



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
 June 1, 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>Monte Vista Police Department</i>	Absent
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>	Absent
County Sheriffs of Colorado	Marc Snowden <i>Jefferson County Sheriff's Department</i>	Absent
Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce	Loren Furman <i>Colorado Chamber of Commerce</i>	Absent
Hard Cider Industry	Eric Foster <i>Colorado Cider Guild</i>	Present
Brewery (Large)	Bob Hunt <i>Molson Coors</i>	Present
Local Brewery (Small)	Dan Diebolt <i>Diebolt Brewing Company</i>	Present
Law Enforcement Representative	Chief W.J. Haskins <i>Glendale Police Department</i>	Absent
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>	Absent
Off-Premises Retailer (Small)	F. Seyoum Tesfaye <i>Franktown Liquors</i>	Absent
Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer	Gonzalo Mirich <i>Jimbo's Liquor</i>	Present
Minority Owned On-Premises retailer	Veronica Ramos <i>The Electric Cure</i>	Present
Local Spirituous Manufacturer	Stephen Gould <i>Colorado Distillers Guild</i>	Present by Proxy
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>	Absent
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
Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue	Don Strasburg <i>AEG Presents</i>	Present
Local Vinous Manufacturer	Juliann Adams <i>Vines 79 Wine Barn</i>	Present
National Vinous Manufacturer	Anne Huffsmith <i>Nakedwines.com, Inc.</i>	Absent
Wholesaler (Malt)	Yetta Vorobik <i>Crooked Stave Artisan Distribution</i>	Present

Seat	Representative	Attendance
Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituous)	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 meeting minutes from [May 4, 2023 meeting](#).
 1. No amendments or corrections submitted by members of the Liquor Advisory Group.
 2. Motion to adopt the minutes made by Andrew Quarm. Seconded by Sarah Morgan.
 3. Meeting minutes are adopted.
- III. Overview of LAG Large Group Meeting
 - A. Overview of LAG large group meeting and subgroup reports.
 1. Due to the holiday, the July LAG meeting will be held on **July 13, 2023 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**
 2. The July subgroup meetings will be held on the usual schedule:
 - a) Marketplace Structure: July 20, 2023 from 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.
 - b) Regulation of Retail Operations: July 20, 2023 from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
 - c) Licensing: July 27, 2023 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
 - B. Discussion of the voting process for preliminary proposals.
 1. Public comment will be taken prior to the LAG members voting on a proposal, to allow any concerns and opinions from members of the public to be considered before a vote.
- IV. Marketplace Structure Subgroup Report and Topic Discussion
 - A. Review [meeting minutes from May 18, 2023](#).
 1. No amendments or corrections submitted by members of the Marketplace Structure subgroup.
 - B. Adoption of meeting minutes by the LAG members in attendance at the meeting.
 1. Meeting minutes are adopted.
 - C. Review subgroup discussion from the May meeting (presented by Bob Hunt).
 - D. Review possible soft proposals discussed during the subgroup meeting.
 1. [Proposal 6: Tasting/Salesroom Increase](#)
 - a) Motion
 - (1) Motion to put the proposal to a vote made by Juliann Adams. Motion seconded by Eric Foster.
 - b) Overview of Discussion
 - (1) While the proposal generally received support from the group members, there were a few key concerns raised around both the language of the proposal and the intent behind it.

- (a) There was concern with a lack of associated licensing fees or any kind of “rigorous process” around applying for the additional locations, including local licensing approval.
 - (i) The division noted that, under the Manufacturer and Wholesaler tiers, sales rooms do not have associated fees with their application. The local licensing authorities have a forty-five day timeline during which they may provide feedback on concerns such as noise, zoning restrictions, fire code, et cetera. There are no restrictions that currently exist in statute for these license types that prevent them from being located near schools or other liquor-licensed locations.
 - (a) The division also noted that this proposal was worded to be “high level” only, with the details to be worked out later unless the Liquor Advisory Group would like to discuss the details now.
 - (ii) The distillery representative mentioned that the manufacturing industry already pays a considerable amount of excise tax, which might balance out a lack of associated fees as far as the division is concerned. The division clarified that no proceeds are received from excise tax.
- (b) The restaurant industry commented that this proposal is beginning to mirror on-premises locations, and if the Licensing subgroup is planning to review and/or “revamp” how locations are licensed overall in Colorado, perhaps this conversation was more of a licensing issue than a marketplace issue. In light of this, a question was raised if the group could hold off on the proposal until a new licensing structure is presented by the Licensing subgroup.
 - (i) The facilitator explained that this proposal falls under Marketplace Structure as it’s primary intention is to expand product exposure opportunity. The division also emphasized that the Licensing subgroup is focused on the Retail tier, not the Manufacturer and Wholesaler tiers.
 - (a) The division also noted a difference in which products can be sold in a sales room, depending on the type of sales

room that is applied for. For example, an off-premises sales room (Retail tier) can sell sealed to-go containers of alcohol while an on-premises sales room (Manufacturer tier) can only sell the products that have been personally manufactured by the licensee.

