



**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  
 September 14, 2023

<b>Seat</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
State Licensing Authority	Heidi Humphreys <i>Executive Director, 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>	Absent
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	Marc Snowden <i>Jefferson County Sheriff's Department</i>	Absent
Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce	Loren Furman <i>Colorado Chamber of Commerce</i>	Present
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>	Present
MADD	Executive Director Fran Lanzer <i>Mothers Against Drunk Driving</i>	Present

Seat	Representative	
Off-Premises Retailer (Large)	Kris Staaf <i>Albertsons Safeway</i>	Present
Off-Premises Retailer (Large)	Sara Siedsma <i>Kum &amp; Go</i>	Absent
Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)	Jim Shpall <i>Applejack Wine &amp; Spirits</i>	Present
Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)	Edward Cooper <i>Total Wine &amp; More</i>	Present
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
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>	Absent
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, &amp; RiNo Art District</i>	Present
Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue	Don Strasburg <i>AEG Presents</i>	Present by Proxy Andy Klosterman
Local Vinous Manufacturer	Juliann Adams <i>Vines 79 Wine Barn</i>	Present
National Vinous Manufacturer	Anne Huffsmith <i>Nakedwines.com, Inc.</i>	Present
Wholesaler (Malt)	Yetta Vorobik <i>Crooked Stave Artisan Distribution</i>	Present

Seat	Representative	
Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituous)	Fuad Jezzini <i>Maverick Wine Company of Colorado</i>	Absent
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 the [meeting minutes from August 3, 2023](#).
    1. No amendments were put forward for the minutes.
    2. Motion to approve the minutes made by Dana Faulk Query. Motion seconded by Andrew Quarm.
    3. No dissenting votes were recorded, and no members abstained from the vote. Meeting minutes adopted.
- III. Overview of LAG Large Group Meeting
  - A. Overview of LAG large group meeting and subgroup reports.
  - B. Discussion of schedule updates for remaining Liquor Advisory Group meetings:
    1. The last full LAG meeting will be to approve the report draft and will be held on **October 30th from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. at 1881 Pierce Street, Room 110**.
    2. Members should hold November 2nd from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. as a possible additional LAG meeting.
  - C. Comments from Executive Director Heidi Humphreys
    1. Executive Director (ED) Humphreys began her comments by applauding the work that the Liquor Advisory Group members have done. Based on the founding expectations for the group set by former Executive Director Ferrandino during the December 6, 2022, meeting of the LAG, ED Humphreys expressed concerns that Proposals 31 and 32 addressed concepts already voted on by the People of Colorado in Proposition 124 and 126 during the November 2022 general election. Based on these previously set expectations, ED Humphreys stated she did not think the LAG should address these proposals.
    2. Mr. Jim Shpall drafted the language for both Proposals 31 and 32 and expressed disagreement with ED Humphrey's interpretations regarding the intent of the propositions voted on in the November 2022 election. Mr. Shpall emphasized that Proposal 31 was intended to address issues arising from SB16-197 as well as address liquor-licensed drugstore licenses and the sale of spirits in these license types, whereas Proposition 124 addressed the availability of additional retail liquor store licenses.
    3. LED Director Stone-Principato concurred with ED Humphreys, stating that we should adhere to the original intent of the LAG.
- IV. Licensing Subgroup Report and Proposal Discussion
  - A. Review the [meeting minutes summary from August 24, 2023](#).
  - B. Adoption of summary by the LAG members in attendance at the meeting.
    1. No amendments were put forward for the minutes.
    2. Meeting minutes adopted.

- C. Review subgroup discussion from the August meeting (presented by Andryn Arithson).
- D. Review possible [soft proposals](#) discussed during the subgroup meeting:
  - 1. Proposal 26: Amendment to 44-3-419 Arts Licensee
    - a) Overview of the [Proposal](#) (presented by Andryn Arithson)
    - b) Overview of LAG Discussion
      - (1) There was general support from the group members for this proposal, with some highlighting the benefits and additional funding opportunities this would provide for nonprofit organizations with arts licenses.
      - (2) Mr. Fran Lanzer noted that he would like some clarifying language as to which cultural events this proposal might be appropriate for; specifically, how will the proposal address events that focus on children, as these events will likely have adults (e.g., parents, guardians, etc.) attending with the children who are of legal age to purchase alcohol. To address this, the division proposed adding rulemaking authority for the state to address these concerns and have the opportunity for stakeholder engagement when formulating rules around this. Mr. Lanzer expressed his appreciation for and agreement with this amendment.
    - c) Amendments
      - (1) Per the division's request to keep consistent language throughout the statute, the proposal was amended as follows: "Limited advertising of availability of alcoholic beverages for sale may be placed on the licensed premise while an artistic or cultural event is taking place."
      - (2) The proposal was also amended to give the division rulemaking authority to address any concerns that may arise among industry and/or community members.
    - d) Public Comment
      - (1) No public comment was submitted on this proposal. If any member of the public wishes to provide comment or input on this proposal, they may email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).
    - e) Motion
      - (1) Motion to put the proposal to a vote made by Andryn Arithson. Tara Olson seconded the motion.
    - f) [Vote](#)
      - (1) No dissenting votes were recorded on the motion. No members abstained from the vote.
      - (2) Motion passed.
  - 2. Proposal 27: Catering license
    - a) Overview of the [Proposal](#) (presented by Andy Klosterman)
    - b) Overview of LAG Discussion

