Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board
Meeting Minutes June 18, 2026

The Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board (CCB) held a public meeting at 9:00 a.m. on June 18, 2026 at the Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau 7120 Amigo Street, Room 5, Las Vegas, Nevada and at the Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau 401 S. Carson Street, Room 2134, Carson City, Nevada.

Cannabis Compliance Board Members Present:

Maj. Gen. Ondra Berry, (Ret.), Chair
Jerrie Merritt
Dr. Vicki Mazzorana
L. Kristopher Rath

Chair Berry called the meeting to order.
Executive Director Michael Miles called the roll, and a quorum was established.
Chair Berry, Members Merritt, Mazzorana and Rath were present in Las Vegas.
Vice Chair Durrett was not present.

Chair Berry announced for the record that the board is not permitted to deliberate or act on any of the items during public comment unless the subject is included on the agenda as an item which action may be taken. Board members will refrain from commenting or responding to public comments. Chair Berry asked that comments regarding agenda item nine be held until that item is discussed.

I. **Public Comment**

Will Adler, representing Silver State Government Relations commented on workshops and SB157 workshop and its passage in 2025. He expressed awareness that the regulations were sent to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) for review but does not know the status and intent of the regulatory package to be discussed in agenda item nine.

Adora Williams of Caliente Extracts, spoke regarding agent cards and said there was no meaningful change in the regulations regarding the charge for renewal. Ms. Williams commented that training and longevity is key to a compliant facility and asked for consideration of changing the renewal cost for agents in the industry for multiple years.

Amber Jansen representing Talkin and Tokin presented her belief that Nevada can lead with cannabis transparency. She expressed concern regarding the importance of clear labeling of cannabis that is irradiated or remediated and asks for transparency since this is a legislative matter, noting there are cultivators who voluntarily inform customers by labeling their packaging to include this information. Ms. Jansen asked for a neutral, fact-based transparent system that provides access to product history and allows consumers to make informed decisions. Additionally, she expressed concern that Nevada cannabis recalls can be difficult for consumers to navigate and understand.

Gerardo Gonzalez from Talkin and Tokin spoke on behalf of people who are disappointed with the Cannabis Compliance Board, the industry, and cannabis lounges. He noted citizens do not vote for the members of the board and said there should be accountability by the board to businesses, workers, consumers and the local community. Mr. Gonzalez said the board levies tax, fines, restrictions more than helping the industry grow. He mentioned community-based events in New York and Arizona and said the CCB should be known for creating pathways to responsible growth, innovation, tourism and community participation.

There were no additional public comments.

II. **Consent Agenda**

A. **Consideration of Approval of May 21, 2026, Cannabis Compliance Board Meeting Minutes**

B. **Consideration of Approval to Extend Final Inspection Deadline to June 16, 2027**

1. CN Licensco Inc (C090, P065)

C. **Consideration of Approval to Extend Final Inspection Deadline to July 1, 2027**

1. The Venue at SoL Cannabis LLC (CLA003)
2. Deep Roots Harvest Inc (CLA005)
3. KV Group LLC (CLI002)

Chair Berry opened Agenda Item II for discussion. There was no discussion.
Chair Berry moved to approve the Consent Agenda.
Member Rath seconded. Vice Chair Durrett asked the record to reflect that she was now present via video conference. Members Durrett, Merritt and Mazzorana said aye. Motion carried.

III. **Status Check**

Chair Berry asked for items A and B to be considered together. There was no objection from members of the board.

A. **Clark NMSD, LLC (D186) – Status Check and Consideration of Extension to Submit Transfer of Interest Application for D186 and prospective retail-attached consumption lounge (Case No. 2023 003)**

B. **Clark Natural Medicinal Solutions LLC (C165 & P108) – Status Check and Consideration of Extension to Submit Transfer of Interest Application(s) for C165 & P108 (Case No. 2023-021)**

Emily Bordelove, Senior Deputy Attorney General appeared on behalf of the CCB and provided status on items A and B. Ms. Bordelove advised Clark NMSD and Clark Natural Medicinal Solutions ("Clark Naturals") were part of a global settlement previously presented to the board as status checks or extensions previously granted. Amanda Connor, representing respondents, was introduced to the board.