- (ii) The manufacturing industry representatives echoed the proposal's intent to expand opportunities to expose the public to their products. Specifically, the option to apply for temporary sales rooms would allow manufacturers to attend farmers markets (and similar events) which is an opportunity they currently do not have.
- (c) There was additional concern around these sales rooms turning into taverns. A question was raised around the volume of products that would be available for tastings and what the food requirement would be.
 - (i) The division explained that because malt liquor, winery, and spirituous liquor manufacturers fall under the Manufacturing tier, there are no volume limits in place. Such limits exist under the Retail Tier because those locations are retail establishments with manufacturing privileges only. The division expressed concerns with the LAG limiting manufacturers on what products they are allowed to produce. If the LAG would like to focus on discussing limiting the amount of product in the on-premises sales room, that could be discussed.
 - (ii) Additionally, sales rooms do not have a food requirement because they are intended to be locations where the consumer can taste what the manufacturer has made. Manufacturers can and do coordinate with food trucks, especially if the food truck is located outside the sales room location.
 - (iii) The division emphasized that the Manufacturing tier is about producing a product for sales in the community and to retail establishments. These sales rooms are designed to be an on-premise privilege, with the option for on-premise drinking, to showcase the manufacturer's

product that they have manufactured, and are different from tastings offered in an off-premises retail establishment.

(2) The restaurant representatives stated they would be comfortable taking this proposal to a vote with the caveat that licensing for the additional sales rooms would have to adhere to the local licensing authority as a Hotel & Restaurant (H&R) license. In the spirit of parity, the representatives stated this proposal doesn't feel fair when compared to restaurants; if these locations are on-premises drinking establishments, it's only fair that they be subject to the same requirements that other on-premises locations are subject to.

(a) A manufacturer representative pointed out that several of these discussion points were already thoroughly addressed during the Marketplace Structure subgroup discussion. This is a license that already exists and the proposal is only intended to allow for beer and spirits manufacturers to take advantage of the opportunity. There was pushback against amending this proposal as suggested by the restaurant industry.

(b) The division stated that it seems the discussion is not considering what this license type already has. These sales rooms can operate as either on-premise or off-premise, and for those that operate as on-premise, there is a limited space capacity. This is not an on-premises retail establishment where all types of alcohol can be sold; only manufactured products, as manufactured by the licensee, can be sold, and they are not permitted to sell multiple types of alcohol at the same time (e.g., consumers cannot taste a cider, malt beverage, and spirit at the same time). Comparing manufacturer sales rooms to retail establishments is not parity.

(c) Additionally, a manufacturer representative stated that many of the on-premises retail locations have privileges built into their license type that manufacturers do not have. If on-premises retail establishments want the same restrictions in place for the sales rooms, then manufacturers should receive the same benefits. However, the representative emphasized that this is not a conversation they want to have; they just want the opportunity to expand their product exposure.

c) Public Comment

(1) Nick Hoover, Colorado Restaurant Association

- (a) The members of the Restaurant Association have had several conversations about this issue over the years, and with the expansion of sales rooms, that started in the early 2000s and has since “blown up,” they aren’t looking like tasting rooms. They don’t look like a place where you come and taste a couple of products and leave; they look like bars. They’re adding entertainment, they’re adding trivia, they’re adding live music; [these are] all things that are meant to keep people there, consuming more and purchasing more, just like a bar would add. A lot of tasting rooms have added full kitchens and full menus that look like a full restaurant. These places, while colloquially being called a tasting room, aren’t necessarily acting that way in every case.
- (b) Because of this, the Association’s members feel that they [the sales rooms] are acting like a third tier license and because of that, should be licensed the same way. These are things that are very concerning to the Restaurant Association and short of a full parity on the licensing, the Association will not ever get in a position where they wouldn’t oppose this particular topic.
- (c) If the proposal was to go down the route of allowing temporary sales rooms only, that’s a different conversation that they might be able to get on board with. However, at this point, with the proposal as written, the Restaurant Association would be adamantly opposed.

(2) Shawnee Adelson, Colorado Brewers Guild

- (a) The Brewers Guild is supportive of this proposal. Ms. Adelson did address a couple concerns that have been brought up by the restaurants and the Restaurant Association.
- (b) To the point that there has been an explosion of tasting rooms since the end of 2015, there has been an increase of forty-seven manufacturing breweries (from 197 to 294). At the same time, the Hotel & Restaurant licenses have gone up over 300. Ms. Adelson doesn’t feel it’s fair to say tasting rooms are “exploding here.”
 - (i) Mr. Hoover clarified this point in a response, stating that he did not say the explosion happened after 2015 but rather the early 2000s. In comparison to 2003 and 2004, sales rooms have gone up “exponentially” and that is the

concern that the Colorado Restaurant Association's members have.

- (c) Also, to point out some statistics: there are currently 140 limited winery licenses while there are only 130 temporary licenses or additional sales room licenses that are not permits. The Brewers Guild is not assuming that every one of these licenses is going to have five locations, so the expectations on that should be tempered.
 - (d) Limited wineries can do this and it doesn't sound like the restaurants want to remove that privilege from the limited wineries. The brewers are just asking for fair access to market.
 - (e) In 2022, for liquor licensing, excise tax has lost four million gallons of excise licensing taxes. The breweries are losing market access; all they're asking for is market access and this proposal gives them market access.
 - (f) Also, to echo earlier points made, if you want breweries to be licensed like on-premises retailers, then [breweries] want the privileges that on-premises retailers have, which is to be able to sell all products.
 - (g) "We are licensed differently, we all are unique and separate, and we want to keep ourselves unique and separate. Just like there's off-premise and on-premise, there's manufacturing."
 - (h) The Brewers Guild is asking for a vote in support of this proposal so that beer can be an even playing field with wine.
- (3) Mollie Steinemann, Colorado Municipal League
- (a) Ms. Steinemann echoed some of the licensing concerns that members of the LAG brought up. Ms. Steinemann is grateful to the division for going through the process of local input in this type of license; however, the Municipal League would like to see a more robust local licensing component added to this, should it move forward, especially when talking about the permanent locations. The League would like to see additional local licensing considerations incorporated in this proposal because it's very important for local governments to have the freedom of flexibility, to manage where these liquor licensed establishments exist within their jurisdiction, and they would like to have a little more input, especially with permanent locations.