- (1) It was briefly discussed whether this proposal included aspects of Proposition 124; specifically, whether the creation of a new retail license type could be considered in conflict with the Liquor Advisory Group's initial directive. The division clarified that the governor gave the Liquor Advisory Group the initiative to review existing license types and either condense them or create new license types.
- (2) Following this clarification, the group members had a robust discussion that focused on three primary concerns:
  - (a) Overall benefit to the industry:
    - (i) There was some debate among the group members as to whether this new license type was needed, as the current system has been in place for a long time. The members in favor of this proposal noted that one of the LAG's directives was to modernize liquor laws in Colorado, and this proposal establishes a currently non-existent system of accountability and licensing structure for the state's growing industry. It was also noted that other states have allowed for some sort of catering license.
    - (ii) There was further debate among the group members as to whether the current system was operating efficiently; some members stated that the elements of this proposal would create more paperwork and layers, while others noted "major inefficiencies" in the current system that would be addressed and fixed by the proposal.
  - (b) Potential impact for retailers:
    - (i) Concern was expressed that this proposal would be "another swipe" against the retail tier by taking away the business retailers have under the current system. Mr. Klosterman countered that the proposal wouldn't change what currently exists by allowing a consumer to go to a liquor store for their products and that liquor stores are still extremely viable in states with catering licenses. For example, in Texas, Mr. Klosterman noted that the catering license has created "healthy competition" in the industry.
  - (c) Public safety measures:
    - (i) The group discussed how these catered events would be regulated under the proposal. Mr. Klosterman clarified that under the proposal, the

caterer would be responsible for obtaining a permission letter from the venue expressly stating that they may serve alcohol on the venue premises, which gives the state and local licensing authorities the ability to regulate the events as necessary.

- (ii) For private events, there was concern about required identification verification prior to serving individuals at the event; however, it was noted that this is already required in statute. Additionally, while the state doesn't have the authority to access private homes for events, the homeowner would take on liability if there is service to intoxicated persons and/or underage individuals. The division expressed that this proposal grants somewhat of a purview over the private events, as the licensing authorities would be part of the process.

c) Public Comment

(1) Trevor Vaughn, *City of Aurora*

- (a) Mr. Vaughn noted that this proposal would create a level of oversight when caterers use event centers that do not have liquor licenses, in that any private parties that bring in alcohol and have excess leftover product can then take it with them and the event center will not be considered responsible for the leftover product.

(2) Steve Findley, *Colorado Beer Distributors Association*

- (a) Mr. Findley asked several clarifying questions related to this proposal. First, he asked if individuals would be allowed to bring their own alcohol products to the event. The division explained that this would only apply to small events. The proposal allows individuals to hire a caterer to serve the alcohol, but the consumer retains the right to purchase the alcohol from a retail liquor store for the caterer to serve. It would be a contract wherein the caterer and consumer would determine whether the caterer was purchasing the alcohol or the consumer made the purchase for the caterer to serve. Mr. Findley noted that this process felt inconsistent, as this would be a licensed event, but consumers would be allowed to bring in their own alcohol.
- (b) Mr. Findley's second question was whether purchases made would be subject to retail purchasing limits. The division confirmed that these purchasing limits would

remain in effect. Additionally, the division noted that wholesalers would be included under this proposal for larger events (meaning the alcohol could be purchased from a wholesaler for the event) and emphasized that the desire behind this proposal was to give flexibility. Consumers who don't have funds for a caterer to buy all the alcohol for them may have the funds to purchase the alcohol on their own and have the caterer serve it, and the proposal grants them the option to utilize either avenue.

- (c) The division also expressed the need to be innovative and creative with this proposal; if there are some issues after it's had time to work in the industry, these can be addressed via rulemaking in addition to education for caterers and consumers.

- (3) No additional public comment was submitted on this proposal. If any member of the public wishes to provide comment or input on this proposal, they may email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).

d) Motion

- (1) Motion to put the proposal to a vote made by Stephen Gould. Dana Faulk Query seconded the motion.

e) [Vote](#)

- (1) Two dissenting votes were recorded on the motion. One member abstained from the vote.
- (2) Motion passed.

3. Proposal 28: Amendment to the requirement for a public hearing for new license applications

a) Overview of the [Proposal](#) (presented by Trevor Vaughn)

b) Overview of LAG Discussion

- (1) The Liquor Advisory Group members did not have a discussion on this proposal. If any member of the LAG wishes to provide additional input on this proposal, please email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).

c) Public Comment

- (1) No public comment was submitted on this proposal. If any member of the public wishes to provide comment or input on this proposal, they may email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).

d) Motion

- (1) Motion to put the proposal to a vote made by Dan Diebolt. Dana Faulk Query seconded the motion.

e) [Vote](#)

- (1) No dissenting votes were recorded on the motion. No members abstained from the vote.
  - (2) Motion passed.
4. Proposal 29: Removal of state and local fee amounts/fee caps from statutory language
  - a) Overview of the [Proposal](#) (presented by Trevor Vaughn)
  - b) Overview of LAG Discussion
    - (1) Some members of the group expressed support for this proposal, stating that at times having fees set in statute makes it difficult for the division to make changes and for the industry to keep up with changes in the market; giving flexibility would help both the division and industry as a whole. However, other members of the group voiced concerns about the potential for abuse by local authorities. It was noted that local jurisdictions could and likely would publish their costs to create transparency with the industry.
    - (2) The division expressed several concerns with the proposal.
      - (a) Primarily, the division was concerned about possible conflicts with TABOR and the state constitution, as the statute in question falls under Article 3, and therefore, there is a required percentage that must be deposited into the Old Age Pension Fund. The division was concerned about an unstable state budget with a “patchwork system” of locals setting different fees.
      - (b) Additionally, the division was concerned about creating competition between neighboring jurisdictions with competing prices.
      - (c) Overall, the division stated that there were other items that need to be fleshed out on how to make this a fair system while also not impacting the overall state budget where there are constitutional conflicts. Even if the fees were set by rule, the division would have to calculate the deposits into the Old Age Pension Fund and how it impacts the state constitution.
  - c) Public Comment
    - (1) No public comment was submitted on this proposal. If any member of the public wishes to provide comment or input on this proposal, they may email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).
  - d) Motion
    - (1) Motion to put the proposal to a vote made by Andrew Quarm. Juliann Adams seconded the motion.
  - e) [Vote](#)