Ms. Connor greeted the board and spoke on behalf of Clark NMSD and Clark Natural and provided status on the transfer of interest submitted by Clark Natural which was withdrawn due to the proposed buyer's unresponsiveness and non-cooperation. Ms. Connor said Clark NMSD is actively seeking a buyer, and an active marketing agreement was approved by the court to sell all licenses, with a bidding process to begin in July 2026. Once a bid is accepted, transfers of interest will be submitted, and requested an extension from the board to complete this matter.

Member Rath said the request is progressing and it is appropriate to grant the extension with status updates from the licensee.

Chair Berry asked for additional comments or discussion. There were none.
Chair Berry moved to approve item III A and B, extending time to submit applications for applicable licenses, and extending the status check for both items to the December 17, 2026, board meeting. Respondent(s) are to submit written status reports to the board addressing the status of transfers for each license on the following dates:

- August 3, 2026
- October 5, 2026, and
- December 7, 2026

Once submission of the TOI applications reach license, any remaining status report deadlines relating to the license shall be deemed satisfied and no further reports or status checks will be required
Member Mazzorana seconded. Members Durrett, Merritt and Rath said aye. Motion carried.

IV. Three-Month Status Update from Conditional Licensee TRNVP098 LLC (RD672)

Chair Berry noted this matter is for discussion only and introduced Shane Terry to the board.
Mr. Terry spoke on behalf of TRNVP098 and provided history and update on Lander County's 2025 zoning ordinance and confirmation hearing on licensing fee structure. Mr. Terry acknowledged the difficulty in finding suitable retail locations and said although one location is under consideration, it is necessary to determine what must be done to bring utilities to the site. Additional sites are being reviewed but remain conditional which causes the timeline to be undetermined. Mr. Terry said an executed letter of intent is in place with plan to move forward on the license. He asked the board to consider a future hearing where he can check in with the board.

Chair Berry asked to confirm that Mr. Terry will provide an update at the August 2026 board meeting; Mr. Terry affirmed.

Member Mazzorana asked where the sites are located. Mr. Terry said they are in the area of Battle Mountain, Lander County.

Member Rath said that there is a legitimate need for an extension and asked if August or October is appropriate.

Mr. Terry agreed with and August status check.

Chair Berry asked for additional comments or discussion. There were none.
Chair Berry noted this matter will be heard on the August 2026 agenda for an update.

V. License Agreement

Rachel Branner, Division Chief – Investigation and Enforcement, presented one Management Services Agreement.
A. Management Services Agreement between Las Vegas Wellness and Compassion LLC (P045) (SVC26000001) and Sunset Investment Facility LLC
Chief Branner summarized the agreement stating the request is for approval of the relationship between Las Vegas Wellness and Compassion and Sunset Investment Facility ("Sunset") so Sunset may participate in production operations while a transfer of interest and suitability investigation is finalized. Ms. Branner noted that the MSA stipulates Las Vegas Wellness and Compassion will maintain control and authority and Sunset Investment will be permitted to provide specific operational services under the agreement. No areas of concern were identified preventing CCB staff from recommending approval. Alicia Ashcraft, Chad Wallace of Las Vegas Wellness and Compassion and Michael Viellion of Sunset Investment Facility were introduced to the board.

Chair Berry welcomed Ms. Ashcraft.
Alicia Ashcraft, representing Michael Viellion and Chad Wallace greeted the board and said the request is a straightforward interim management services agreement, pending negotiation and submission of a transfer of interest. Ms. Ashcraft thanked CCB Investigator Lauren for her work on the matter.

