

**Testimony for Submission to the Vermont House Committee on Government Operations and Military Affairs**  
**Regarding S-0278 – An Act Relating to Cannabis**  
**Date: May 04, 2026**

**Testimony in Strong Support of Key Provisions of S-0278**

Honorable Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Brad Macrae, and I am one of the owner/operators of Sunkissed farm, a licensed Vermont cannabis business employing 14 people. I am writing today in **strong support** of several important provisions in S-0278.

**Increasing the personal possession limit to two ounces** is a common-sense update that aligns Vermont with neighboring states. This change would help make our retailers more competitive so that we don't lose customers who want to purchase larger amounts to other states. We are already challenged and hear every week about customers traveling to other states that are not as restrictive, hurting our business.

**The creation of cannabis event permits** is one of the most exciting and forward-looking parts of this bill. Events like cannabis festivals, educational tastings, and consumption lounges have proven to be major economic drivers and tourism magnets in other states. I urge the Committee to **expand and strengthen** this section by keeping costs low, streamlining the application process, and making it as easy as possible for licensed businesses to participate. Normalizing cannabis events the same way we treat beer festivals, wine tastings, and food events will deliver a significant economic boon to Vermont's tourism economy and rural communities.

**Reducing outdoor cultivator tier fees** (Section 10a) is critically important. Many small and mid-sized outdoor cultivators are still struggling to achieve profitability. These fee reductions will help keep businesses solvent, preserve Vermont's reputation for high-quality outdoor cannabis, and support family farms across the state.

Finally, **making employee licenses biennial instead of annual** (Section 13) is a practical and welcome change that reduces administrative burden and cost for both employees and employers without compromising safety or oversight.

These provisions together represent a thoughtful evolution of Vermont's cannabis program that prioritizes economic growth, tourism, and regulatory fairness. I respectfully ask the Committee to support these sections and advance S-0278 with the positive changes intact.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brad Macrae  
Sunkissed Farms  
Windsor, VT

## **Testimony Opposing the Delivery Permit Provisions as Currently Written (Section 6)**

Honorable Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Brad Macrae, and I am one of the owner/operators of Sunkissed farm, a licensed Vermont cannabis business employing 14 people. While I support many parts of S-0278, I must **oppose the delivery permit provisions** in their current form (new 7 V.S.A. § 913).

Allowing only cultivators and manufacturers to obtain delivery permits — while **excluding retailers** — is fundamentally **anti-competitive**. This structure gives a small group of license holders an exclusive advantage in last-mile delivery, the most consumer-facing and profitable part of the supply chain. It will hurt existing retail businesses that have invested heavily in storefronts, staff, and compliance, while preventing retailers from participating on equal footing.

This approach does not create a level playing field. It concentrates market power, reduces consumer choice, and disadvantages the very businesses that have been the public face of Vermont's regulated cannabis program since legalization. A more equitable model would either allow all license types to deliver or create a separate, open delivery license category available to any compliant business.

I urge the Committee to **amend or remove** the delivery section unless it is revised to ensure fair and equal participation across the industry.

Thank you for your attention to this important concern.

Respectfully,  
Brad Macrae  
Sunkissed Farms  
Windsor, VT

## Testimony Regarding the Local Control Commission Provisions (Section 11)

Honorable Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Brad Macrae, and I am one of the owner/operators of Sunkissed farm, a licensed Vermont cannabis business employing 14 people. I have serious concerns about the local control commission provisions in Section 11 of S-0278.

While I support the principle of local input, the current framework makes an already difficult and restrictive process even more anti-competitive. Requiring businesses to obtain both a state license **and** a separate local control license — with no fee cap and the ability for towns to impose additional conditions — adds another layer of bureaucracy, cost, and uncertainty.

Many towns already make it extremely difficult for cannabis businesses to open through lengthy zoning processes, public hearings, and restrictive ordinances. Creating a new local control commission with broad authority to condition, suspend, or revoke licenses will further discourage investment, slow growth, and give municipalities tools to effectively block businesses they don't like — even when state law permits them.

I respectfully ask the Committee to **simplify or remove** the local control license requirement, or at minimum place clear limits on what conditions towns may impose and ensure the process is transparent, timely, and not duplicative of state licensing.

Vermont's cannabis industry needs regulatory certainty and a fair path to market — not additional barriers that favor well-connected operators over new and small businesses.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Macrae  
Sunkissed Farms  
Windsor, VT