(4) *No additional public comment was provided on this proposal.*

Members of the public may submit their input on this proposal to dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us.

d) Amendments

(1) The proposal was amended to reflect that wine manufacturers are permitted to apply for the sales rooms alongside malt liquor and spirituous manufacturers.

(2) The definition of a sales room (44-3-103(49), C.R.S.) was also added to the proposal under **Current Statutory Language**. The division added this language following the discussion because if the group intends to make changes to the statute, there are additional areas of the Liquor Code which will need to be considered in relation to the definition of a sales room. Adding in the wineries and the distilleries in this piece would need to be considered by the General Assembly.

e) Vote

(1) The motion passes with a vote of 9 in favor, 6 against, and 4 taking no position or abstaining from a vote.

(a) The facilitator acknowledged that there was not consensus on this proposal, with consensus defined as the majority of the group members indicating they can live with the proposal. For now, the facilitator decided to leave the vote as is and move forward. If other proposals from the Marketplace Structure subgroup are in a similar position, the facilitator will determine if there's a need to revisit this proposal.

(b) There was a question from an LAG member as to whether only 15 votes (9 in favor, 6 against) qualifies for a quorum. The facilitator stated that the members who abstained from a vote and/or took no position count as having voted because they are here and present acting.

2. Proposal 7: Non-contiguous Locations for Beer and Spirits Manufacturers

a) Motion

(1) Motion to move this proposal to a vote made by Yetta Vorobik.
Seconded by Eric Foster.

b) Overview of Discussion

(1) The distillery manufacturers voiced strong support for this proposal, highlighting that it is critical to ongoing operations for growth and products for distilleries.

(2) *No additional comment was offered by members of the LAG on this proposal.* Any additional comments or input by members of the Liquor Advisory Group can be emailed to dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us.

c) Public Comment

(1) Shawnee Adelson, Colorado Brewers Guild

(a) The Brewers Guild is supportive of this proposal. For wineries right now, this is something that is allowed by the TTB. [The proposal] would not be for additional sales rooms; this is just for manufacturing and the idea is to allow for manufacturing in a different location. For example, two licensed manufacturing locations across the street from each other, where one has a sales room and does some manufacturing, while the other only does manufacturing. The idea is just to clean that up.

(b) Some other businesses do manufacturing in the same strip mall, maybe just a couple doors down, so it isn't that additional sales rooms are trying to be created through this. This is already in the statute.

(2) *No additional public comment was provided on this proposal.*

Members of the public may submit their input on this proposal to dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us.

d) Vote

(1) The motion passes on a vote of 19 in favor, 0 against, and 1 member taking no position.

3. Proposal 8: Off-Premises Tastings

a) Motion

(1) Motion to move this proposal to a vote made by Jim Shpall.
Seconded by Andrew Quarm.

b) Overview of Discussion

(1) There was brief discussion around the purchase requirement at the retailer's price. Much of the discussion was focused around the wording of "at the retailer's price."

(a) It was noted that federal regulation [27 CFR 6.95](#) states that the product cannot be purchased at *more than* the ordinary retail price.

(2) There was additional discussion around the products available for these tastings:

(a) It was clarified that the product must already be present on the retailer's shelves; manufacturers/suppliers are not permitted to bring in products that the off-premises retailer does not regularly stock solely for purposes of the tasting.

(b) There was concern around allowing products purchased by manufacturers/suppliers to be returned to them, especially if they were opened during the tasting. The division stated that because the products were purchased by the manufacturer/supplier from the retailer, they are

then considered a consumer and the product is theirs to do with as they wish.

- (3) A spirits manufacturer representative expressed the opinion that spirits manufacturers overall are supporting anything that allows for flexibility, with the understanding that there will be some licensing requirements associated with new privileges. The representative also emphasized that this proposal is heavily dependent on an agreement between manufacturers and retailers and that this is simply an option for both parties to participate in.

c) Amendments

- (1) Following this discussion, the [proposal](#) was amended (under the first bullet of **Proposal from Subgroup**) to state, “Product(s) being tasted must come from the off-premise retail licensee’s existing inventory. A manufacturer or supplier may supply the product to be tasted so long as the manufacturer or supplier purchases said products from the retailer at not more than the retailer’s ordinary retail price.”

d) Public Comment

- (1) Shawnee Adelson, Colorado Brewers Guild

- (a) Ms. Adelson thanked Mr. Shpall for working on this proposal. Overall, the craft brewers understand the proposal’s intent. One of the concerns is with buying the product back at retail price. It doesn’t have to be at retail price; it could be laid-in cost or at-cost and would still comply with federal regulations. With that, while Ms. Adelson sees that this aspect of the proposal could be exempted from federal law, the manufacturer is paying a retailer to be able to do [tastings] and it could be misconstrued as financial inducement to the retailer when paying at a retail cost because they’re making money off the product to be able to do [the tasting].

