



**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

March 2, 2023

<b>Seat</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
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 George Dingfelder <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	Colonel Matthew Packard <i>Colorado State Patrol</i>	Present by Proxy Joe Dirnberger <i>Colorado State Patrol</i>
County Sheriffs of Colorado	Division Chief Todd Reeves <i>Jefferson County Sheriff's Department</i>	Present
Downtown Partnership/Chamber of Commerce	Loren Furman <i>Colorado Chamber of Commerce</i>	Present
Hard Cider Industry	Eric Foster <i>Colorado Cider Guild</i>	Absent
Brewery (Large)	Bob Hunt <i>Molson Coors</i>	Present
Local Brewery (Small)	Karen Hertz <i>Holidaily Brewing</i>	Present
Law Enforcement Representative	Chief W.J. Haskins <i>Glendale Police Department</i>	Present
MADD	Executive Director Fran Lanzer <i>Mothers Against Drunk Driving</i>	Present

<b>Seat</b>	<b>Representative</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Off-Premises Retailer (Large)	Kris Staaf <i>Albertsons Safeway</i>	Present
Off-Premises Retailer (Large)	Jason Bassett <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 by Proxy Nick Hoover <i>Colorado Restaurant Association</i>
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, &amp; RiNo Art District</i>	Absent
Tavern/Large Dance Entertainment Venue	Don Strasburg <i>AEG Presents</i>	Absent
Local Vinous Manufacturer	Juliann Adams <i>Vines 79 Wine Barn</i>	Present by Proxy Sherrie Hamilton <i>Red Fox Cellars</i>

Seat	Representative	Attendance
National Vinous Manufacturer	Anne Huffsmith <i>Nakedwines.com, Inc.</i>	Present
Wholesaler (Malt)	Yetta Vorobik <i>Crooked Stave Artisan Distribution</i>	Present
Wholesaler (Vinous/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 Minutes from February 2, 2023 Meeting
    1. No amendments.
    2. Motion to adopt by Colleen Norton, seconded by Joe Durso.
    3. No objection to approving the minutes.
    4. Minutes are adopted.
- III. Overview of LAG Large Group Meeting and Work Group Reports
  - A. Each of the work groups has met, and the groups respectively put a lot of thought into the issues that were previously identified by the LAG as topics of discussion for the work groups. Today, each of the work groups will report on the discussions they had in those first meetings. Feedback is invited from the other LAG members.
  - B. Keystone facilitators clarify that, as we start introducing recommendations from the work groups to be adopted by the LAG, as a whole, these are preliminary recommendations and will remain preliminary as the work group continues preparing recommendations. These will then be collectively adopted by the group toward the end of the process. Anything that has been marked as a “soft proposal” on the agenda indicates a direction in which the group recommendations may be moving. We are not going to vote on these today.
    1. When we get to the point of making preliminary recommendations, there will be a roll call vote of the entire LAG.
- IV. Regulation of Retail Operations Work Group Report
  - A. Overview of Work Group’s First Meeting (presented by Cally King)
    1. During the first meeting of the Regulation of Retail Operations Work Group, the group primarily focused on extending hours of operation to four a.m. From that discussion came a preliminary proposal of creating a “soft close” or “gentle close” option for operation hours.
  - B. Definition of “Consensus” (presented by Cally King)
    1. The facilitators will use the definition of “consensus” from the [LAG Charter](#); it is defined as general agreement that’s shared by all the people in the group on an optional idea or recommendation, and that all participants can support or abide by

it at a minimum, and to which they do not object. In other words, “consensus” is a recommendation or idea that everyone can live with.

