

Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board
Regulatory Workshop
SB 157 – Regulations 1, 10, 11
November 19, 2025
Minutes

The Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board (CCB) held a public workshop at 700 E. Warm Springs Road, Suite 150, Las Vegas, Nevada beginning at 10:00 a.m. on November 19, 2025.

Deputy Director Michael Miles called the meeting to order. Deputy Attorney General Stephanie Itkin, Division Chief – Health & Safety Kara Cronkhite, Laboratory Program Supervisor Elizabeth Perez, and Laboratory Inspector Lynette Kogler were present on behalf of the CCB in Las Vegas.

Deputy Director Miles asked attendees to limit comments to the topic of SB 157 until the open public comment portion of the meeting.

Instructions to join the meeting via Zoom for public comment were read aloud.

I. Public Comment

There was no public comment not related to SB 157 in Las Vegas or online.

II. Proposed Amendments and additions to Nevada Cannabis Compliance Regulations 1, 10 and 11.

Kara Cronkhite, Division Chief – Health & Safety provided an overview of the proposed amendments and additions to NCCRs 1, 10 and 11, advising that Regulation 1.125 removed the definition of “Lot” to conform to the way it appears in statute; Regulation 10.075 was amended to add reference to ASTM International (ASTM) D8334/D334M as stated in statute; 11.030 removed specifics such as “chain of custody” or “as adopted by reference” and references ASTM D8334 in its entirety to align with statutory requirements; 11.050 was amended to align with ASTM D8334 per statute; 11.070 is the same as 11.030, removes specific examples of the standard, and references the ASTM standard as a whole and references the sixty gram composite collection, from which the twenty gram sample would be collected.

Deputy Director Michael Miles expressed appreciation for and recommended submission of written public comments. He opened the discussion for regulations 1, 10 and 11.

Layne Martin, of Nevada Cannabis Association discussed regulation 10, and the lack of availability of the ASTM standards for review by licensees prior to the workshop. She expressed concern that many of the parties commenting may not have seen the document due to its cost. Ms. Martin noted that a copy will be available upon request to ASTM by the CCB and asked for the CCB to request a read-only copy of this and any ASTM standards to be made available to licensees. She requested language to be added to the section which limits the extent not consistent with Nevada law, as well as any section in the regulations that references third-party materials, or to incorporate any provisions that licensees should follow into the NCCRs so there is a single, comprehensive body of rules to follow. Ms. Martin restated that CCB should clearly

list the documentation requirements so input and comments can be received during the rule-making process. Ms. Martin referenced draft guidance for *SB 157 and ASTM D8334/D8334M Sampling* submitted by Will Adler, of Silver State Government Relations, which states, “This information must be provided upon request (to the CCB)…” noting that it is not part of the standard but is proprietary information and the standard does not require it to be shared.

Continuing, Ms. Martin said ASTM says that states are not required to adopt its standards verbatim, and section 1.2 of ASTM says where the standards differ from local requirements, the local rules take precedence, and this preserves the board’s discretion.

Ms. Martin advised she provided written public comment and if adopted, the changes will harm licensed businesses, reduce tax revenue and weaken the licensed market’s ability to compete with the illegal cannabis and hemp market. She commented SB 157 provides that sample sizes must scale with lot sizes, nothing requires a 60-gram sample, and this size requirement will eliminate efficiency and cost-savings, instead creating staff and transportation costs.

Will Adler, of GTI and Silver State Government Relations, echoed Ms. Martin’s comments and said it is necessary to understand the entire context of the ASTM standards and intent. He requested more specifics in regulatory requirements. Mr. Adler mentioned the 2025 legislative session discussions and said there were good conversations about changing the definition of “lot”, noting although the ideal is 60 grams, it is not mandated. He suggested regulatory language could refer to a minimum standard and be left for laboratories to determine the sample size. He asked if the guidance could say “cultivators wish to test at 60 grams today, go forth and do so” until the regulations are done, and expressed his appreciation for the workshop.

Kimberly Maxon-Rushton, of Cooper Levenson, on behalf of RSR Analytical Laboratories commented that historically, regulations referenced multiple external sources that laboratories were required to consult and follow. Industry representatives previously expressed concern that it was unclear exactly which standards needed to be met. Requiring laboratories to continually monitor secondary sources and periodicals for compliance would inevitably lead to varying interpretations, some of which might conflict with the Agency’s expectations.

Ms. Maxon-Rushton emphasized that ongoing workshops and continued dialogue—working collaboratively between the Agency and industry—will help ensure safety and protection of the public. For the record, she stated she reviewed the ASTM standards and identified fourteen provisions that industry members believe warrant amendment. This, she argued, demonstrates the depth of the industry’s concern about meeting the Agency’s required standards.

Ms. Maxon-Rushton strongly recommended continuing the workshop process, allowing licensees to thoroughly review the standards and engage in open discussion with the CCB. She believes this collaborative approach will generate more accurate and meaningful comments for the small business impact statement.

Adam Fulton of Jennings Fulton, spoke on behalf of 374 Labs, G3 Labs, MA and Associates, ERP, NV Cann Labs, RSR Analytical Laboratories and DPL Nevada dba Digipath Labs.

Mr. Fulton reminded CCB that he submitted a 53-page brief outlining issues of concern: scientific and constitutional that must be addressed regarding SB 157. He recommended reviewing the brief because it highlights issues and problems which must be addressed.

Continuing, Mr. Fulton discussed the science of the proposed protocol of fifteen-pound lots and the measurement uncertainty and statistical power drop and the importance of this issue. He said if SB 157 is enacted without proper regulatory oversight and regulations, there will be no statistical viability in Nevada. Mr. Fulton stated that .88 percent of each lot must be sampled to achieve the confidence level needed in Nevada, and as lot size increases, this results in an increase in the amount of testing. He opined that the public will be at risk if the CCB does not follow statistical, mathematical results.

Mr. Fulton provided a comparison between current testing certainty, and said if statistical oversight is reduced or eliminated, the risk to the public can be damaging because the results will be unreliable. Additionally, retesting will be problematic due to different results received by different laboratories. He restated the potential for a public health problem.

He recalled a history of dialog about testing, and that CCB always put public health and protecting citizens as priority and asked CCB to review the submitted brief.

Will Adler asked for clarification of the requirements of the composite sample minimum, divided into three tests.

Chief Cronkhite replied that the requirement for a five-pound lot size of flower and a fifteen-pound lot size of trim is ten grams per sample. In 2024, the board approved a collection size increase to a twenty-gram collection size sample, and one sample collection is provided to laboratories to use as needed.

Mr. Adler expressed his dissatisfaction that after the prior ten years, products are now tested at what is considered an unsafe level. He commented that Nevada does a good job at testing and is the “gold standard” because other states ceased microbial counts, and said testing at ten grams is sufficient based on historical testing in Nevada.

Chief Cronkhite asked for additional public comments.

There were no additional public comments on proposed regulation changes to NCCR 1, 10 or 11.

III. Public Comment.

Deputy Director Miles opened Agenda Item III and asked for public comment in Las Vegas.

There were no additional public comments in Las Vegas or online.

IV. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:29 a.m.