- (1) No dissenting votes were recorded on the motion. Eight members abstained from the vote.
  - (2) Motion passed.
5. Proposal 30: Increased processing timeline for Retail Establishment Permit applications
- a) Overview of the [Proposal](#) (presented by Chloe White)
  - b) Overview of LAG Discussion
    - (1) The Liquor Advisory Group members did not have a discussion on this proposal. If any member of the LAG wishes to provide additional input on this proposal, please email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).
  - c) Public Comment
    - (1) No public comment was submitted on this proposal. If any member of the public wishes to provide comment or input on this proposal, they may email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).
  - d) Motion
    - (1) Motion to put the proposal to a vote made by Tara Olson. Andryn Arithson seconded the motion.
  - e) [Vote](#)
    - (1) No dissenting votes were recorded on the motion. No members abstained from the vote.
    - (2) Motion passed.

*Proposal 31 was struck from the agenda per Executive Director Humphreys' directive during the opening remarks.*

V. Regulation of Retail Operations Subgroup Report and Proposal Discussion

- A. Review [meeting minutes summary from August 17, 2023](#).
- B. Adoption of summary by the LAG members in attendance at the meeting.
  1. No amendments were put forward for the minutes.
  2. Meeting minutes adopted.
- C. Review subgroup discussion from the August meeting (presented by Fran Lanzer).
- D. Review [soft proposals](#) discussed during the subgroup meeting:
  1. Proposal 32: Purchase of Inventory
    - a) Overview of the [Proposal](#) (presented by Jim Shpall)
      - (1) *Paragraph 1(e)(iv) of the proposal was struck per Executive Director Humphreys' directive during the opening remarks.*
    - b) Overview of LAG Discussion
      - (1) The group members had a robust discussion around the details of this proposal, the highlights of which are as follows:
        - (a) This proposal would only apply to retail liquor licensees and not restaurant owners, liquor-licensed drugstores, or arts licensees.
        - (b) It was noted that retailers have communicated this was an issue, especially when they have or are going out of business. Wholesalers can currently buy back products if they deem the product can be resold; however, if the product is not deemed as such, then the product will be

sold off through auctions.

- (i) It was also noted that under current statute, when a retailer is staying in business and wants to sell back inventory, there is a thirty-day provision during which the wholesaler may buy back the product. However, as this proposal pertains solely to retailers who are going out of business, the thirty-day requirement does not apply.
  - (c) The state would conduct a thorough review of the licensee before permitting the transaction to occur. The review would include making sure the surrendering licensee doesn't have administrative actions pending against the license or any taxes owed. This would all be addressed and completed before the sale occurs.
  - (d) There was a request to establish timelines for the notification process for both the local and state licensing authorities and for wholesalers. Additionally, the division requested that wholesalers be notified of the pending transaction via certified mail to ensure the wholesaler is fully aware of the situation and may take the opportunity to buy back any product they wish.
- c) Amendments
- (1) Following the group discussion, the proposal was amended as follows:
    - (a) The local liquor licensing authority shall be notified at least sixty days prior to the sale occurring.
    - (b) The wholesaler shall be notified via certified mail.
    - (c) The wholesaler has fifteen days from the date of notification to determine whether they wish to buy back inventory.
- d) Public Comment
- (1) Steve Findley, *Colorado Beer Distributors Association*
    - (a) While Mr. Findley agreed that the beer distributors don't want beer products included under this proposal because of territory and quality control issues, he asked if the notice [to wholesalers] would be sent to *all* wholesalers, including beer distributors.
    - (b) The division expressed a willingness to amend the proposal accordingly; however, the division felt that if beer was excluded from this proposal, there wasn't a need to provide notice to the beer distributors. Mr. Shpall agreed with the division's comment and added that he would prefer not to require this, as he felt it would be another step in the process. Mr. Findley stated he would be fine with not including a notification to the beer distributors.
  - (2) Dustin Chiappetta, *Pearl Wine Company*
    - (a) Mr. Chiappetta initially asked for clarification on Paragraph (e) of the proposal. It was noted that Paragraph (e)(iv) was struck from the proposal language per ED Humphreys' directive during the opening

comments.

(b) Mr. Chiappetta had no further comment.

(3) No additional public comment was submitted on this proposal. If any member of the public wishes to provide comment or input on this proposal, they may email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).

e) Motion

(1) Motion to move the proposal to a vote made by Jim Shpall. Dan Diebolt seconded the motion.

f) [Vote](#)

(1) No dissenting votes were recorded on the motion. Two members abstained from the vote.

(2) Motion passed.

