

CANNABIS CONTROL COMMISSION

November 6, 2025

10:00 AM

**In-Person at Cannabis Control Commission, Second Floor Public Meeting Room,
Worcester Union Station, 2 Washington Square, Worcester and with Remote Access via
[Microsoft Teams Live*](#)**

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

Documents:

- [Meeting Packet](#)
- October 9, 2025, 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.00 Draft Social Consumption Regulations.

In Attendance:

- Chair Shannon O'Brien
- Commissioner Kimberly Roy
- Commissioner Bruce Stebbins

Minutes:

- I. Call to Order
 - The Chair recognized a quorum and called the meeting to order.
 - The Chair gave notice that the meeting is being recorded.
 - The Chair gave an overview of the agenda.
- II. Commissioners' Comments & Updates – 00:01:09
 - There were no comments or updates by Commissioners.
- III. Commission Discussion and Votes – 00:01:19
 1. Discussion and Review of Draft Regulations and Policy Questions
 - Associate General Counsel Erica Bruno (AGC Bruno) began the discussion of the proposed draft Social Consumption (SC) regulations, starting with material at 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.050(6)(g). The Chair observed that instead of 60 months, the period could preferably be 36 months to be consistent with other social equity Licenses. Commissioner Stebbins explained the rationale behind 60 months with the example of people taking out home equity loans for financing. Commissioner Roy



concurred with the Chair's analysis citing how access and opportunity would be promoted. The Chair commented that unlike previous Licenses, exclusivity analysis would now be conducted in real time, and that the 36 months could always be extended in the future. The conversation shifted to when the time period would begin, either at the time of the first SC business opening or starting with the commencement of the third or fifth business. Executive Director Travis Ahern (ED) discussed some of the future steps once the SC regulations were passed, starting with budgeting issues and steps involving setting up the working groups for implementation. Consensus began forming around 36 months, with commence dates for each discrete License type. The Chair and the ED endorsed the necessity of real time data collection and review. Deputy General Counsel Michael Baker (DGC Baker) suggested that a time frame be used for real time updates, and the Chair proposed 6-month interval updates. Consensus was reached on requiring reporting every six months. AGC Bruno directed attention to material on 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.050(6)(f)3.e., requiring the number of events in each municipality for each year, and the notice and submission of plans requirements. The Chair compared the language favorably to existing Alcoholic Beverages Control Commission (ABCC) regulations, and Commissioner Stebbins offered one minor amendment to reflect the two-step approval from the Commission as well as the municipality. AGC Bruno directed attention to 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.050(6)(f)3.f.5. and read the proposed amendments. The Chair requested clarity on how the public safety briefings would be conducted and Commissioner Roy expressed that it appeared that the briefings might not be mandated. AGC Bruno agreed that the language could be more specific to specify that briefings shall be conducted with law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical services and may be conducted jointly or individually but must involve all three. The ED pointed out that some flexibility is built in to allow for the differing needs of different municipalities. AGC Bruno reviewed specifics required for the briefings, such as the information presented and who received it. AGC Bruno summarized individual sections and Commissioner Roy offered an amendment to add "point of sale" to the site plan requirement language. Commissioners Roy and Stebbins proposed merging the event plan and the pre-event public safety report into one standard form, so public safety considerations are addressed in one place and also easier for the Licensing team if there is a standardized form. AGC Bruno related input from police chiefs that they want more involvement before event plan is submitted to Commission.

- Commissioner Roy moved to take a recess returning at 11:25 AM.
- Commissioner Stebbins seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
 - Commissioner Roy – Yes
 - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
 - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion.
- The Commission took a brief recess. (Returned at 01:25:32.)