- (b) Ms. Adelson would advocate for amending the language to read “laid-in cost” or “at cost of product.”

- (c) Additionally, Ms. Adelson requested volume limits that suppliers can do, so that the proposal doesn’t benefit those that have the money and resources to be the only ones doing the tastings [and allows for] more level playing field for small manufacturers and suppliers. Ms. Adelson did not propose specific limits but is willing to speak with the LAG members about this further as requested.

- (2) *No additional public comment was provided on this proposal.* Members of the public may submit their input on this proposal to dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us.

e) [Vote](#)

- (1) The motion passes on a vote of 20 in favor, 0 against, and 1 member taking no position.

4. [Proposal 2: Educational Classes \(amended for a re-vote\)](#)

a) Overview of Amendment to Proposal

- (1) This proposal was brought to the Liquor Advisory Group for a revote in light of [Proposal 8](#), which allows off-premises retailers to conduct tastings.
- (2) Language was stricken from the proposal due to being in violation of federal regulations regarding consumer tastings (see [27 CFR 6.95](#)).

b) Motion

- (1) No objection was made to this amendment by members of the LAG.
- (2) Motion to move this amended proposal for a vote made by Joe Durson. Seconded by Fran Lanzer.

c) Overview of Discussion

- (1) A wholesaler representative expressed support for this amendment, stating that the amount that can be charged to the consumer for these educational classes does not have a limit, so this gives perfect flexibility to cover costs. For example, if the set amount for class attendance is \$10.00 per person, there is an option to then add in the cost of the product, if viable to do so.
- (2) The division voiced agreement with the wholesaler perspective that wholesalers would be allowed to increase the fee to include the cost of a product that is opened for the class. The division also added that nothing in the amended proposal prevents manufacturers from participating; the amendment only removes the language that they bring products for the retailers.
 - (a) It was emphasized by the division that manufacturers/wholesalers would have to go along with the federal regulations if they want to bring in a product for the classes. The product would already have to be on the retailer's shelf and the manufacturer/wholesaler would purchase the product at the ordinary cost.

d) Public Comment

- (1) *No public comment was provided on this proposal.* Members of the public may submit their input on this proposal to dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us.

e) [Vote](#)

- (1) The motion passes on a vote of 20 in favor, 0 against, and 1 member taking no position.

V. Licensing Subgroup Report and Topic Discussion

A. Review [meeting minutes from May 25, 2023](#).

1. No amendments or corrections submitted by members of the Licensing subgroup.
- B. Adoption of meeting minutes by the LAG members in attendance at the meeting.
 1. Meeting minutes are adopted.
- C. Review subgroup discussion during the subgroup meeting (presented by Renny Fagan).
- D. Review possible soft proposals discussed during the subgroup meeting.
 1. Proposal 9: Make “lodging rooms” a subsection of the Hotel & Restaurant license type.
 - a) Overview of Proposal
 - (1) The idea behind this proposal is to separate Lodging (as a license type) from Entertainment and merge Lodging (as a concept) with Hotels.
 - (2) “Lodging facilities” would become a subsection under the Hotel & Restaurant license.
 - b) Motion
 - (1) Motion to move this proposal forward for a vote made by Sarah Morgan. Seconded by Juliann Adams.
 - c) Overview of Discussion
 - (1) A member of the LAG asked if the division has received input from Colorado Hotel & Lodging (CHL) on this proposal. At this time, the division has not received any comment or input from the CHL.
 - (2) There was a brief discussion around clarifying the differences between “lodging facilities” and “hotels.”
 - (a) The division explained that “lodging” is defined in statute as a location (for example, a motel) with sleeping rooms that does not have a full kitchen but does have space for public meetings. Alcohol is allowed to be served in these public meeting spaces.
 - (b) Guests are allowed to purchase alcohol on their own (e.g., from a local off-premises retailer) and consume it in their room. There is no room service or alcohol service to these rooms.
 - (3) The Licensing subgroup felt that “lodging facilities” fit as a subsection under the Hotel & Restaurant license. This proposal does not take any privileges away from either lodging facilities or hotels; it only pulls apart “Lodging” and “Entertainment,” as the subgroup felt they are two different concepts.
 - d) Public Comment
 - (1) *No public comment was provided on this proposal.* Members of the public may submit their input on this proposal to dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us.
 - e) Vote
 - (1) The motion passes with a vote of 16 in favor, 0 against, and 5 members taking no position.

