

Advisory Committee on Medical Marijuana Scoring

Tuesday, May 14, 2019

4:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Truman Building, Fourth Floor

Room 494

Advisory Committee Members Present

Kim Grinston, DIFP – State of Missouri Executive Branch Member

Eric Hueste, DHSS – State of Missouri Executive Branch Member

Ken Palermo, DHSS – State of Missouri Executive Branch Member

Mike Halford, DPS – State of Missouri Executive Branch Member

Alan Spell, DED – State of Missouri Executive Branch Member

Kelly Dyer – Public Member

Hwei Ying Johnson – Public Member

Department Staff Present

Lyndall Fraker, Section for Medical Marijuana Regulation, DHSS

Richard Moore, General Counsel, DHSS

Steve Doerhoff, Legal Counsel, DHSS

Patti Hageman, Legal Counsel DHSS

Lyndall Fraker, the Director of the Section for Medical Marijuana Regulation, Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services (“DHSS”), opened the meeting and introduced the committee members present.

Richard Moore, General Counsel, reported that the Department provided the committee members with five documents. The Department is going to be asking the committee members to review the evaluation criteria. Next, committee members will be asked to review the questions and discuss which questions apply to the various applicants and what scale will be used to score the question. The committee members will also be asked about the weights within the topic. Finally, the committee members will review the topic weights in coordination with the ten constitutional topics.

Richard Moore asked the committee members to start with the Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table. He reported that there are four levels of points that can be awarded on the zero to ten scale. Additionally, there are two levels of points that can be awarded on a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory scale, a Yes/No scale, and No/Yes scale, depending on which is more appropriate. Richard Moore asked the committee members about their thoughts on the scoring table. There was a consensus among committee members to accept the Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table.

Richard Moore then asked the committee to review the questions when applied to the scoring scale and the weight within the topic. He reported that this is a listing of all ten committees' recommendations. The Department then took the importance level, as decided by the committee members, and the weight within the topic category. Richard Moore asked if committee members had any changes or questions about the document. A committee member reported that she has amendments that she would like to discuss. The committee member, Hwei Ying Johnson, on behalf of herself and Paul Bailey, presented the proposed changes to the committee members. It was recommended that changes be made to Questions 97 and 98 by increasing the weight of the two questions from three to eight.

Question 97:

Describe the design and capacity/size of your proposed cultivation facility.

Hwei Ying Johnson made the motion for the change of weight from three to eight but there was not a second and the motion failed. Question 97 will remain at a weight of three.

Question 98:

Describe the technology to be used in growing medical marijuana in your proposed cultivation facility.

Hwei Ying Johnson made the motion for the change of weight from three to eight and it was seconded, followed by committee consensus. The weight within the topic for Question 98 is an eight.

It was reported that Hwei Ying Johnson would like to increase the weight on Question 99 from four to five.

Question 99:

Describe your plan for good agricultural practices (GAP), including any certifications.

Hwei Ying Johnson made the motion for the change and it was seconded, followed by committee consensus. The weight within the topic for Question 99 is a five.

Hwei Ying Johnson reported that they would like to add one more question, similar to that of Question 116, about waste management. Richard Moore clarified that Paul Bailey was also on the Advisory Committee on Cultivation Facility Experience and that Paul Bailey and Hwei Ying Johnson would make up two-thirds of that committee. He asked the committee that if they choose to make the addition of waste management, that it be the same as Question 116 or that they change Question 116 to reflect the language of the new question.

Question 116:

Describe your plans for waste storage and destruction.

New Question 1:

Describe your plans for waste management and waste nutrient recycling.

Hwei Ying Johnson reported that she believes the question should be added to protect our environment and preserve our natural resources. Richard Moore reported that the rules include discarding and disposal of waste and that applicants will have to comply with all state and federal rules and regulations. He reported that there are minimum requirements on this topic. After committee discussion on the addition of the question, Richard Moore inquired about combining the proposed new question and Question 116 and adding it after Question 100, to the cultivation category.

New Question 1 as amended:

Describe your plans for waste storage, waste management, waste nutrient recycling and destruction.

There was committee consensus to accept question as amended. There was also committee consensus to keep the zero to ten scale for the question and a weight of seven for the weight within the topic.

Question 116 as amended:

Describe your plans for waste storage, waste management, waste nutrient recycling and destruction.

There was committee consensus to change the language of Question 116 to reflect the language of the added question. The committee agreed that the weight of Question 116, which was previously eight, should be changed to mirror the added question. There was committee consensus to change the weight of the question to seven.

Committee consensus to accept the questions, the “applies to” column, the scoring scale, and the weight within topic.

Richard Moore next asked the committee members to review two charts regarding the weights of the topics and the ten constitutional topics. Hwei Ying Johnson recommended changing the weights of the four highlighted topics from 0.2 to 0.3. She made the motion, but there was not a second and the motion failed.

Committee consensus to accept the topic weights as recommended and presented by the Department.

Lyndall Fraker closed the meeting.