



JOE LOMBARDO
Governor

CANNABIS COMPLIANCE BOARD STATE OF NEVADA

ccb.nv.gov
CARSON CITY OFFICE
3850 Arrowhead Drive, Suite 100
Carson City, Nevada 89706
Main Line: (775) 687-6299

LAS VEGAS OFFICE
700 East Warm Springs Road, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

JAMES HUMM
Executive Director

MICHAEL MILES
Deputy Director

ADRIANA GUZMÁN FRALICK
Chair

SMALL BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT AS REQUIRED BY NRS 233B.0608

Nevada Cannabis Compliance Regulations

1. Background

The Cannabis Compliance Board drafted proposed changes to the Nevada Cannabis Compliance Regulations (“NCCR”) 6, 7, 10 and 12 to incorporate changes from the 2025 legislative session, clarify definitions, provide clarity to manufacturing, cultivation and laboratory standards and to provide other matters properly relating thereto.

2. A description of the way comments were solicited from affected small businesses, a summary of their responses, and an explanation of the manner in which other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

On November 5, 2025, the Cannabis Compliance Board (“Agency”) notified the public of the proposed changes and upcoming workshop by posting a notice of workshop, proposed language, and the results of its survey on the CCB website.

Draft language provided proposed changes to the following NCCRs:

- Regulation 6. Production and Distribution of Cannabis
- Regulation 7. Cannabis Sales Facility
- Regulation 10. Minimum Good Manufacturing Practices for Cultivation and Preparation of Cannabis and Cannabis Products for Administration to Humans
- Regulation 12. Packaging and Labeling of Cannabis Products

On October 24, 2025, the CCB sent a thirty-nine-question survey to solicit input and information from small businesses to gauge what impact the proposed language would have on their businesses. This survey closed on November 3.

The survey and a link to the proposed language was distributed via Constant Contact email platform to 10,282 members of the public and members of the cannabis industry and was accessible to the public on the CCB website meeting notices page.

The questionnaire was open for eleven (11) days. During that time, eight (8) people completed the survey. Many respondents did not provide additional comments beyond indicating whether the regulations would have adverse or beneficial effects. Nongermane comments were omitted from the results.

Responses received provided the following major themes:

- Concerns about development of SOP's and training required.
- Concerns that implementing these changes might disproportionately affect laboratory licenses compared to other license types.
- Concern over limited marketing of cannabis products and the interpretation of what is attractive to children.
- Concerns regarding potential confusion between establishments that use different lot sizes.

50% of respondents (4 individuals) identified themselves as owners/officers of cannabis establishments.

75 % of respondents identified as having less than 150 employees.

For each of the Regulation changes – for Regulations 6, 7, 10 and 12, respondents were asked whether the changes would have a direct or indirect adverse impact to their business, a direct or direct beneficial impact on their business, or whether they were “not affected” or “unsure” of the impact on their business. Those results are further detailed by each regulation as follows:

Regulation 6 Adverse Impact

Four respondents (67% of respondents) indicated an adverse economic effect.

33% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Concerns about required training on seed-to-sale tracking system for all employees being unnecessary.
- Concerns about the impact of the requirement to develop additional Standard Operating Procedures.
- Concerns about inventory control and camera systems within licensed laboratories

Regulation 6 Indirect Adverse Impact

Three respondents (50% of respondents) indicated an adverse economic effect.

50% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Concerns about required implementation of new Standard Operating Procedures. and the ultimate ability to be compliant.
- Concerns about lot size variability among establishments.

Regulation 6 Beneficial Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 6 Indirect Beneficial Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 7 Adverse Impact

Only one respondent (17% of respondents) indicated an adverse economic effect.

83% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanation:

- Concerns about what might be considered attractive to children, and design restrictions limiting marketing ability.

Regulation 7 Indirect Adverse Impact

Three respondents (50% of respondents) indicated an adverse economic effect.