E. Topic Discussion: Retail Event License/Catering Permit proposal

1. This discussion pertained to the [proposal](#) submitted by Andy Klosterman on May 20, 2023.
2. Overview of Discussion
 - a) The group had a robust discussion around the proposal submitted by Mr. Klosterman, how the proposal relates to special event permits, and whether or not the proposal could be consolidated into the existing festival permit. Highlights of the discussion included the following:
 - (1) The biggest concern with involving nonprofit organizations with entertainment events (via special event permits) is that nonprofits don't hold liquor licenses and the system around special event permits brings organizations whose members are not required to undergo responsible vendor training in liquor service. The entertainment industry would prefer to work with "well-vetted parties" who can execute large scale alcohol service at big events.
 - (a) To this point, the division clarified that special events overall are intended for nonprofit organizations as a way for them to obtain alcohol products, provide the products at their events, and then take the sale of these products and put it towards their nonprofit. For-profit businesses have the festival permit as an alternative option that is tailored to their purposes more than a special event permit. The passing of [SB23-264](#) gives for-profit businesses the ability to hold nine festivals within a calendar year and jointly participate in fifty-two festivals within the same calendar year. This also allows special event permit holders to participate in a festival at the same time as a for-profit business.
 - (b) There was input from a representative of the entertainment industry that nine festivals was too low of a number for his industry; his business puts on "a thousand shows" per year.
 - (c) Another member of the LAG voiced an opinion that while getting a nonprofit organization to participate in a special event permit could be a "hassle," it can be done and the system didn't feel "broken."
 - b) There was some confusion during the discussion around the intent of Mr. Klosterman's proposal. The division clarified that this proposal, as presented during the May Licensing subgroup meeting, addressed a retail catering license, rather than a special event license. Mr. Klosterman also provided additional context to the intent behind his proposal:
 - (1) The retail catering license being proposed is "commonplace nationally;" following some recent research by the Colorado

Event Alliance, Mr. Klosterman reported that forty other states have basic capabilities for retailers to have some sort of temporary license off-site.

- (2) Mr. Klosterman expressed that the festival license is a “great building block” for his proposal because it’s very similar to what’s needed for large, public events; however, he agreed that the allowed number of festivals is very limiting and effectively prevents local small businesses with only one or two establishments in the state from pulling the same number of permits that an out-of-state franchise or larger corporation could pull.
- (3) For private events, utilizing the festival permit would be “way too complicated” and the volume would also be a major problem. According to Mr. Klosterman, there are “thousands” of private events that occur in the state of Colorado. The proposed catering license is intended to function specifically for these events and the festival permit isn’t a viable solution.
- (4) Mr. Klosterman emphasized that Colorado’s events industry is competing on a national basis with some of the largest states in the US (namely, Texas, California, and Florida). Currently, Mr. Klosterman expressed the opinion that there is a lack of clarity around how a retailer could participate in the events industry which creates disparity; the proposal looks to remedy this.

3. Next Steps

- a) Following the Licensing subgroup discussion and the discussion held today during the LAG meeting, Mr. Klosterman and Mr. Strasburg will collaborate to refine and revise the original proposal. The revised proposal will be submitted to the division no later than **June 15, 2023** for the Licensing subgroup to consider during their June meeting.

4. Public Comment

- a) *No public comment was provided on this proposal.* Members of the public may submit their input on this proposal to dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us.

VI. Regulation of Retail Operations Subgroup Report and Topic Discussion

A. Review [meeting minutes](#) from May 18, 2023.

1. No amendments or corrections submitted by members of the Regulation of Retail Operations subgroup.

B. Adoption of meeting minutes by the LAG members in attendance at the meeting.

1. Motion to adopt the minutes made by Dana Faulk Query. Seconded by Erika Zierke.
2. Minutes are adopted.

C. Review subgroup discussion from the May meeting (presented by Cally King).

1. A proposal on the topic of making to-go drinks permanent will be prepared during the June subgroup meeting and presented to the group at the July LAG meeting.
- D. Topic Discussion: Standardizing container definitions.
1. This was brought to the Liquor Advisory Group as a clarification matter to determine whether the subgroup is meant to discuss amount limits (as specified in 44-3-911(2)(b)(III), C.R.S.), container sizes (as specified in the Colorado Liquor Rules under 47-906), or federal container sizes (as referenced in [27 CFR 5.203](#) and [27 CFR 4.72](#)).
 2. Overview of Discussion
 - a) Overall, the LAG members felt that this topic was brought to the Regulation of Retail Operations subgroup because there is “no set standard for to-go cups.” There was expressed concern about people using, for example, plastic, unsealed cups as a “to-go drink container” and this does not feel like a safe decision.
 - (1) To this point, the division stated that specifications and regulations on to-go containers (e.g., warning labels, a sealed cup, no straw inserted in the lid) exist in Colorado Liquor Rule 47-906. The division requested that the LAG members review this regulation and then provide feedback to the division. These comments will then be brought to the summer rulemaking group.
 - (2) Additionally, the division requested that if any members of the LAG or the public are observing violations of the regulations around to-go alcohol drink containers, they report these incidents to the division. The division will then educate those licensees as to the proper standards for to-go containers.
 3. Group Decision
 - a) Because this is a matter that currently exists in rule and is not a statutory matter, the Regulation of Retail Operations subgroup will no longer address this topic.
 - b) Members of the LAG and the public were invited to attend summer rulemaking to address this topic further, if so desired.
- E. Topic Discussion: Public safety issues for the subgroup to discuss.
1. Overview of Discussion
 - a) The division put forth a few suggestions for public safety items that the subgroup could consider. These suggestions were then discussed by the LAG members.
 - (1) Put the Alcohol by Volume (ABV) on all alcohol products (beer, spirits, and wine), with the intent that consumers (especially out-of-state visitors) understand the alcohol percentage in the product(s) they’re consuming.
 - (a) There was robust discussion around this suggestion. A retail representative voiced support, adding that perhaps the label could read, “This is a wine-based/spirits-based

product with an ABV of...” which the division was in support of.