2. The “soft close” option was one that the Retail Operations Work Group reached consensus on.

C. Work Group Preliminary Proposal: The Soft Close

1. Overview of proposal (presented by Cally King)

- a) Liquor service would end at two a.m.; however, patrons would be allowed to stay inside the establishment, finishing their drinks, having some food, or arranging transportation, until four a.m. The goal here is to keep people from flooding into the streets at the same time.
- b) The work group also discussed public safety needs around this proposal; for example, if someone is waiting for a ride (taxi, Uber, or Lyft), they would be able to wait inside instead of out on the streets, especially on cold days.
- c) There are still some guardrails that need to be built around this proposal:
  - (1) If a customer leaves the establishment at two a.m., will they be allowed back inside unless they were stepping out for a cigarette or to make a quick phone call? It was discussed among the group members that this should be a matter of business choice.
  - (2) The work group also discussed putting guardrails in place to prevent people leaving other bars and then trying to come into another establishment after the two a.m. last call.
  - (3) Additional suggestions made around restaurant licensees being able to serve food after the two a.m. last call, with tavern licensees able to serve snacks instead of a full menu.

D. Additional Input from Work Group Members

1. Another potential guardrail that came up during the “soft close” discussion was establishing limits for the amount of alcohol that could be served at the two a.m. last call; for example, to prevent people from ordering twenty shots at one time and then drinking them for the next two hours.

E. Large Group Discussion

1. It was noted that if the LAG were to vote to allow bars and other venues to stay open until four a.m., this is not a mandate to stay open until that specific time. It’s ultimately a matter of business choice. If it doesn’t make sense in certain neighborhoods to stay open until four a.m., businesses likely won’t stay open.

F. Additional Topics Proposed for Work Group Discussion (presented by Cally King)

1. In addition to the already established list of topic areas for the work group to discuss, the group also added a few other topics areas they would like to cover:
  - a) Eliminating the full meal requirement (*Note: it was determined that this falls under the Licensing work group*).
  - b) Allowing the same person to register as a manager for more than one on-premises location.
  - c) Expanding opportunities for off-premises retailers to offer educational classes and tastings to the consumers or public.

G. Next Steps for the Work Group (presented by Cally King)

1. The Retail Operations Work Group will discuss mandatory closure days during the next meeting on March 16.
2. The facilitators will put together an anticipated list of when the work group will discuss specific topics to ensure that the work group addresses all suggested topics within the time frame available.

V. Licensing Work Group Report

A. Work Group Preliminary Proposal: Limit the Number of Licenses

1. Overview of Work Group Discussion (presented by Sarah Morgan)

- a) The Licensing work group agreed that we need to streamline and minimize the number of licenses that we currently have. The initial suggestion was to reduce the number of license types to five:
  - (1) On-Premises
  - (2) Off-Premises
  - (3) Manufacturer/Importer
  - (4) Wholesaler/Packager
  - (5) Special Events/Festivals
- b) From this initial discussion, several comments were raised that perhaps five categories were not enough. Further work group discussion involved whether five license types was the right number, what problems were included with limiting the license types that much, and how to get creative with similar license types.
  - (1) The work group also talked about minor differences between existing license types (e.g., Tavern, Hotel & Restaurant, Beer & Wine) and if these could be consolidated.
- c) The work group members also addressed the full meal requirement for on-premises license types. This led to the following discussions:
  - (1) How to differentiate which license types need a full kitchen (currently satisfied just by having a microwave to heat food up) and which ones need to only provide snacks.
  - (2) What businesses is the full kitchen requirement necessary for?
  - (3) Could businesses choose to serve full meals if it makes sense for their business model? For example, Art licensees and Bed & Breakfast permittees may struggle with a minimum food requirement as they don't have the capacity to support this and aren't in the business of regularly serving food.
    - (a) Also, should these types of licensees retain special or more limited privileges? The work group suggested that these business types should have a permit instead of a license, and the permit would have a time limit instilled and parameters on how it can be used.
  - (4) ABV Differentiation: If a licensee is serving an ABV at 15% or less, they only need to provide snacks; if the ABV is at 15% or more, they would need to have substantive meals available. The

thought is, with a high alcohol content, more substantial food would lessen the effect of the alcohol and using the alcohol percentage as a guide might be a helpful way to determine the food requirement for licensees.