- AGC Bruno resumed the discussion on the proposed event form template and then shifted the discussion to proposed language on 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.050(6)(f)3.b. added the word “Marijuana” to the language regarding Host Community Agreements (HCAs) which was inadvertently omitted from prior draft. Discussion turned to the requirement for the event diagram, with a detailed delineation of what the diagram would contain, adding the requirement to show service areas. Commissioner Roy asked about waste, and AGC Bruno explained this requirement only addresses the diagram of the event space. She added there needed to be a policy regarding how waste would be addressed but wouldn’t necessarily be reflected on the event diagram. The ED described how Detroit handled waste issues, namely that the retailer of origin handles the waste so product would not be wasted on site, it would be transported back to the retailer. Commissioner Roy clarified, seeking information on where receptacles would be located and where they would appear on the diagram, for example ashtrays and flame retardant receptacles for smoking materials. AGC Bruno shifted to material around the requirements for all Social Consumption Establishments (SCEs). AGC Bruno read language from 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.050(6)(f)3.i., with the change designed to spell out that only Licensees licensed to sell to Consumers, as opposed to business-to-business, can sell at a temporary consumption event, excluding a Licensee such as a third-party transporter. DGC Baker explained why retailers have more expertise in selling to Consumers, so they function as subcontractors at events for an Event Organizer. Commissioner Stebbins sought clarification for, for example, an outdoor Cultivator that was granted a SC License and thus would be licensed by the Commissioner to sell to Consumers. Commissioner Roy pointed out that anyone licensed to sell to Consumers could participate in these temporary consumption events, including but not limited to equity Licensees. As the discussion evolved, it was suggested that the language be reviewed by the Legal department to ensure that the clause could be universally understood.
- AGC Bruno read the proposed language from subsection (t) stating that a Marijuana Event Organizer is not required, for a temporary event, to install an alarm system. Commissioner Roy proposed to specify that they still must provide a security plan, so there is no abdication of security, just not a full alarm system.
- AGC Bruno went on to 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.105(2)(b)8. concerning additional requirements for Responsible Vendor Training (RVT). There was discussion around confirming that all employees at a SC event would need to complete RVT, not only the point of contact.
- Starting at 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.110(1)(l), AGC Bruno read some minor legal amendments. AGC Bruno referred to provisions in the regulations, consistent with Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), for keeping smoking/combustion consumption out of plain sight. Commissioner Stebbins asked about other regulations and procedures regarding safeguards for indoor smoking which already require solid walls and concealed views through windows. The language is intended to capture both smoking and non-smoking social consumption sites, as the sale and storage as



- well as combustion consumption must be out of plain sight. Commissioners also raised the issue of buffer zones; municipalities will have local oversight on that issue.
- Pertaining to 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.141(3)(b)1., AGC Bruno read proposed serving limits, starting with point of service limits. There was discussion about conversion between flower and edibles, and the ability to purchase up to the limits that could be purchased by an individual at retail. DGC Baker and Commissioner Roy clarified limits by converting grams into ounces. A question was asked whether a person can purchase the 3.5 gram service limit and then right away purchase another, up to the daily limit, as well as the cost and tax implications of making multiple smaller transactions as opposed to purchasing more at once. DGC Baker explained that under the proposed language a Consumer could purchase up to the daily limit but only take a portion of it back to their seat. The Chair analogized to purchasing a bottle of wine at a bar and don't drink it all at once but can pour a second glass. AGC Bruno explained that in this proposed model, the Consumer would need to go back up to the bar to get more of their purchased product. Concerns were raised about who is responsible for purchased product that is not being held by the Consumer, and liability.
 - Commissioner Roy moved to take a recess returning at 1:30 PM.
 - Commissioner Stebbins seconded the motion.
 - The Chair took a roll call vote:
 - Commissioner Roy – Yes
 - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
 - Chair O'Brien – Yes
 - The Commission unanimously approved the motion.
 - The Commission took a brief recess. (Returned at 03:37:52.)
 - The Commission continued discussion about point of service limits under 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.141(3), and AGC Bruno explained changes that Legal had considered during the recess to address some of the concerns previously addressed, including potentially increasing the amount a Consumer could take with them at one time up to half of the daily sales limit. A question was asked about what happens to an amount that is served and then not consumed and it was noted there is both a hospitality and a public safety component. Commissioner Roy pointed out that once a product is purchased, it is no longer in the Seed-to-Sale system so there is a practicality about tracking sold product that is not being held by the Consumer and a lot of considerations and unintended consequences, as well as enforcement challenges.
 - Commissioner Roy moved to take a recess returning at 2:00 PM.
 - Commissioner Stebbins seconded the motion.
 - The Chair took a roll call vote:
 - Commissioner Roy – Yes
 - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes



- Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion.
- The Commission took a brief recess. (Returned at 03:54:06.)
- Commissioner Roy mentioned the lack of seed-to-sale tracking and time limits not being set forth for someone purchasing and then going back to make a new purchase. She extended her concerns to storage and wasting issues. Enforcement Counsel Timothy Goodin (EC Goodin) mentioned issues once products were taken out of Metrc. He also explained how re-entering products into Metrc would be handled and that it can be done. He explained that when a Consumer pre-ordered a product, it was not actually finalized until the Consumer picks it up in store. DGC Baker opined that the processes surrounding pre-orders, which by nature is pre-paid, with EC Goodin extending the discussion explaining the process for product that has been paid for but not picked up at the end of the night, re-entering in Metrc and wasting the product. Approaches to SC purchasing and an example of a budtender handing only some of the daily allotment, while retaining the rest, at least temporarily, was mentioned. Commissioner Stebbins also raised the possibility of someone who did not consume all their product at the event, having the option of leaving the event, after it was properly bagged, with what product that they had remaining. Commissioner Roy expressed her concerns around the need for no gray space, around product coming out of Metrc. AGC Bruno provided clarity regarding what an open bill entailed, with DGC Baker stating that a tab would be for one individual. There was analogy to a “two-beer rule” for sporting events where you can only take a certain amount back to your seat but can go back and purchase more. The problem of selling product that has left Metrc and not in the possession of the consumer was raised and concerns about tracking, storage, and diversion. An option would be for some of the sold product to be packed up and sealed but given to the consumer. Concern that the way the regulation is currently drafted has compliance and enforcement challenges and needs further consideration. Chief of Investigations and Enforcement Nomxolisi Jones (Chief Jones) was recognized and expressed concerns about diversion and challenges with “doggy bags”; it would be better from an enforcement standpoint for consumers to make the smaller purchase and go back for another purchase, in smaller quantities. Commissioner Roy expressed frustration with the concept of spacing out of the services.
- The Chair suggested that the discussion be shifted to a new topic, at which time AGC Bruno read 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.141(4)(a)2.b., about displaying the Consumer information card, to address a senator’s concern conveyed during public comment to add a warning that consumption may cause potential psychosis. AGC Bruno then moved to 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.141(4)(f), which she read jointly with subsection (j), which addressed sales after an event ended, and if sales of Cannabis should be tied to the end of an event, comparing the issue to movie theaters staying open past the time it could serve concessions.
- Commissioner Roy moved to take a recess returning at 3:00 PM.



- Commissioner Stebbins seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
 - Commissioner Roy – Yes
 - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
 - Chair O’Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion.
- The Commission took a brief recess. (Returned at 05:05:44.)

IV. Public Listening Session Regarding Disproportionately Impacted Areas

- The Chair rendered her comments and instructions regarding the conduct of the Public Listening Session.
- The first speaker was Kevin Gilnack from Equitable Opportunities Now (EON). He commented upon the need to obtain better and less skewed data regarding over-policing and persistent negative impacts on communities impacted negatively on the war on drugs. He cited omissions of three neighborhoods excluded in Boston, mentioning the Forest Hills neighborhood, and also addressed Tier 2 and the need for enhanced reporting therein. The Chair looked forward to the social justice Commissioner seat being filled and many equity issues be adequately addressed.
- The next speaker was Alfredo Johnson. He advocated for positive Disproportionately Impacted Areas (DIA) consideration for his former Vernon Hill neighborhood, where he wished to further achieve his goals as a Cultivator.
- The next speaker was Grant Smith-Ellis. He advocated for remote testimony at future listening sessions. He also questioned why the Donahue Report findings had not been adopted and also cited the work of Chief of Research Julie Johnson (Chief Johnson). He raised substantive constitutional concerns going forward when weighing equity.
- The next speaker was Ryan Dominguez from the Massachusetts Cannabis Coalition (MCC). He urged a perspective for grants from the Social Equity Trust Fund, to ensure that the funds are most effectively disbursed. He also urged for more focused and individualized analysis for grants.
- The next speaker was Tito Jackson from Apex Noire. He cited the poor methodology which excluded Lawrence in the past, and then cautioned the methodology based on arrests. He added that disproportionality should be further analyzed through convictions, not simply arrests. He cautioned against extending grant funds to those who were not disproportionately affected by the war on drugs. Commissioners Roy and Stebbins mentioned that Lawrence had not provided the data necessary to render a DIA determination in the past.

V. New Business Not Anticipated at the Time of Posting – 5:49:08

- The Chair stated that there was no new business which was not anticipated at the time of posting.

VI. Next Meeting Date – 5:49:12



- The Chair stated that the next meeting was scheduled for November 7, 2025, with November 18, 2025, mentioned as a tentative date.

VII. Public Listening Session Regarding Disproportionately Impacted Areas (Cont.) – 5:49:48

- The Chair stated they had one more speaker before adjournment.
- The next speaker was Nairobi Sanchez from La Bodeguita. She cited the need to analyze and consider numerous factors such as federal poverty data, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits, public housing units, insurance rates, racial profiling, and the specific needs for services of each DIA. She also mentioned the frustrating example of Lawrence and Revere as DIAs. No towns were mentioned and expanded upon by Commissioner Stebbins. She stated that Lowell was considered a DIA, but its Belvidere Hill neighborhood was a relatively affluent area not historically disproportionately affected by the war on drugs, like the Bradford neighborhood in Haverhill.

VIII. Adjournment – 6:01:47

- Commissioner Stebbins moved to adjourn.
- Commissioner Roy seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
 - Commissioner Roy – Yes
 - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
 - Chair O’Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion.