Chair Berry asked for additional comments or discussion. There were none.
Chair Berry moved to approve item V, Management Services agreement and relationship between Las Vegas Wellness and Compassion and Sunset Investment Facility.
Member Rath seconded. Members Durrett, Merritt and Mazzorana said aye. Motion carried.

VI. Transfers of Interest

Rachel Branner, Division Chief – Investigation and Enforcement, presented four transfer of interest requests.

A. **Libra Wellness Center, LLC (C149, P094) (TOI #25000007)** selling ownership of C149 and P094 to Wellness Growth Capital LLC, NRHCJ LLC
Chief Branner stated the request from Libra Wellness Center seeks approval to transfer 100 percent of its cannabis cultivation and production licenses to NRHCJ LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Wellness Group Capital ("Wellness"). Ms. Branner advised the board that Libra defaulted on a loan made by Wellness in 2020, and Wellness negotiated an agreement whereby Libra transfers cannabis licenses and associated collateral to Wellness' subsidiary in full satisfaction of the outstanding debt. A majority of Libra Wellness owners approved the agreement as required pursuant to the operating agreement. No waiver request was submitted, and no areas of concern were identified which will prevent CCB staff from recommending approval. Minority members of Libra have concerns and written comments are provided for board review.

Adam Fulton spoke on behalf of Libra, and Blake Bias and Eric Nord, manager of Libra were available for questions. Mr. Fulton thanked CCB staff and said this request is a good example of parties coming together to resolve matters.

Member Rath asked Chief Branner if any issues were noted in the operating agreement; Ms. Branner said no issues were found. Member Rath then asked Mr. Fulton if there was comment on the request from minority owners; Mr. Fulton said there was no comment.

Jesse McCray, co-founder of Libra Wellness Center appeared on behalf of ten minority owners of Libra Wellness Center and expressed concern regarding the proposed transfer of interest. He asked the board to continue the matter for a limited period to allow review of information, and for minority owners to retain counsel. He said significant issues relating to independence, fairness and adequacy of the process remain unresolved between Libra Wellness, Wellness Growth Capital, NRHCJ and Global Biolabs LLC. Mr. McCray summarized points of concern, stating that minority owners are not asking the board to reject the transaction but asked for sufficient time to review details before a decision is made.

Chair Berry asked Mr. McCray if counsel is retained; Mr. McCray said they are in the process of securing counsel.

Member Rath asked Mr. Fulton for response.

Mr. Fulton said documentation and additional time was given to the minority owners and counsel for Mr. McCray has not contacted him. He said there is no basis to prevent transfer of the licenses, and the majority have approved the transfer.

Chair Berry asked for additional comments or discussion.

Vice Chair Durrett asked when notice was provided to the minority owners.
Mr. McCray said documentation was received one month prior, despite multiple requests.
Mr. Fulton stated documentation notice of transfer were provided to minority owners more than one month prior and affidavits were provided to CCB with dates of notice.

Member Rath noted the majority members approved of the transfer, and he agrees with moving forward.

Chair Berry asked for additional comments or discussion. There were none.
Chair Berry moved to approve item VI A, transfer of interest for Libra Wellness Center LLC, selling ownership of C149 and P094 to Wellness Group Capital LLC and NRHCJ LLC.
Member Rath seconded. Members Durrett, Merritt and Mazzorana said aye. Motion carried.

B. **Nevada Natural Medicines LLC (C047, P028) and Nevada Holistic Medicine LLC (C046, D053) (TOIs #2500015, # 2500016, 2500036)** completing an internal transfer of interest.
Chief Branner presented multiple TOI request numbers for agenda item B, submitted by Nevada Natural Medicines and Nevada Holistic Medicine, requesting approval for internal ownership changes and removal of two members. Ms. Branner advised the board that both are related entities with near identical ownership structures, and request transfer of ownership from members Richard Crighton and Otto Merida to the Glenwood Trust, controlled by existing owner/manager/trustee Scott Sibley. Nevada Natural Medicines and Nevada Holistic Medicine request waivers of NCCR 5.110 pursuant to NCCR 5.112, and no areas of concern were identified preventing CCB staff from recommending approval of the transfers of interest. Scott Sibley, Ryan Welch, Richard Crighton and Otto Merida were introduced to the board.