## VI. Marketplace Structure Subgroup Report and Proposal Discussion

A. Review meeting [minutes summary from August 17, 2023](#).

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

1. No amendments were put forward for the minutes.

2. Meeting minutes adopted.

C. Review subgroup discussion from the August meeting (presented by Anne Huffsmith).

D. Review possible [soft proposals](#) discussed during the subgroup meeting:

1. Proposal 33: DTC shipping for beer and spirits with courier permit for delivery of products

a) Overview of the Proposal (presented by Dan Diebolt)

b) Overview of LAG Discussion

(1) The proposal received considerable support from distillery representatives who expressed that this could benefit small, family-owned businesses by granting them market access they currently don't have because many large distributors won't pick them up. Additionally, it was commented that consumer demand has changed, and this proposal presents a unique opportunity to learn from wine and how its direct-to-consumer shipping program has worked. Overall, supporters of the proposal felt this would build the industry by respecting and addressing the needs of all three tiers.

(2) However, other group members felt that additional discussion was needed around this proposal. The main concerns expressed were as follows:

(a) Manufacturers shouldn't be the only ones allowed to participate in the shipping privilege. Retailers should be allowed to access this privilege as well.

(b) More research needs to be done into what the industry specifically wants and what the benefits versus the risks would be.

(c) The proposal lacks the structure necessary to operate efficiently in the state.

(d) The proposal is premature as there is no common carrier permit currently in existence. It was suggested that the shipping practice should be staggered over a three-year process: the courier permit could operate the first year, the retailers participate in the shipping privilege during

the second year, and then the manufacturers could participate.

- (e) There is no consensus on this proposal, and the market overall is not looking for more delivery options.
- (3) There was ample discussion around whether this proposal only applied to in-state shipping or if it would allow out-of-state businesses to ship into the state. Some group members expressed the opinion that if out-of-state businesses could ship into Colorado, it would create a system where the “borders are easily penetrable with no controls and no rules.” It was further noted that there have been violations and issues around the definitions of a distillery, winery, et cetera, as the definitions vary across the states.
  - (a) The division affirmed that this proposal was not intended to restrict shipping within the state. The shipping privileges would extend to out-of-state opportunities, which mirrors how the wine shipping program currently operates.

c) Public Comment

(1) Chris Fine, *Colorado Licensed Beverage Association*

- (a) Mr. Fine noted that there hasn’t been consensus on this proposal and that he felt this issue needs to be more thought out. He added that the last time this issue was tabled, it was done so because it was “bumping up against” a ballot measure. Mr. Fine acknowledged that there is a nuance between third-party delivery and shipment but posed the question of whether the people of Colorado would think there was a difference. Additionally, Mr. Fine noted that this would take alcohol products from responsible retailers to a third party that doesn’t have the same rules that the industry lives by and then be “dropped off” without proper protocol. There also wouldn’t be the same penalties, as the division cannot shut down Instacart, FedEx, and other carriers.

(2) Sam DeWitt, *Colorado Brewers Association*

- (a) Mr. DeWitt commented that this proposal provided an “incredible opportunity” for craft beer in Colorado to ship in and out of state, which in turn provided ways for brewers to grow, expand, and find new markets and customers (including those who live out of state). Mr. DeWitt added the opinion that this does not affect the three-tier system and highlighted *Bow & Arrow Brewing Company* in New Mexico, which, following a televised special, recently received an abundance of requests for their brewed product that they could not fulfill. These, Mr. DeWitt noted, are lost sales, just like beer tasted at a local festival that cannot be shipped out of the state. Mr. DeWitt commented that this proposal was about “capturing lightning in a bottle” and creating new streams of revenue for small and independent craft breweries. Additionally, Mr. DeWitt stated that surveys

are showing that consumers have tried beer that they wish they could try again, but it's not available near their homes.

(3) Don Hammond, *State 38 Distilling*

- (a) Mr. Hammond echoed some of the comments that have already been made and added his own business experience as a small distillery trying to build its brand. Direct-to-consumer shipping would give them the opportunity to be able to sell their products to those customers who come to the distillery from out of state or even out of the country. In summary, Mr. Hammond stated he was in support of the proposal, and it would be a great boom for his business.

(4) Micki Hackenberger, *Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of Colorado*

- (a) Ms. Hackenberger noted that she has testified on this issue before and continued to express opposition to the proposal. She commented that any proposal has a number of risks, and it's not as simple as issuing a courier permit that allows shipping to the door. Having already addressed the safety concerns in prior public comment sessions (e.g., access to minors, counterfeit product issues, etc.), Ms. Hackenberger further addressed concerns about how the common carrier permit is being discussed. Ms. Hackenberger noted that "common carrier reporting" was being used as if it was the same as a "courier permit," and she stated that they were not the same.
- (b) Additionally, Ms. Hackenberger was concerned that the proposal implies that the statute currently has an "adequate" common carrier permit, which it does not. Ms. Hackenberger noted that the statute needs a common carrier section with a "very robust" reporting of manifests, guardrails, driver training, et cetera. In conclusion, Ms. Hackenberger commented that the proposal seems to imply that it's a simple matter of issuing a courier permit for the shipping of beer and spirits, and it's more complicated than this. The proposal needs to be worked on, and Ms. Hackenberger noted that this issue has been discussed and rejected by the LAG as a whole at least two or three times previously.

(5) Neil Fisher, *WeldWerks Brewing Co.*

- (a) Mr. Fisher noted that the point of this proposal is to have parity with wine and that the industry has seen how direct-to-consumer shipping can be successful with wine both in Colorado and in other states. This is a great case study of how direct-to-consumer shipping can work within the three-tier system. As a small independent manufacturer, Mr. Fisher stated he sees an opportunity to get specific products into the marketplace, obtain access to the market, engage customers, and build brands that would otherwise be undeveloped or wouldn't thrive.

Additionally, Mr. Fisher expressed that the industry has “significant advantages” that weren’t present ten years ago when addressing the potential of expanding direct-to-consumer shipping. He stated he would hate to see Colorado fall behind as an innovator and advocated that the state has a great legislative environment that allows for industry growth.