- (b) Representatives from the manufacturing industry expressed concern around additional costs associated with this addition to their product labels. Some felt that “clear and stringent guidelines” already exist at the federal level for ABV labeling and there would be “national outrage” at any significant changes to labeling requirements for manufacturers.
 - (i) To this point, the division stated that potential costs to the industry were considered before putting this suggestion forward, and that while the division doesn’t feel this would require major formatting changes to the labels, the details around this suggestion have been deliberately left up to the LAG members to discuss at length.
- (2) Put restrictions in statute regarding the areas that alcohol products can be placed in grocery stores and convenience stores, specifically in relation to candy and soda pop aisles, and near entrances and exits. There have been reports of parents mistakenly picking up a hard product instead of soda and serving it to their children.
 - (a) There was general support for this suggestion. Through discussion, it was clarified that the goal is to keep alcohol out of areas that children are most likely to frequent (candy and soda aisles). For soda aisles specifically, the division would like to see a designated area for hard/liquor-based products only, rather than intermixing with regular soda products.
 - (b) The division also stated that the LAG members should consider how to address instances of cross-promotion (e.g., an alcohol display in the produce section).
- (3) Allow the division to charge licensees for all investigations, provided it can be proven that said licensee committed the violation. Currently, the division is only permitted to charge for investigations when the licensee signs an Assurance of Voluntary Compliance (AVC), with the understanding that the licensee is not admitting to having committed the violation. The division feels it would benefit both the division and industry as a whole to charge an hourly fee for the investigations. The fee would go with not only the violation cost but also the investigation costs for the division. If the process results in an increase to the

division's funding, the associated fees for licenses would be lowered.

- (a) The main point of discussion around this suggestion was that LED be allowed to keep all the funds from the investigations without lowering the license fees. The division explained that, as part of TABOR, only 16.5% of the division's budget can be held over from year to year.
- b) The LAG members also put forth the following public safety considerations:
 - (1) Alcohol sales through self-checkout.
 - (a) Following brief discussion, the division clarified some confusion with this process. Customers are allowed to use shopping apps to scan an alcohol product and have it in their cart while shopping, but the sale cannot be completed until their ID is checked. The customer's identification is not checked at the beginning of their shopping trip.
 - (2) Alcohol sales through Amazon One.
 - (a) The division stated that it was consulted on this new process and agreed to it. The process is as follows:
 - (i) The customer downloads the Amazon One app.
 - (ii) They present their identification card (front and back) which is scanned into their profile.
 - (iii) Their picture is taken and added to their profile.
 - (b) When a consumer purchases an alcohol product and presents the Amazon One app, the sales associate has access to both a photo of the ID card and the individual associated with the account. The sales associate must verify that the person in front of them is the person presented in the app before completing the sale.
 - (3) Penalties for the use of fake identification cards at restaurants.
 - (a) This item was briefly mentioned during the May subgroup meeting by a representative of the restaurant industry. The representative stated that there seems to be little punishment for individuals using fake IDs, but there are heavy penalties for restaurants who don't catch the lack of authenticity with the ID card. The hope is that instilling heavier penalties for the individuals using these fake IDs would deter future actions.
 - (i) During that same discussion, the division expressed that it might be a more successful venture to focus on penalizing the companies that produce these IDs. However, it was noted

that some of these companies function online with physical locations that are out of state and therefore not under the division's jurisdiction.

(4) Required testing before the issuance of a liquor license.

(a) A member of the LAG expressed the opinion that many liquor licensees are not well-versed in the liquor code or regulations, and simply operate until they are caught committing a violation. It was proposed that some sort of test be required before a liquor license can be issued, wherein the licensee must demonstrate that they know what is expected of them and what they can/cannot do.

(5) Increased penalties for shoplifting of alcohol products.

2. Public Comment

a) Steve Findley, Colorado Beer Distributors Association

(1) In referencing an earlier point made about funding for LED, Mr. Findley asked if this discussion was off the table, as far as a bigger policy discussion; is there some way we could change it or ask the legislature to look at how to better fund LED through, for example, excise taxes, noting that excise taxes have been brought up a couple times? Mr. Findley acknowledged that this was a pretty big policy lift to ask; he was just wondering if this was something the LAG wanted to discuss or not.

(a) There was general support from LAG members around having this discussion, as it is frustrating when the division does not have the means or funding to enforce the law.

b) Andy Klosterman, Colorado Event Alliance

(1) Mr. Klosterman also participates in the Colorado Task Force for Drunk and Impaired Driving and he expressed confusion as to why, when there is a DUI or alcohol-related incident, there isn't better information around trying to capture what retail establishment the responsible party may have gotten a drink from. Not from a liability standpoint but from an educational standpoint; as a business owner, it's important to know, even if your particular business wasn't related to any alcohol incidents.

c) Shawnee Adelson, Colorado Brewers Guild

(1) Regarding the division's suggested process to put ABV on alcohol products, Ms. Adelson asked if this ABV label requirement would include all products, regardless of where they are sold, including on-premise cocktails, to-go drinks, off-premise drinks. [The division agreed that this was a correct statement.]