Scott Sibley addressed the board and said they seek to streamline their operations.

Chair Berry asked for additional comments or discussion. There were none.
Chair Berry moved to approve item VI B, transfer of interest for Nevada Natural Medicines LLC, and Nevada Holistic Medicine LLC completing an internal transfer of interest.
Member Merritt seconded. Members Durrett, Mazzorana and Rath said aye. Motion carried.

C. **Clear River, LLC (C097, D087, D108, RD230, RD231, P047, T020) (TOI #2500042)** transferring partial ownership in C097, D087, D108, RD230, RD231, P047, T020 to KAJ Universal Real Estate Investments, LLC
Chief Branner explained the request submitted by Clear River seeks approval for transfer of 40 percent ownership to KAJ Universal Real Estate Investments, noting that KAJ is the current owner of the real estate in which Clear River establishments operate. Acknowledging the purchase price is a nominal amount, she stated there is a possibility of future shared ownership in real estate between Clear River and KAJ. Clear River requested a waiver of NCCR 5.110 pursuant to NCCR 5.112, and no areas of concern were identified preventing CCB staff from recommending approval of the transfer of interest. Amanda Connor, Robert Black, Sr. and Kevin Hooks were introduced to the board.

Amanda Connor of Connor and Conner, representing Clear River, introduced Robert Black Sr, current member of Clear River and Kevin Hooks, proposed member through KAJ Investments and Cami Perkins, representing Mr. Hooks.

Ms. Connor noted this is a straightforward transaction with intent of bringing Mr. Hooks in as a member of the company.

Chair Berry asked for additional comments or discussion. There were none.
Chair Berry moved to approve item VI C, transfer of interest and partial ownership from Clear River LLC to KAJ Universal Real Estate Investments LLC as detailed in the submitted request, along with a waiver of NCCR 5.110 pursuant to NCCR 5.112.
Member Merritt seconded. Members Durrett, Mazzorana and Rath said aye. Motion carried.

Ms. Connor thanked the board for their approval and expressed appreciation to Investigator Dean for her work.

D. **SSAC Corporation, SSAC D1 LLC (D060) (TOI #2500010)** transferring ownership of D060 to 5Seat Investments LLC
Chief Branner advised the board that SSAC D1 seeks to return dispensary license D060 to original owner, 5Seat Investments. Ms. Branner noted the dispensary license has been nonoperational since August 2024, an amended TOI was submitted and withdrawn. No areas of concern were identified preventing CCB staff from recommending approval of the transfer of interest. Janette Yribarren, Patricia Clark, Stefan Haller and Patrick Spydell were introduced to the board.

Adam Fulton spoke on behalf of SSAC, Alexander Haller and Patrick Spydell. Mr. Fulton thanked staff and said this is another example of parties working together.

Chair Berry asked for additional comments or discussion. There were none.
Chair Berry moved to approve item VI C, transfer of interest for SSAC Corporation, SSAC D1 LLC, to transfer ownership interest of D060 to 5Seat Investments LLC.
Member Rath seconded. Members Durrett, Merritt and Mazzorana said aye. Motion carried.

VII. Closed session under NRS 241.030(1) to consider the character, allegations of misconduct, professional competence, or physical and mental health of Trever Giles Adamson
The board went into closed session for this matter. The board came back on record following the closed session.