(6) Emily Casey, *Casey Brewing and Blending*

- (a) Ms. Casey stated that she represents a destination brewery whose business comes from travelers and visitors to the state. At this time, her business is not big enough to sign with a distributor or self-distribute. Selling beer via direct-to-consumer shipping would help her business by increasing production and hiring employees. Additionally, Ms. Casey noted that customers have stated that they would like to purchase the beer if shipping was an option.

(7) Sandy Rothe, *Whistling Hare Distillery*

- (a) Mr. Rothe commented that if Colorado is going to have a viable three-tier system, all “similarly situated” people should be treated equally. He expressed his interest in a wholesaler representing his business, but at this time, they won’t take his product. He advocated that distillers need to add avenues to the market.
- (b) Additionally, Mr. Rothe noted that direct-to-consumer shipping of spirits occurs “all the time,” so the idea that there isn’t direct-to-consumer shipping currently happening in Colorado “is a farce.” Mr. Rothe stated he would like parity in the industry or for direct-to-consumer shipping to be shut down, as it’s unfair to those who are complying with the law.
  - (i) The division commented that if there is shipping into the state of Colorado of beer or spirits, that is illegal, and the division requests that it should be reported by emailing [dor\\_led@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led@state.co.us) so the division’s investigators can look into it.

(8) Nick Hoover, *Colorado Restaurant Association*

- (a) Mr. Hoover stated that he discussed this proposal with the CRA members and asked for clarification on whether out-of-state manufacturers would be allowed to ship into the state. Mr. Hoover noted that restaurants feared their allocation of specific products would be in jeopardy if this were allowed.
  - (i) The division clarified that it would have to allow shipping in and out of the state.

(9) Barry Young, *Fraser Valley Distilling*

- (a) Mr. Young represents a small family distillery that is tourist-focused and currently self-distributing to approximately twenty stores. The opportunity for direct-to-consumer shipping is critical to his business. If it’s working for wine, if it’s working for other states, Mr.

Young stated he “has faith” it will work for the Colorado liquor industry. He shared his business experience, that many customers from both inside and outside the state come to his distillery, try the product, and then buy it to take home. He noted that he “never has a week go by” without getting multiple calls from consumers asking them to ship products. For those who operate businesses in tourist areas, this would be a game changer.

- (10) Kate Coler, *Moet Hennessy USA*
  - (a) Ms. Coler noted that the industry has decades of experience in working with direct-to-consumer shipping in the wine sector. Expanding direct-to-consumer shipping for beer and spirits would create parity, and the wine direct shipping permit has shown that it can be done in a responsible way. Ms. Coler expressed that this proposal complements the three-tier system and benefits all stakeholders by allowing Colorado customers to buy products in the way they want while making products available in the marketplace that currently aren’t available.
- (11) Ainsley Gilleriano, *Colorado Distilled Spirits Council*
  - (a) Ms. Gilleriano noted that she has previously commented on this proposal and would like to echo that this “isn’t a novel idea.” Forty-seven states allow the shipment of wine, and eleven states allow the shipment of distilled spirits. Following the guidelines that are already in existence for wine in Colorado would be a responsible way to do this. She expressed the opinion that getting into the “what ifs” can throw a curveball into a “common sense proposal” and advocated that this supports the three-tier system and could support each tier by growing jobs in all three tiers as it did when direct-to-consumer shipping for wine was allowed.
- (12) Eric Strom, *Palmer Peak Distillery*
  - (a) Mr. Strom noted that being able to ship directly to consumers out of state would be a game changer; overnight, Mr. Strom stated that his business could go from a small local reach to a nationwide reach. Currently, Mr. Strom expressed that he is losing out on sales that he could otherwise get with the infrastructure already in place (and working in other states) for wine direct shipping, and losing out on sales from out-of-state visitors. Mr. Strom also noted that he is currently losing out on sales for people in-state because they can’t bring the product home.
- (13) Emily Rhoades, *Distillery 291*
  - (a) Ms. Rhoades noted that Colorado has always been known as a leader in liquor laws and a state in support of small businesses and craft beer and craft spirits. She expressed the opinion that not continuing the conversation and not continuing the push towards

direct-to-consumer shipping into progressive laws in the state is going to put Colorado “behind states that are much more conservative,” like Michigan and Kentucky. Ms. Rhoades added that craft spirits in Colorado put the state “on the map” and amount to approximately 60% of tourism dollars and 40% of local dollars in her tasting room. Overall, Ms. Rhoades stated that it’s a “billboard” for Colorado when the state’s distilled spirits are winning “major awards” and “putting Colorado on the map,” and that the state needs to be on the map for moving forward and progressing.

- (14) Steven Harrison, *Craft Wine Association/Vinoshipper*
- (a) Mr. Harrison referenced the [documents](#) he previously submitted via public comment for the LAG members to review. These documents, he stated, reflect actual experiences his business has had across the state, working with approximately 2,500 producers. Mr. Harrison expressed hope that Colorado could create an equal system for all producers, noting that it can already be seen how the incumbent three-tier system disadvantages craft producers because they can’t get distribution.
  - (b) Additionally, Mr. Harrison provided published documents on how direct-to-consumer shipping is an “on-ramp” to the three-tier system and supports the whole model: brands start small, get a following, and then build into the system. In partnership with the Craft Wine Association, Mr. Harrison stated that his company created the National Direct Shippers Bill of Rights [included in the provided documents]; Mr. Harrison felt that this document should be referenced when the industry members are asking questions about “how things should be done.” Mr. Harrison explained that the Bill of Rights is ten principles that “work around the country today” and noted that this document recently received support from the American Distillery Institute, which represents over 1,000 craft producers.
  - (c) Finally, Mr. Harrison referenced the Age Verification document he provided, stating that it removes much of the public safety concerns around underage persons getting access to alcohol.
- (15) Michael Walker, *America Crafts Spirits Association*
- (a) Mr. Walker expressed the opinion that consumers want direct-to-consumer shipping for both beer and spirits; additionally, Mr. Walker stated that distillers need this privilege, as it is an “on-ramp” for distribution. He added that there is an avenue for growth for distilled spirits both within and outside of Colorado, and it’s both a win for tourism and for local agriculture. Additionally, Mr. Walker stated that as brands get bigger, it will help wholesalers and retailers in the long run.