(2) Ms. Adelson agreed with the previously expressed concerns with the investment that has been put in with product labeling and

emphasized the cost that this new requirement could cause for some small manufacturers.

d) Kyle Schlachter, Colorado Wine Industry Development Board

- (1) Regarding the ABV on the labels, Mr. Schlachter stated that the TTB already sets very clear rules regarding this. Mr. Schlachter thinks there would need to be some very clear clarification on what is being proposed. Specifically to wine, he stated there are currently, under 27 CFR 4.36, guidelines around wines that are between 7 to 14 percent alcohol which allow the phrase “table wine” to be put on the bottles. It would have dramatic impacts if wine in Colorado was required to specifically state the alcohol percentage more stringently than what the federal requirements are. He would like to see more thorough discussion on what is being proposed here and would imagine the wine industry would be strongly opposed to any changes.

e) Scott and Jared Blauweiss, Mr. B’s Wine & Spirits

- (1) Mr. and Mr. Blauweiss previously submitted a public comment in regards to how the language is written in SB10-1027; in that, for to-go products from on-premise licenses, it specifically states that, for example, a consumer can purchase to-go two 750 [mL] of wine or one 750 [mL] of hard alcohol per transaction. What it doesn't specify is how many transactions each day any particular consumer could purchase (meaning, how many products). What they [Scott and Jared] have seen in the industry is that there is a handful of on-premise licenses operating, in a sense, like a liquor store; via a kind of loophole with the way the language [in SB10-1027] is miswritten, the way they [these locations] are being run is not in the spirit of the intention of the language, that people can buy as much booze as they want from a restaurant. Beyond that, there’s even different on-premise licenses advertising full cases of wine and discounts on full cases of wine. [Scott and Jared] wanted to see where the [LAG] was on that, especially the division. It’s very concerning that an on-premise [location] can act in the same way as a liquor store but with all the other privileges of an on-premises [establishment] on top of that.

- (a) The division responded that the only thing we have to worry about is the consumer. How would we enforce that and say to a consumer that they cannot come to the establishment at one point during the day, purchase a product and leave, then come back later and buy more product? Also, how would purchases be tracked per customer? The division doesn’t know how this would be defined. The division agreed that this is a concern

because the original intention was not to turn these into retail liquor stores; it was a privilege for the consumer to take a small quantity and leave.

(b) Scott and Jared suggested changing the language to “per day” instead of “per transaction.” They also asked where the LED stands on cracking down on some of these on-premises locations that have full shelving, look like a full liquor store, and are advertising for consumers to join their wine club and get a case of wine once a month. This is not in the spirit of how the law was intended.

(i) The division agreed and asked that any on-premises licensees with this setup be reported to the division so that they may be educated on how to operate within the spirit of the law.

f) Ainsley Giglierano, Distilled Spirits Council

(1) Regarding the concerns about ABV labeling, Ms. Giglierano agreed that this would put a very heavy burden on manufacturers specifically and this is something that is already handled in great detail at the federal level from the TTB. If this is something that’s going to be proposed, Ms. Giglierano stated it would be helpful to get something in writing that explains why this is being looked at or why the current labeling isn’t adequate.

g) *No additional public comment was provided on this topic.* Members of the public may submit their input on this proposal to dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us.

VII. Action Items

- A. Mr. Klosterman and Mr. Strasburg will collaborate to refine and revise the [retail event license/catering permit proposal](#). The revised proposal will be submitted to the division no later than **June 15, 2023** for the Licensing subgroup to consider during their June meeting.

The next Liquor Advisory Group will be held on July 13, 2023 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. The meeting will be in-person at 1707 Cole Boulevard, Suite 300, Lakewood , Colorado with a virtual option for those who cannot attend in person.

June subgroup meetings:

Marketplace Structure: June 15, 2023 from 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

Regulation of Retail Operations: June 15, 2023 from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Licensing: June 22, 2023 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

July subgroup meetings:

Marketplace Structure: July 20, 2023 from 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

Regulation of Retail Operations: July 20, 2023 from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Licensing: July 27, 2023 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Appendix: Voting Records

Proposal 6: Tasting/Sales Room Increase

VOTER NAME	Tasting/Salesroom Increase		
	Yes	No	N-P
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>			X
Andrew Palmquist ABSENT <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>			
Andrew Quarm <i>National Wholesaler</i>			X
Andryn Arithson <i>Arts Licensee</i>	X		
Anne Huffsmith ABSENT <i>National Vinous Manufacturer</i>			
Bob Hunt <i>Brewery (Large)</i>			X
Colleen Norton <i>Colorado Municipal Clerks Association</i>	X		
Dan Diebolt <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>	X		
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>		X	
Dave Hayes ABSENT <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>			
Don Strasburg PROXY <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>			
Edward Cooper ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>			
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	X		
Erika Zierke <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>		X	
F. Seyoum Tesfaye ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Small)</i>			

Fran Lanzer <i>MADD</i>		X	
Fuad Jezzini <i>Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituos)</i>	X		
Gonazlo Mirich ABSENT <i>Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer</i>			
Jim Shpall <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>	X		
Joseph Dirnberger ABSENT <i>Colorado State Patrol</i>			
Joseph Durso <i>National Spirituous Manufacturer</i>	X		
Juliann Adams <i>Local Vinous Manufacturer</i>	X		
Kris Staaf <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>			X
Loren Furman ABSENT <i>Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce</i>			
Marc Snowden ABSENT <i>County Sheriffs of Colorado</i>			
Sara Siedsma ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>			
Sarah Morgan <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>		X	
Stephen Gould PROXY <i>Local Spirituous Manufacturer</i>			
Tara Olson <i>Colorado Municipal League</i>		X	
Veronica Ramos <i>Minority Owned On-Premises Retailer</i>		X	
W.J. Haskins ABSENT <i>Law Enforcement Representative</i>			
Yetta Vorobik <i>Wholesaler (Malt)</i>	X		
Vacant <i>Colorado County Inc.</i>			