VIII. Review of Waiver for Trever Giles Adamson Pursuant to NRS 678B.633
Chair Berry stated Agenda VIII is held in open session and asked the board to refrain from discussing anything from the closed session on the matter and asked for additional comments.
Hearing none, Chair Berry moved to keep previously granted exemption in place with the following additional restrictions: A medical card must be produced within the next thirty (30) days along with a letter from Mr. Giles Adamson's employer.
Member Mazzorana seconded. Members Durrett, Merritt and Rath said aye. Motion carried.

IX. Notice of Intent to Adopt Permanent Regulations as contained in LCB File No. R152-24 (RP1). This item is a continuation of the rulemaking first considered at the November 20, 2025, Board meeting under LCB File No. R152-24 (Proposed Draft) which was subsequently revised and reissued as R152-24RP1 (First Revised Proposed Draft) and published in the Nevada Register on May 28, 2026.
The Board will consider possible action to adopt, amend, and/or repeal the revised proposed regulations affecting multiple regulatory provisions, including definitions, licensing, enforcement, discipline, cultivation, production, laboratory standards and practices, testing, packaging, and labeling, distribution, and consumption lounges. The full text is posted and available on the Board's website here:
https://ccb.nv.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/Posted-Proposed-R152-24RP1.pdf

Member Rath disclosed that he worked on the regulations while working at the Attorney General's office but there is no legal basis for his abstention and will vote on the matter.

Executive Director Michael Miles reminded everyone that the regulations being considered for approval are from the 2023 legislative session and were workshopped in 2023 and 2024; the regulations do not have anything to do with SB 157, or anything discussed in the 2025 session.

Emily Bordelove, Senior Deputy Attorney General and counsel for CCB provided an overview of R152-24 RP1, stating the process began in 2023 when legislation changed the procedure of how the board adopts regulation. The change required the board to submit proposed regulations to the Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) for review and revision. Ms. Bordelove noted this to be the first regulatory package submitted through this procedure, and said this package is based on regulatory amendments the board developed and workshopped in response to the 2023 legislative session, and summarized the history:

- June 2024 the board submitted initial draft language to LCB for review.
- July 2025 LCB returned its proposed draft.
- CCB staff reviewed LCB draft language and identified areas where the language did not fully reflect the intended meaning in the original draft and made additional revisions.
- CCB Staff presented revisions to the board at the November 2025 meeting; stakeholders raised concerns regarding portions of Chapter 11 and the board voted to continue its review of Chapter 11 while moving forward with the remainder of proposed regulations.

- CCB Staff continued discussion with stakeholders and worked with LCB on proposed revisions to Chapter 11.
- LCB advised that regulations cannot proceed separately and must be considered together as a single regulatory package.
- CCB resubmitted language from the November 2025 meeting along with additional changes for Chapter 11 that were discussed with industry, and LCB returned its revised version discussed during the June 18, 2026, meeting. This package, R152-24 RP1, is from the 2023 session. It is not the board's complete implementation of legislation enacted during the 2025 session. It does not include changes that were workshopped in 2025 and 2026.

Deputy Director Steve Gilbert summarized the proposed changes to the regulations:

Sections 2-6 define certain terms for purposes of the regulations adopted by the Board

Section 7 establishes the method to compute any period of time set forth in the regulations governing cannabis.

Sections 9 deletes the language **"**Signage of the business name, company logos, devices, lights, figures, paintings, drawings, branding, or plaques that are used in the design of the cannabis establishment are not subject to the requirements of NCCR 12.070(1)-(3), however, each of the foregoing items must comply"

Sections 10-12, 60, 76-78, 86 and 87 revise various provisions to specify that certain references to edible cannabis products apply only to adult-use edible cannabis products.

Sections 23, 24, 31-37 and 89 revise the procedures by which disciplinary action may be taken against a licensee or registrant.

Sections 14, 15 and 25-29 (1) establish new categories of violations and the graduated penalties; and (2) revise the categories and presumptive graduated penalties set forth in existing regulations.

Sections 41, 46 and 59 make conforming changes to reflect the recategorization of certain violations.