- (16) Austin Adamson, *Ballmer Peak Distillery*
- (a) Mr. Adamson opened his comments by stating he operates a 64-square-foot production facility, and that while his business can produce “a lot” of product, once they reach capacity, they are “stuck” with the inventory. If his business had the ability to ship directly to consumers, he would be able to move product off the shelves and bring in dollars from out-of-state. Mr. Adamson also noted that his business purchases local ingredients whenever possible, and with more money coming in from out of state, his company would be spending it in Colorado and supporting the state’s economy.
  - (b) Additionally, Mr. Adamson stated that the tourism element is “huge” with people who come to Colorado for the craft breweries and craft distilleries, which results in a domino effect of their friends and family back home coming to visit the same place and sharing the experience. Overall, Mr. Adamson stated this would be “huge” for small producers and that he cannot imagine remaining in this industry much longer without this in his arsenal.
- (17) Lenny Eckstein, *Deerhammer Distillery Company*
- (a) Mr. Eckstein agreed with previous comments that direct-to-consumer shipping is already happening in Colorado; however, he added that making it legal would allow his business to hire an employee specifically to handle that aspect of product distribution. Currently, Mr. Eckstein noted that when he approaches out-of-state distributors, he is told that his company is “too small” for them to take on, which prevents him from distributing to other states.
- (18) Bobby Martin, *Mystic Mountain Distillery*
- (a) Mr. Martin shared that his company is currently the largest self-distributing distillery in Colorado, but that he has been turned down by larger distributors. He advocated that this proposal is not “asking for anything new” but instead is looking for the same rights that wineries currently have. For his business, Mr. Martin stated that he would like to be able to compete “as everyone else does.”
  - (b) Presently, Mr. Martin stated that he sends vans to multiple locations across Colorado to deliver his products, with industrial permits to allow his business to ship, industrial solvents that require ID verification and a signature check; he added that the carriers are responsible for the aforementioned and will not leave the product without the verification. Mr. Martin concluded his comments by saying that the reason Proposition 125 [related to third-party delivery] failed is that customers had poor experiences with companies like UberEats.

- This proposal would be more responsible in the practice.
- (19) David Fishing, *Storm King Distilling Company*
- (a) Mr. Fishing stated that in the past year, his business has lost between \$20,000 and \$50,000 on direct-to-consumer sales. His company is a tourist destination and currently does not manufacture enough to attract a distributor or self-distribute. The business has the ability to provide products to people who come in and enjoy the product or brand, but many of these customers live in Denver or in another state and therefore can't get the product locally. Mr. Fishing appealed to the LAg members that many manufacturers came to speak on this proposal and asked that their voices "be heard."
- (20) Steve DeGruccio, *Molly Brown Spirits*
- (a) Mr. DeGruccio expressed sympathy with the concerns about alcohol "getting into the hands of kids" but noted that there is a framework currently in place for wine which addresses these concerns, and this proposal is "simply taking the name 'wine' and adding 'beer and spirits' to it." Mr. DeGruccio stated that this practice is already in effect, already being done, and expressed that it seemed "odd" that the "only argument" here could be from an economical standpoint for wholesalers and retailers. Mr. DeGruccio expressed understanding that wholesalers and retailers need to support their needs but stated that, in his opinion, there was "no basis" to not put direct-to-consumer shipping in place for beer and spirits.
- (21) Steve Findley, *Colorado Beer Distributors Association*
- (a) Mr. Findley had three primary questions to clarify aspects of the proposal:
- (i) Would out-of-state manufacturers be required to obtain this permit?
- (a) The division confirmed that out-of-state manufacturers would be required to obtain the permit.
- (ii) It sounds like there is already "a lot" of illegal shipping going on in the state; how would the state know who has a permit and who doesn't?
- (a) With regard to the parties that are coming from out of state and shipping illegally, the division has limited authority over the companies because they don't hold a license in our state. The division would have to contact the state the companies are in and ask for assistance in taking action on their license because the division doesn't have authority on their license. Alternatively, the division would have to turn to other means in asking for

assistance in taking action against these parties or getting a cease and desist order to them.