Proposal 7: Non-contiguous Locations for Beer and Spirits Manufacturers

VOTER NAME	Non-Contiguous for Beer/Spirits		
	Yes	No	N-P
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	X		
Andrew Palmquist ABSENT <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>			
Andrew Quarm <i>National Wholesaler</i>	X		
Andryn Arithson <i>Arts Licensee</i>	X		
Anne Huffsmith ABSENT <i>National Vinous Manufacturer</i>			
Bob Hunt <i>Brewery (Large)</i>	X		
Colleen Norton <i>Colorado Municipal Clerks Association</i>	X		
Dan Diebolt <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>	X		
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	X		
Dave Hayes ABSENT <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>			
Don Strasburg <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	X		
Edward Cooper ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>			
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	X		
Erika Zierke <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	X		
F. Seyoum Tesfaye ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Small)</i>			
Fran Lanzer <i>MADD</i>			X

Fuad Jezzini <i>Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituos)</i>	X		
Gonazlo Mirich ABSENT <i>Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer</i>			
Jim Shpall <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>	X		
Joseph Dirnberger ABSENT <i>Colorado State Patrol</i>			
Joseph Durso <i>National Spirituous Manufacturer</i>	X		
Juliann Adams <i>Local Vinous Manufacturer</i>	X		
Kris Staaf <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>	X		
Loren Furman ABSENT <i>Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce</i>			
Marc Snowden ABSENT <i>County Sheriffs of Colorado</i>			
Sara Siedsma ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>			
Sarah Morgan <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	X		
Stephen Gould PROXY <i>Local Spirituous Manufacturer</i>			
Tara Olson <i>Colorado Municipal League</i>	X		
Veronica Ramos <i>Minority Owned On-Premises Retailer</i>	X		
W.J. Haskins ABSENT <i>Law Enforcement Representative</i>			
Yetta Vorobik <i>Wholesaler (Malt)</i>	X		
Vacant <i>Colorado County Inc.</i>			

Proposal 8: Off-Premises Tastings

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

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

Proposal 2: Educational Classes (amended for a re-vote)

VOTER NAME	Educational Classes (amended)		
	Yes	No	N-P
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	X		
Andrew Palmquist ABSENT <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>			
Andrew Quarm <i>National Wholesaler</i>	X		
Andryn Arithson <i>Arts Licensee</i>	X		
Anne Huffsmith ABSENT <i>National Vinous Manufacturer</i>			
Bob Hunt <i>Brewery (Large)</i>	X		
Colleen Norton <i>Colorado Municipal Clerks Association</i>	X		
Dan Diebolt <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>	X		
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	X		
Dave Hayes ABSENT <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>			
Don Strasburg <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	X		
Edward Cooper ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>			
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	X		
Erika Zierke <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	X		
F. Seyoum Tesfaye ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Small)</i>			
Fran Lanzer <i>MADD</i>	X		
Fuad Jezzini <i>Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituous)</i>	X		

Gonazlo Mirich ABSENT <i>Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer</i>			
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		
Kris Staaf <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>	X		
Loren Furman ABSENT <i>Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce</i>			
Marc Snowden ABSENT <i>County Sheriffs of Colorado</i>			
Sara Siedsma ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>			
Sarah Morgan <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	X		
Stephen Gould PROXY <i>Local Spirituous Manufacturer</i>			
Tara Olson <i>Colorado Municipal League</i>	X		
Veronica Ramos <i>Minority Owned On-Premises Retailer</i>	X		
W.J. Haskins ABSENT <i>Law Enforcement Representative</i>			
Yetta Vorobik <i>Wholesaler (Malt)</i>	X		
Vacant <i>Colorado County Inc.</i>			

Proposal 9: Make “Lodging Rooms” a Subsection of the Hotel & Restaurant License

VOTER NAME	Lodging Consolidation into H&R		
	Yes	No	N-P
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	X		
Andrew Palmquist ABSENT <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>			
Andrew Quarm <i>National Wholesaler</i>	X		
Andryn Arithson <i>Arts Licensee</i>	X		
Anne Huffsmith ABSENT <i>National Vinous Manufacturer</i>			
Bob Hunt <i>Brewery (Large)</i>	X		
Colleen Norton <i>Colorado Municipal Clerks Association</i>	X		
Dan Diebolt <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>			X
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	X		
Dave Hayes ABSENT <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>			
Don Strasburg <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	X		
Edward Cooper ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>			
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>			X
Erika Zierke <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	X		
F. Seyoum Tesfaye ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Small)</i>			
Fran Lanzer <i>MADD</i>			X
Fuad Jezzini <i>Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituous)</i>	X		

Gonazlo Mirich ABSENT <i>Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer</i>			
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		
Kris Staaf <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>	X		
Loren Furman ABSENT <i>Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce</i>			
Marc Snowden ABSENT <i>County Sheriffs of Colorado</i>			
Sara Siedsma ABSENT <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>			
Sarah Morgan <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	X		
Stephen Gould PROXY <i>Local Spirituous Manufacturer</i>			
Tara Olson <i>Colorado Municipal League</i>			X
Veronica Ramos <i>Minority Owned On-Premises Retailer</i>	X		
W.J. Haskins ABSENT <i>Law Enforcement Representative</i>			
Yetta Vorobik <i>Wholesaler (Malt)</i>	X		
Vacant <i>Colorado County Inc.</i>			