- (5) Should businesses require drink tickets and limit the number of pours/number of drinks allowed per hour if the establishment doesn't have food?
  - (6) Should licensees provide licensing authority with how they address patrons being able to access food, rather than serving it themselves?
- d) The work group discussed where catering fits under a license that allows for serving drinks off-premises. There was a suggestion that current full restaurant license holders could be given special or higher priority for catering licenses because they already have experience with liquor service and staff certified via responsible vendor training. For on-premises license holders, the group also discussed if a structure could be created where, once a licensee has been approved by the state as a responsible alcohol vendor, they could gain access to different permit types such as the Special Event Permit.
2. Overview of Preliminary Proposal (presented by Sarah Morgan)
- a) The work group discussed potential licensing categories within On-Premises license types. Topics and items for consideration that arose out of this discussion are as follows:
    - (1) Retail
      - (a) Could we create a general on-premises retail license?
      - (b) Could Tavern, Hotel & Restaurant, Pub licenses be consolidated?
        - (i) The group discussed combining brew pubs, vintner's restaurants, and distillery pubs, with concern raised on how LED would know which kind(s) of alcohol the combined "pub license" would be manufacturing. A suggested resolution to that is for the applicant to put this on their license application (similar to Special Event Permits).
        - (ii) Additional concerns were raised about the different production limits that currently apply to each of these license types.
    - (2) Art & Entertainment
      - (a) The work group members were unsure if there was a significant difference between Lodging & Entertainment and/or Hotel & Restaurant, outside of the Bed & Breakfast license type.

(b) The group thought Festivals and Special Event Permits could be included under this category. However, some concern was expressed that these should be separate instead because they are temporary in nature.

(3) Lodging

(4) Permits

(a) Could permits be reframed as complementary parties that aren't really in the business like Bed & Breakfast licenses or Art Gallery licenses?

(b) There was a discussion about whether Bed & Breakfast permits should be allowed to provide unlimited days of four-hour complimentary drink service instead of applying for a Hotel & Restaurant license?

#### B. Additional Input from Work Group Members

1. Clarification provided by the facilitators and the LED that it's fine for the work groups to write new language around the preliminary proposals, with the understanding that OLLS may adjust it later. Additionally, when drafting these preliminary proposals the group should remember the three guiding principles: modernization of the code, consumer standpoint, and public safety.

a) In terms of the Licensing work group, it's a combination of looking at what currently exists and reviewing it for what needs to be clarified/streamlined while keeping those three principles in mind.

2. Facilitators also discussed some guiding principles that came out of the Licensing work group discussion:

a) Local needs and desires in consolidating certain license types;

b) Consumer safety;

c) Careful consideration of the privileges and restrictions currently embedded within each license type, that these won't be lost during consolidation;

d) Factoring in the type of alcohol in relation to the license type and the requirements associated therein, especially regarding food; and

e) Enforceability of recommended changes to the code and/or rules.

#### C. Large Group Discussion

1. There was some discussion among the group about using the alcohol percentage as a guide to determine the food requirement; initially, this recommendation came from the perspectives of festivals and art galleries. Specifically from an arts licensee view, it was noted that any restrictions on serving mixed cocktails would impede the licensee's ability to accommodate special requests (e.g., serving a certain kind of vodka) from patrons. Also, the nature of these events doesn't mesh with high drinking levels and there are safeguards currently in place that fit with the business type.

a) It was proposed that the full meal requirement maybe should be tied to population density instead. For example, if there are twenty different

restaurants in the same neighborhood that serve full meals, adding another one may be unnecessary.