- (iii) How would the state notify manufacturers across the country that this permit is required in Colorado?
  - (a) The division would put out a notification, start giving out permits, and hopefully, the information would get out to the other states. Additionally, the division stated it could contact the state liquor administrators in other states so that these states are aware that Colorado requires this permit and companies need to apply for it.
  - (b) Mr. Findley noted that bad actors who are currently shipping illegally probably wouldn't get the permit. The division agreed but noted that this would give the division the ability to talk with other states, once the permit was in effect.
- (22) Audrey Ramsden, *Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of America*
  - (a) Ms. Ramsden voiced opposition to this proposal and echoed support for Ms. Hackenberger's previous comments on the issue. She referenced the comments brought up today regarding illegal alcohol shipments already occurring, which is missed tax revenue for Colorado and compromises the safety of the alcohol industry. Ms. Ramsden stated that if Colorado was going to allow more alcohol shipments into the state, the industry needed to "have a handle" on what is already happening. She added that the WSWA is "all for" supporting greater efforts in enforcement and "cracking down" on illegal shipments, but felt that this was not present in the proposal. She also noted that Colorado does not have a carrier reporting statute.
  - (b) Finally, Ms. Ramsden stated that the idea that direct-to-consumer shipping is gaining momentum across the country is "simply not true" and that it has been "years" since any state legislature adopted new direct-to-consumer privileges.
- (23) Shawnee Adelson, *Colorado Brewers Guild*
  - (a) Ms. Adelson expressed that the Guild is supportive of this proposal and echoed previous comments that this proposal simply asks for what exists in the wine shipping permit to be applied for beer. In reference to some of the public safety concerns, Ms. Adelson noted that the Guild has engaged with UPS on the courier component to address some of these safety concerns. Finally, Ms. Adelson noted that Colorado likes to call itself the "state of craft beer" but is currently seeing fewer breweries than at the beginning of this year. She stated that the

proposal asks for market access in order for breweries to survive and that the Guild is just asking for “where wine is, beer should be.”

(24) Ryan Thompson, *10th Mountain Whiskey*

(a) Mr. Thompson commented that he hasn’t heard comments regarding the increase in jobs that this proposal would bring to each distillery. For his business, Mr. Thompson stated this would allow him to immediately add up to three employees to handle the grid for consumer shipments, and if this proposal was passed, it would prove extremely beneficial for his business and other craft distilleries across the state.

d) Motion

(1) Motion to move the proposal to a vote made by Stephen Gould. Dan Diebolt seconded the motion.

e) Vote

(1) The motion passed with 6 in support, 5 against, and 9 group members abstaining from the vote.

(a) Mr. Andrew Quarm expanded his vote in opposition to the proposal by stating that he felt the industry should spend more time “digging into” what can be done for the local businesses who shared their experiences and perspectives during public comment. Mr. Quarm also noted that if we address direct-to-consumer shipping within the state, we would have to address it outside of the state as well; as was mentioned during the public comment, only eleven states currently allow DTC shipping, so there are complications to consider. Mr. Quarm expressed that the issue was not as simple as “marrying it with wine,” especially given the out-of-state aspect. In conclusion, Mr. Quarm stated that he supported looking into this issue further, but at this time opposed the proposal as put before the LAG.

(b) Mr. Jim Shpall also voted in opposition to the proposal; however, Mr. Shpall spoke to the craft brewers and distillers who shared their concerns and experiences during public comment, stating that they were invited to come speak to local retailers regarding carrying their product.

2. Proposal 34: Common carrier permit for wine products

a) Overview of the Proposal (presented by Jim Shpall)

b) Overview of LAG Discussion

(1) There was overall support for this proposal. It was noted that the creation of this permit allows the Liquor Enforcement Division the ability to ensure that a carrier does not leave the alcohol product at the door and instead adheres to the law, which requires the carrier to ensure that the person receiving the package is the individual who ordered the goods, is of age, and is not intoxicated.

(2) The Liquor Advisory Group members did not have further discussion on this proposal. If any member of the LAG wishes to

provide additional input on this proposal, please email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).

c) Public Comment

(1) Steven Harrison, *Craft Wine Association*

(a) Mr. Harrison voiced his support for the proposal, stating that he has seen it used across the country and through his platform [Vinoshipper]. Mr. Harrison added that his company works extensively with UPS and expressed that this process works well with the carriers submitting the manifests for tracking, after which the state matches the tracking with legal shippers and makes sure the numbers match; if anything doesn't match the carrier reports, the state has the opportunity to contact them and follow up.

(b) Mr. Harrison also noted that New Hampshire has had a system for the common carrier permit in place for over fifteen years, and it is a very successful program.

(2) Micki Hackenberger, *Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of Colorado*

(a) Ms. Hackenberger stated that the WSWC has "long been supportive" of establishing a "very robust" common carrier reporting statute in Colorado that includes alcohol manifests showing delivery, requiring a signature upon delivery, and prohibiting delivery at the door if the recipient is not there.

(b) Ms. Hackenberger added that the WSWC will submit a model guideline for the permit.

(3) No additional public comment was submitted on this proposal. If any member of the public wishes to provide comment or input on this proposal, they may email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).

d) Motion

(1) Motion to move the proposal to a vote made by Jim Shpall. Stephen Gould and Andrew Quarm simultaneously seconded the motion.

e) [Vote](#)

(1) No dissenting votes were recorded on the motion. One member abstained from the vote.

(2) Motion passed.

3. Proposal 35: Give authority to the LED to address illegal out-of-state shipments of alcohol products

a) Overview of the Proposal (presented by Jim Shpall)

b) Overview of LAG Discussion

(1) The Liquor Advisory Group members did not have a discussion on this proposal. If any member of the LAG wishes to provide additional input on this proposal, please email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).

c) Public Comment

(1) No public comment was submitted on this proposal. If any member of the public wishes to provide comment or input on this

proposal, they may email the division at [dor\\_led\\_rulemaking@state.co.us](mailto:dor_led_rulemaking@state.co.us).

d) Motion

- (1) Motion to move the proposal to a vote made by Jim Shpall. Andrew Quarm seconded the motion.

e) [Vote](#)

- (1) No dissenting votes were recorded on the motion. No members abstained from the vote.
- (2) Motion passed.