50% responded no or unsure/not affected.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 7 Beneficial Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 7 Indirect Beneficial Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 10 Adverse Impact

66% responded no or unsure/not affected and 34% responded yes.

Explanations included:

- Newly introduced waste reporting requirements may be disproportionately burdensome for laboratories compared to other facility types.

Regulation 10 Indirect Adverse Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 10 Beneficial Impact

83% responded no or unsure/not affected and 17% responded yes.

Explanations included:

- Routine cultivation waste disposal will be more efficient with updated waste allowances.

Regulation 10 Indirect Beneficial Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 12 Adverse Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 12 Indirect Adverse Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 12 Beneficial Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

Regulation 12 Indirect Beneficial Impact

100% responded no or unsure/not affected and 0% responded yes.

No explanations were provided.

3. **The manner in which the analysis was conducted, including the methods used to determine the impact of the proposed regulation on small businesses.**

The Agency used informed, reasonable judgment in determining that there would not be an impact on small businesses due to the nature of the regulation changes. The Agency also reviewed its current inventory requirement for labs and current packaging guidelines. The proposed permanent regulations refine and clarify existing requirements. The additional training requirements and mandated SOPs aim to document compliance with industry-standard requirements and expectations. The Agency consulted with the Administrative Law Judges who act as its hearing officers for additional input on the regulations.

In addition to reviewing current packaging, testing, and trainings guidelines, the Agency analyzed the written responses from the Small Business Impact Survey to determine the likely impact of the proposed permanent regulations on small businesses. This analysis included categorizing responses to identify themes and the frequency with which impacts were named. The Agency also looked at issues named with less frequency but could potentially have impact. CCB has determined that there will be no adverse impacts on small businesses.

4. **The estimated economic effect of the proposed regulation on the small businesses which it is to regulate:**

Direct and indirect adverse effects

The Agency finds that there is no adverse economic effect on small business beyond existing requirements associated with maintaining compliance.

The changes make updates to existing regulations and provide clarification on regulatory procedures for small businesses.

Direct and indirect beneficial effects

The Agency anticipates that cannabis businesses that may be impacted will realize the beneficial economic impacts of increased packaging limits and clarity in regulatory language.

5. **A description of the methods that the agency considered to reduce the impact of the proposed regulations on small businesses and a statement regarding whether the agency used any of those methods.**

The agency considered the feedback from the public and the survey results and determined that revisions to the proposed language were not necessary to reduce the impact on small businesses.

6. **The estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the proposed regulations.**

The proposed permanent regulations present no significant foreseeable or anticipated cost for enforcement. To the extent regulations have been clarified, licensees will find it easier to maintain compliance and operations. This may reduce disciplinary actions and potentially reduce costs to the agency.

7. **If the proposed regulations provide a new fee or increases to existing fees, the total annual amount the agency expects to collect and the manner in which the money will be used.**

The proposed regulations do not increase or introduce new fees.

8. **If the proposed regulations include provisions which duplicate or are more stringent than federal, state or local standards regulating the same activity, an explanation of why such duplicative or more stringent provisions are necessary.**

The proposed permanent regulations do not overlap or duplicate any regulation of other federal, State or local governmental entities, but do reference regulatory authority granted by NRS 678A through NRS 678D.

9. **The reasons for the conclusion of the agency regarding the impact of these regulations on small businesses.**

The Agency has determined that there will be no adverse impacts to small cannabis businesses, as set forth above. Conversely, the Agency has determined that there may be beneficial impacts to small cannabis businesses based on increased packaging limits and clarity in regulatory language.

I hereby certify, to the best of my knowledge or belief, a concerted effort was made to determine the impact of the proposed regulations on small businesses and the information contained herein is accurate.

Dated this 17th day of November 2025.



James Humm
Executive Director
Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board

To receive a printed copy of this Small Business Impact Statement, contact:

Attn: Small Business Impact Summary – 12/4/25
Cannabis Compliance Board
700 E. Warm Springs Road #100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Email: regulations@ccb.nv.gov