2. The group also covered the idea of consolidating and streamlining the different license types. While the Licensing work group didn't necessarily drill down into the specifics around this process yet, future work group meetings will likely focus on several elements of this process, including but not limited to:
  - a) The distinctions between the different license types, keeping in mind what will or could be affected by consolidation.
  - b) The innate privileges for each license or permit type and how those could be potentially affected.
  - c) What sanctions will be impacted.
3. Some concerns were raised around the consolidating/streamlining process, including:
  - a) Adding multiple restrictions could result in a lot of details embedded within the liquor code that can't be properly enforced.
  - b) Streamlining or reducing the number of license types for the sake of limiting confusion about what license type works best for a specific business model, keeping in mind what the rules are and what privileges come with that license.
    - (1) An example offered was based on a model in Oregon: the only difference between Hotel & Restaurant and Tavern licenses is the mini bar permit. If that was removed, three licenses could possibly be consolidated into a "full on-premises license."
    - (2) It was also noted that Texas is currently chipping away at the number of their license types to reduce complexity in the industry.
4. It was previously suggested that the group could look at reducing the number of licenses but include add-ons. This might be a way to streamline and avoid confusion while still allowing the group to address nuances and other elements, depending on what works for the business and the business location.
  - a) For example, making a cabaret license into an add-on for an on-premises license.

#### D. Next Steps for the Work Group

1. The facilitators will work on developing a general schedule of when the work group will be discussing specific topics.
2. The LED is currently compiling a state survey comparing number of license types to what we currently have in Colorado. This will focus on dual-licensing states, but general numbers will be provided for control states as well.

#### E. Additional Topics Proposed for Work Group Discussion

1. The processes around applying for a license and renewing a license; for example, is there a way to automatically renew multiple licenses unless there is an issue with the license? (*Note: this is currently on the list for the work group to review at a future meeting.*)

## VI. Marketplace Structure Work Group Report



- A. Work Group Preliminary Proposal: Direct to Consumer Shipping for Beer and Spirits
  - 1. Overview of Preliminary Proposal (presented by Renny Fagan)
    - a) Proposition was, essentially, to allow breweries and distilleries to do what wineries already can. The discussion included being aware of interstate commerce laws, that we cannot favor in-state commerce over intrastate commerce, and how this would change the marketplace (e.g., would retail stores have shipping rights?).
    - b) Some subsidiary topics for consideration and further discussion included:
      - (1) Delivery vehicle(s) for direct shipments;
      - (2) Common carrier requirements;
      - (3) Underage drinking; and
      - (4) Counterfeit products.
    - c) Work group members also discussed other states that do allow direct shipment of wine, spirits, and malt liquor from manufacturers, and suggested looking into what the experiences have been in those states since passing such legislation.
      - (1) The [2020 law](#) passed in Kentucky (and later [amended in 2021](#)) was referenced as an example.
    - d) The work group agreed that this topic needs to be discussed further before a preliminary proposal can be officially brought to the group.
  - 2. Topics for Future Marketplace Work Group Discussion and Review:
    - a) There are other issues related to the marketplace structure involving spirits, wine, and beer that are not as “global” as the subject of direct-to-consumer shipping. These include:
      - (1) Differences in tasting salesrooms;
      - (2) Onsite storage limitations;
      - (3) Limits on brewery franchises;
      - (4) Non continuous production;
      - (5) Responsibilities of common carriers/deliverers; and
      - (6) Equity in pricing.
    - b) These subjects are planned for discussion in upcoming work group meetings. The general idea for the early stages was to start with a “big picture” approach on structural framework and change.
    - c) There has been a lot of spoken support for the current three tier system; one recommendation is for the LAG to look at ways in which the system can be improved without substantial changes.
- B. Additional Input from Work Group Members
  - 1. There was some disagreement among the work group members as to the DTC privileges currently allowed to wineries, and therefore what could be made available to breweries and distilleries. Additionally, there was some disagreement around the data regarding increased risk of underage receipt from alcohol delivery.
    - a) If the group moved forward with their recommendation, it was discussed that a fail-safe process around courier responsibility and underage receipt of deliveries would need to be in place first.