VII. Action Items

- A. All members of the Liquor Advisory Group are requested to attend the next meeting if possible. During this meeting, the group members will review and discuss the final report.
- B. The October meeting will be held on **October 30, 2023, from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.** The meeting location will be at *1881 Pierce Street, Room 110, Lakewood 80214*. Members who are attending in person should enter the building through the northwest door to access the meeting room.

**Upcoming LAG meetings:**

October 30, 2023, from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

## Appendix: Voting Record

---



---

### Proposal 26: Amendment to 44-3-419 Arts License

**Voting Results: The motion passed**

The motion passed with no dissenting votes recorded. No group members abstained from a vote.

---

### Proposal 27: Catering License

**Voting Results: The motion passed with consensus**

The motion passed with two dissenting votes recorded. One group member abstained from a vote.

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

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



---

**Proposal 28: Amendment to requirement for public hearing for new license applications**

**Voting Results: The motion passed**

The motion passed with no dissenting votes recorded. No group members abstained from a vote.

---

**Proposal 29: Removal of all state and local fee amounts and fee caps from statutory language**

**Voting Results: The motion passed**

The motion passed with no dissenting votes recorded. 8 group members abstained from a vote.

VOTER NAME	Removal of state/local fee amounts & fee caps from statute		
	Yes	No	Abstain
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>			
Andrew Palmquist <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	ABSENT		
Andrew Quarm <i>National Wholesaler</i>			
Andryn Arithson <i>Arts Licensee</i>			X
Anne Huffsmith <i>National Vinous Manufacturer</i>			
Bob Hunt <i>Brewery (Large)</i>	PROXY		
Colleen Norton <i>Colorado Municipal Clerks Association</i>	ABSENT		
Dan Diebolt <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>			X
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>			
Dave Hayes <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>	ABSENT		
Don Strasburg <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	PROXY		
Edward Cooper <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>			X
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>			X

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

---

**Proposal 30: Increased processing timeline for Retail Establishment Permit applications**

**Voting Results: The motion passed**

The motion passed with no dissenting votes recorded. No group members abstained from a vote.

**Proposal 32: Purchase of Inventory**

**Voting Results: The motion passed**

The motion passed with no dissenting votes recorded. Two group members abstained from a vote.

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

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

---

**Proposal 33: Direct-to-consumer shipping for beer and distilled spirits with courier permit for delivery of products**

**Voting Results: The motion passed without consensus**

The motion passed with 6 in support, 5 against, and 9 group members abstaining from a vote.

VOTER NAME	DTC Shipping for Beer/Spirits w/ Courier Permit		
	Yes	No	Abstain
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	ABSENT		
Andrew Palmquist <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	ABSENT		
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>	ABSENT		
Dan Diebolt <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>	X		
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>			X
Dave Hayes <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>	ABSENT		
Don Strasburg <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	PROXY		
Edward Cooper <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>		X	
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>	X		
Erika Zierke <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>			X
F. Seyoum Tesfaye <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Small)</i>	ABSENT		
Fran Lanzer <i>MADD</i>			X
Fuad Jezzini <i>Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituous)</i>	ABSENT		
Gonazlo Mirich <i>Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer</i>		X	
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 <i>Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce</i>	ABSENT		
Marc Snowden <i>County Sheriffs of Colorado</i>	ABSENT		
Sara Siedsma <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>	ABSENT		
Sarah Morgan <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	ABSENT		
Stephen Gould <i>Local Spirituous Manufacturer</i>	X		
Tara Olson <i>Colorado Municipal League</i>			X
Veronica Ramos <i>Minority Owned On-Premises Retailer</i>	X		
W.J. Haskins <i>Law Enforcement Representative</i>	ABSENT		
Yetta Vorobik <i>Wholesaler (Malt)</i>			X
Vacant <i>Colorado County Inc.</i>			

---

**Proposal 34: Common carrier permit for wine direct shipping**

**Voting Results: The motion passed**

The motion passed with no dissenting votes recorded. One group member abstained from the vote.

VOTER NAME	Common Carrier Permit for Wine DTC		
	Yes	No	Abstain
Andrew Feinstein <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	ABSENT		
Andrew Palmquist <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>	ABSENT		

Andrew Quarm <i>National Wholesaler</i>			
Andryn Arithson <i>Arts Licensee</i>			
Anne Huffsmith <i>National Vinous Manufacturer</i>			
Bob Hunt <i>Brewery (Large)</i>			
Colleen Norton <i>Colorado Municipal Clerks Association</i>	ABSENT		
Dan Diebolt <i>Local Brewery (Small)</i>			
Dana Faulk Query <i>Restaurant Licensee</i>			
Dave Hayes <i>Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police</i>	ABSENT		
Don Strasburg <i>Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue</i>	PROXY		
Edward Cooper <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>			
Eric Foster <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>			
Erika Zierke <i>Hard Cider Industry</i>			X
F. Seyoum Tesfaye <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Small)</i>	ABSENT		
Fran Lanzer <i>MADD</i>			
Fuad Jezzini <i>Wholesaler (Vinous/Spirituos)</i>	ABSENT		
Gonazlo Mirich <i>Minority Owned Off-Premises Retailer</i>			
Jim Shpall <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Medium)</i>			
Joseph Dirnberger <i>Colorado State Patrol</i>			
Joseph Durso <i>National Spirituous Manufacturer</i>			
Juliann Adams <i>Local Vinous Manufacturer</i>			
Kris Staaf <i>Off-Premises Retailer (Large)</i>			

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

---

**Proposal 35: Give authority to the LED to address illegal out-of-state shipments of alcohol products**

**Voting Results: The motion passed**

The motion passed with no dissenting votes recorded. No group members abstained from a vote.