Section 16 deals with a consent or settlement agreement including procedures for its approval, authorization to enter a stay of the proceedings; and sets forth certain requirements for the contents.

Section 17 prescribes the contents for a petition a person who has been convicted of an excluded felony offense may submit to the Board to obtain an exemption and establishes the process by which the Board will consider the petition.

Section 18 authorizes the Board to) issue a notice of violation and an order to cease unlicensed cannabis activity to any person who engages in certain activities and take certain additional actions after the issuance of such a notice and order.

Section 19 authorizes the Board to initiate an administrative proceeding to impose certain civil penalties if a person who has received such a notice and order continues to engage in such activities.

Section 22 sets forth certain procedures for the imposition of such an administrative fine.

Section 21 authorizes the Board to bring a civil action against a person who engages in unlicensed cannabis activities to recover a civil penalty of not more than $50,000 and request that the Attorney General bring an action to enjoin the activities.

Section 20 authorizes the Board to issue a summons or subpoena in connection with an investigation of unlicensed cannabis activities in accordance with existing law.

Section 30 changes the time period within which a cannabis establishment which becomes aware of an imminent health hazard must report the hazard to the Board or Board agents from within 2 hours of the discovery of the hazard to as soon as practicable after ensuring the safety of all persons in the vicinity of the hazard.

Section 38 revises the procedures by which a licensee, registrant or applicant for a license or registration card may obtain a determination or advisory opinion from the Board by filing a petition for a declaratory ruling.

Section 39 revises the procedures by which an interested party may file a petition with the Board to request the adoption, amendment or repeal of a regulation.

Section 40 requires the Board to assign a cannabis establishment ID number to a cannabis establishment when the Board approves the application for the license of the cannabis establishment.

Section 43 requires a Board agent to enter and inspect each building or the premises of a cannabis independent testing laboratory at least biennially and conduct certain other inspections as necessary between biennial inspections.

Section 42 removes an obsolete reference to Section 43.

Section 44 requires a cannabis establishment to notify the Board of a closure within 24 hours if the cannabis establishment closes temporarily due to circumstances which make operation impractical or impossible.

Section 45 eliminates the $75 fee required by existing regulations to accompany a request for a replacement cannabis establishment agent registration card.

Sections 47 and 54 revise the maximum amount of cannabis and cannabis products that a person is authorized to possess and that a cannabis sales facility is authorized to sell in a single transaction.

Section 48 revises how costs incurred by the Board for an investigation are charged to a licensee, establishes the hourly rate that the Board will charge for certain investigations; and provides the process for charging and disputing such costs.

Section 49 requires a cannabis establishment to notify the Board or a Board agent in writing within 24 hours after receipt of a notice for eviction.

Section 50 requires a cannabis establishment to report to the appropriate Board agent and to conduct an investigation within 24 hours after discovering a significant variance in inventory.

Section 51 specifies that a cannabis establishment is required to ensure that all mature cannabis plants, packages containing cannabis and batches of immature plants containing 150 plants or less are properly tagged and maintained in compliance with the requirements of the seed-to-sale tracking system. The Board is also authorized to quarantine any cannabis or cannabis product which is not properly tagged or which the Board has reasonable cause to believe violates the provisions of existing law or regulations governing cannabis.

Section 52 revises various requirements concerning the security of a cannabis establishment.

Section 53 requires a cannabis sales facility to post signs containing certain statements and warnings in prominent locations inside the facility and at any customer entrance and drive-through window.

Section 55 revises provisions governing the products that a cannabis sales facility is authorized to sell and is prohibited from selling.

Section 58 requires a cannabis cultivation facility to create a soil amendment report disclosing certain information relating to soil amendments, fertilizers, pesticides and other crop production aids applied to the growing medium or cannabis plants during production and provide the report to a cannabis sales facility with each lot of usable cannabis provided to the cannabis sales facility.

Section 56 requires a cannabis sales facility to provide a copy of the soil amendment report upon request by a consumer.