2. Some specific concerns around this were as follows:
  - a) Retailers may be left out of this option.
  - b) Direct-to-consumer shipping for breweries and distilleries is a nationwide concern; Colorado needs to be able to ship legally to other states.
  - c) There has been an increase in counterfeit alcohol in the states that currently allow DTC for spirits. If the product doesn't go through a wholesaler, who ensures that the product is not counterfeit, this increases the risk.
  - d) LED would have to enforce DTC for spirits, which could result in a profound fiscal impact (estimated \$2.5 million dollar cost, mostly built into seventeen new hires just for enforcement, based on other states).
    - (1) This relates to another prior discussion item of creating a courier license and holding couriers responsible for making sure the alcohol is delivered to the proper individual (i.e., not an underage person).
    - (2) The concerns around enforcement might be addressed by mirroring what is already in place for wineries.
  - e) With Colorado voters not choosing to pass third-party delivery in the 2022 election, the argument was made that this is a clear indication that consumers are not concerned with their level of access to alcohol beverages.
3. Some members feel that direct-to-consumer shipping is not expressly where the work group should be focusing their discussion efforts.

#### C. Large Group Discussion

1. A counter argument arose from the other LAG members that there is an appetite for this kind of evolution in the three-tier system, and the group should be looking at ways to make the existing business model more effective. Additional data on this matter will be presented at the next work group meeting.
2. From the public safety perspective, having research and data to review on this topic would be very helpful.

#### D. Next Steps for the Work Group

1. The work group will take the items from today's discussion to see if there's a possibility for consensus. If not, they will redirect focus to the other items to be addressed.
2. An agenda will be prepared for items that the Marketplace Work Group will discuss moving forward.

### VII. Review of the Work Group Meeting Minutes

#### A. Retail Operations

1. Two amendments were requested:
  - a) Page 2, last paragraph, under "reducing hours": clarify that the discussion was around either keeping the time at two a.m. or making allowance for going to four a.m. There wasn't any serious discussion around reducing hours.
  - b) Page 3, item (d), "alternative options": clarify to say "alternative options to address closing time rush."
2. These amendments were made and the updated meeting minutes posted on the [LAG page](#).

#### B. Licensing

1. No amendments requested by the work group members.

C. Marketplace Structure

1. No amendments requested by the work group members.

VIII. Public Comment

- A. Dominick Lang: As a business owner in rural Colorado, when a consumer comes in looking for a product, it is his practice, as a business owner, to actively go out and look to see where and how this product can be obtained. Haven't yet had trouble obtaining product in rural Colorado; feels that the real issue is finding a retailer who is active in their business. Does not personally support ordering products online.
- B. Dennis Blum: As an interested member of the public, he asked which work group will take up the issue of allowing customers to bring wine into restaurants for a corkage fee. This will be likely addressed in the Regulation of Retail Operations work group.
- C. Audrey Ramsden: Speaking as a representative of the The Wine & Spirits Wholesalers of America, the organization opposes direct-to-consumer shipping for beer and spirits for the following reasons:
  1. Direct shipment increases the risk of underage access to spirits.
  2. Direct shipment increases the likelihood of counterfeit or adulterated products making its way to consumers.
  3. Direct shipment creates numerous oversight issues regarding liability of the producers and shippers.
  4. Direct shipping operates outside of the three-tier system.
  5. Direct shipping increases state tax laws.
    - a) Before the LAG considers expanding direct shipping to other liquor, it is recommended that an audit is conducted to determine whether the current wine direct shipping program is working and whether Colorado is receiving all the taxes that should be paid on direct shipments.
  6. Direct alcohol shipping benefits the largest producers, whose scale allows them to ship most successfully.

IX. Public Email Comments

- A. Steve Findley, Executive Director of the Colorado Beer Distributors Association
  1. Link to [Memorandum](#).
  2. As a representative of the Colorado Beer Distributors and the middle tier, I oppose the concept of expanded direct to consumer (DTC) shipping. Expanded DTC shipping could lead to increases in youth access to alcohol and counterfeit alcohol, as well as create logistical issues involved in shipping beer specifically, and potential interstate commerce clause issues. I have attached a [white paper](#) we produced in conjunction with our national partners outlining these issues.
  3. I'd also like to note that expanded DTC shipping would be a further departure from the three-tier system, syphoning sales from Colorado retailers who can currently deliver direct to consumers under Colorado law. Furthermore, although not directly a DTC expansion as discussed today, Colorado voters just rejected the expanded delivery of alcohol by third parties four months ago, defeating Proposition 126 at the ballot. Colorado's system of alcohol sales and distribution is the envy of almost every other state. Our system provides unmatched access to market for manufacturers of all sizes and almost unlimited choice for our consumers, all while maintaining a safe and well regulated marketplace.

