makes sense when the public is not only not asking for it but voting against it? Part of the LAG is to clean up alcohol rules around the state, but 2.4 million people already cleaned up this issue last fall.
- D. Shawnee Adelson, Colorado Brewers Guild: There is a recent report that we'll be submitting from SOVOS that shows there is a demand for direct to consumer shipping specifically for beer, though I can't speak for spirits. The other thing I would say from our members is many of our breweries come to us and ask why someone can get a nice bottle of wine shipped to their door when they can't get a nice bottle of beer. We're just trying to ask for a common sense answer. Joe hit the nail on the head talking about products that aren't already distributed. Not all retailers can carry every product and there are some high end specialty items for which direct to consumer shipping would be useful. Shipping beer will be prohibitively expensive. If you're just wanting a six pack or a case of beer, people aren't going to be wanting to do that. But there are some items that people may want to ship that are high end, exclusive items. We would support the proposal for doing a three-year study, I think that's a pragmatic approach to address some of the public safety concerns that have been brought up.

VIII. Action Items

- A. Next meeting: May 4, 2023: 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. *Meeting will be in person at 1707 Cole Boulevard, Suite 300, Lakewood, Colorado, with a virtual option available.*

Proposal 1: Remove Mandatory Christmas Day Closure from Statute

VOTER NAME	Remove Mandatory Christmas Day Closure from Statute		
	Yes	No	N-P
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	PROXY		
Andrew Palmquist <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	x		
Andrew Quarm <i>National Wholesaler</i>	x		
Andryn Arithson <i>Arts Licensee</i>	x		
Anne Huffsmith <i>National Vinous Manufacturer</i>	x		
Bob Hunt <i>Brewery (Large)</i>	x		
Colleen Norton <i>Colorado Municipal Clerks Association</i>	x		
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	x		
Dave Hayes <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>	x		
Don Strasburg <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	x		
Edward Cooper <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>	ABSENT		
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	ABSENT		
Erika Zierke <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	ABSENT		
F. Seyoum Tesfaye <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Small)</i>	PROXY		
Fran Lanzer <i>MADD</i>	x		
Fuad Jezzini <i>Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituos)</i>	x		
Gonzalo Mirich <i>Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer</i>	x		
Jim Shpall <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>	x		
Joseph Dirnberger	x		

<i>Colorado State Patrol</i>			
Joseph Durso <i>National Spirituous Manufacturer</i>	x		
Juliann Adams <i>Local Vinous Manufacturer</i>	x		
Karen Hertz <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>	x		
Kris Staaf <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>	x		
Loren Furman <i>Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce</i>	x		
Sara Siedsma <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>	ABSENT		
Sarah Morgan <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	x		
Stephen Gould <i>Local Spirituous Manufacturer</i>	x		
Tara Olson <i>Colorado Municipal League</i>	x		
Todd Reeves <i>County Sheriffs of Colorado</i>	x		
Veronica Ramos <i>Minority Owned On-Premises Retailer</i>	x		
W.J. Haskins <i>Law Enforcement Representative</i>	x		
Yetta Vorobik <i>Wholesaler (Malt)</i>	x		
Vacant <i>Colorado County Inc.</i>	NO VOTE		

Proposal 3: Soft Close for Last Call

Vote #1 - Refer Proposal #3, as amended, back to subgroup for additional revision

VOTER NAME	Refer Soft Close Proposal back to subgroup		
	Yes	No	N-P
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	PROXY		
Andrew Palmquist <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	NO VOTE		
Andrew Quarm <i>National Wholesaler</i>		x	
Andryn Arithson <i>Arts Licensee</i>		x	
Anne Huffsmith <i>National Vinous Manufacturer</i>			X (Abstain)
Bob Hunt <i>Brewery (Large)</i>		x	
Colleen Norton <i>Colorado Municipal Clerks Association</i>		x	
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>		x	
Dave Hayes <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>	x		
Don Strasburg <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>		x	
Edward Cooper <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>		x	
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	ABSENT		
Erika Zierke <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>		x	
F. Seyoum Tesfaye <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Small)</i>	PROXY		
Fran Lanzer <i>MADD</i>	x		
Fuad Jezzini <i>Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituos)</i>		x	
Gonazlo Mirich <i>Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer</i>	ABSENT		
Jim Shpall		x	

<i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>			
Joseph Dirnberger <i>Colorado State Patrol</i>	x		
Joseph Durso <i>National Spirituous Manufacturer</i>		x	
Juliann Adams <i>Local Vinous Manufacturer</i>		x	
Karen Hertz <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>		x	
Kris Staaf <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>		x	
Loren Furman <i>Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce</i>		x	
Sara Siedsma <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>	ABSENT		
Sarah Morgan <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>		x	
Stephen Gould <i>Local Spirituous Manufacturer</i>		x	
Tara Olson <i>Colorado Municipal League</i>		x	
Todd Reeves <i>County Sheriffs of Colorado</i>		x	
Veronica Ramos <i>Minority Owned On-Premises Retailer</i>		x	
W.J. Haskins <i>Law Enforcement Representative</i>	NO VOTE		
Yetta Vorobik <i>Wholesaler (Malt)</i>		x	
Vacant <i>Colorado County Inc.</i>	NO VOTE		

Proposal 3: Soft Close for Last Call

Vote #2 - Proposal #3, as amended

VOTER NAME	Soft Close		
	Yes	No	N-P
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	PROXY		
Andrew Palmquist <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	NO VOTE		
Andrew Quarm <i>National Wholesaler</i>	x		
Andryn Arithson <i>Arts Licensee</i>	x		
Anne Huffsmith <i>National Vinous Manufacturer</i>	x		
Bob Hunt <i>Brewery (Large)</i>	x		
Colleen Norton <i>Colorado Municipal Clerks Association</i>	x		
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	x		
Dave Hayes <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>		x	
Don Strasburg <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>			
Edward Cooper <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>	x		
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	ABSENT		
Erika Zierke <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	x		
F. Seyoum Tesfaye <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Small)</i>	PROXY		
Fran Lanzer <i>MADD</i>		x	
Fuad Jezzini <i>Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituos)</i>	x		
Gonazlo Mirich <i>Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer</i>	ABSENT		
Jim Shpall <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>	x		

Joseph Dirnberger <i>Colorado State Patrol</i>	x		
Joseph Durso <i>National Spirituous Manufacturer</i>	x		
Juliann Adams <i>Local Vinous Manufacturer</i>	x		
Karen Hertz <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>	x		
Kris Staaf <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>	x		
Loren Furman <i>Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce</i>	x		
Sara Siedsma <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>	ABSENT		
Sarah Morgan <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	x		
Stephen Gould <i>Local Spirituous Manufacturer</i>	x		
Tara Olson <i>Colorado Municipal League</i>	x		
Todd Reeves <i>County Sheriffs of Colorado</i>	x		
Veronica Ramos <i>Minority Owned On-Premises Retailer</i>	x		
W.J. Haskins <i>Law Enforcement Representative</i>	x		
Yetta Vorobik <i>Wholesaler (Malt)</i>	x		
Vacant <i>Colorado County Inc.</i>			