X. Additional Resources Provided by the LAG Members for Further Consideration

A. Karen Hertz (*Holidaily Brewing Co.*)

1. I'm a member of the Liquor Advisory Group and the CEO and Founder of Holidaily Brewing Company. I wanted to provide follow up regarding our meeting today.

a) Brewer's Permits from TTB

(1) It was mentioned during the March 2 LAG meeting that a basic permit issued to wineries carries additional oversight from the TTB requiring them to abide by state laws that is not included in the basic permit issued to breweries. This is false. All permits issued to alcohol producers by the TTB carry the same oversight and risk of action for failure to abide by state law.

b) Underage drinking has not been impacted by DTC

(1) See attached info sheet from the BA. I've pulled a couple of salient points.

(2) Anecdotes should not inform policy. We can point to instances of on and off-premises retailers selling to minors. These do not justify a statewide ban on sales in those channels.

(3) [Monitoring the Future](#) 2021 report found:

(a) Underage drinking has been on a steady decline for over three decades. During that same time, DTC shipping of alcohol, primary wine, expanded rapidly and substantially. In 2000 only 16 states allowed DTC shipping of wine, today 47 do.

(b) In states where DTC shipping is legal, underage drinking has declined at a higher rate.

c) Legislation

(1) As far as we know there have only been three bills that have been introduced in the last couple of years that have addressed direct to consumer shipping for beer. Kentucky has been mentioned numerous times (and passed) so we won't go into detail on that one.

(2) Hawaii introduced legislation that would allow for beer and liquor direct to consumer shipping. This again includes liquor and did not pass.

(3) California is the only state that has introduced direct to consumer shipping legislation that only impacts beer. The goal was to update their current law to be in alignment with the Granholm ruling, which would change their laws to allow out of state producers to ship into California. Currently California breweries can ship within the state.

d) Taxes

(1) Based on the 2022 Sovos ShipCompliant/Wines Vines Analytics DTC wine shipping report, we estimate that Colorado brought in

roughly \$8.5 million in sales and excise taxes from DTC of wine.

<https://sovos.com/shipcompliant/content-library/wine-dtc-report/>

- (2) The Tax Policy Center's data shows that state excise taxes have increased in the era of increased DTC.  
<https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/statistics/state-and-local-alcohol-tax-revenue>
- (3) Allowing for DTC would allow the state to collect taxes on beer that is being illegally shipped into Colorado.
- (4) DTC would increase tax revenue because it would increase sales for small breweries that can't distribute in all corners of the state. There are approximately 450+ small and independent breweries operating in Colorado but only a small percentage can participate in traditional wholesale and retail channels. DTC shipping of beer would allow all small and independent brewers the ability to participate in an expanded marketplace, thereby growing their businesses, hiring more employees, and investing more in their communities, just as wine has benefited for many years through the ability to direct ship.

2. Please let me know if you have any questions and I will be sure to bring this to the next Marketplace Breakout Group.

3. Link to [Direct-to-Consumer Shipping Myths](#).

B. Joseph Durso (*Pernod Ricard*)

1. After careful consideration and several conversations with various stakeholders (non LAG committee members), I am happy to submit a document for the LAG staff and committee to consider regarding DTC shipping. The document provides context around what many stakeholders believe the Governor and state legislators should consider in crafting a piece of legislation intended to modernize Colorado's alcohol industry and marketplace.

2. These are broad strokes and I look forward to a robust debate at the next couple of meetings. In the meantime, I am happy to answer any questions or provide more information as needed.

3. Link to [Colorado LAG Proposal Considerations](#).

XI. Action Items

- A. For future meetings, a member of each work group will be assigned to present the report to the LAG group.

- B. Next meeting: April 6, 2023: 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. *Meeting will be in person at 1707 Cole Boulevard, Suite 300, Lakewood, Colorado.*