Section 57 revises limitations for the maximum amounts of cannabis or cannabis products that a cannabis sales facility is authorized to deliver to consumers at any one time or in 1 calendar day.

Section 57 provides that a report of loss or theft must be made immediately to the appropriate law enforcement agency and, after any risk to public safety has been abated, to the Board.

Section 61 requires a cannabis cultivation facility to retain at least one person who is a "private applicator", as defined by existing law.

Section 62 adopts by reference the standards and guidelines which section 66 requires the cannabis independent testing laboratory must be complied with only as required by specific regulation.

Section 63 specifies certain requirements a scientific director employed by a cannabis independent testing laboratory must abide by and the appointment of an interim director when warranted.

Section 64 requires a cannabis independent testing laboratory to implement a safety program which includes certain guidelines.

Section 65 of this regulation requires the cannabis independent testing laboratory to provide the report and accreditation certificate to the Board within 3 business days after receipt of the documents from the accrediting organization.

Section 66 revises the list of standards and guidelines which each independent testing laboratory must be complied with only as required by specific regulation. Section 66 additionally:

- requires a quality control and quality assurance program maintained by a cannabis independent testing laboratory to:
  - (1) include a written ethics policy;
  - (2) provide training to all staff of the laboratory on the written ethics policy; and (3) require all staff of the laboratory to sign a statement which attests that the staff member will adhere to the written ethics policy.
- revises the list of testing methods that a cannabis independent testing laboratory is authorized to use.

Section 67 requires each cannabis independent testing laboratory to ensure the positive identification of the cannabis or cannabis product by verifying the accuracy of certain information and matching it to the information documented in the seed-to-sale tracking system and adhere to certain chain of custody and sample identification requirements.

Section 68 revises various requirements and procedures for the testing conducted by a cannabis independent testing laboratory for research and development purposes.

Section 69 sets forth the quality assurance tests required for usable cannabis which is destined for extraction and revises the quality assurance tests required for wet cannabis which is destined for extraction and changes the required samples size from 10 grams to 20 grams. revise various procedures and requirements for the collection and disposal of samples of cannabis and cannabis products for testing and for the provisions of a certificate of analysis by a cannabis independent testing laboratory.

Section 70 revises the circumstances under which a cannabis independent testing laboratory is required to verify the homogeneity of the potency of an edible cannabis product.

Section 71 requires a cannabis independent testing laboratory to establish limits of detection for every pesticide analyzed by the laboratory and at what level a pesticide residue analysis is considered to be failed.

Section 72 revise various procedures and requirements for the collection and disposal of samples of cannabis and cannabis products for testing and for the provisions of a certificate of analysis by a cannabis independent testing laboratory.

Section 73 requires a Board agent to preapprove any process for the post-harvest treatment or remediation of cannabis and a cannabis establishment to maintain and provide to a cannabis independent testing laboratory that collects a sample for testing documentation of post-harvest treatment or remediated lots or production runs.

Section 74 revises requirements concerning the responsibility for the costs associated with a Board-requested sample of cannabis or a cannabis production tested at an independent testing laboratory and the Board-directed screening and testing on the sample.

Section 75 requires a cannabis cultivation facility or cannabis production facility to disclose to a cannabis sales facility or cannabis consumption lounge any process used for the purpose of reducing or eradicating microbial contamination. Requires a cannabis sales facility or cannabis consumption lounge to provide that information upon request to a consumer and to post a notice that that type of information is available upon request.

Section 77 revises, reorganizes and sets forth additional requirements for the packaging of cannabis and cannabis products sold by a cannabis establishment.

Sections 79-82 revise labeling requirements for cannabis cultivation facilities, cannabis production facilities, cannabis sales facilities and cannabis consumption lounges.

Section 76: removes provisions concerning the maximum amount of cannabis and maximum amount of THC that may be contained in an adult-use cannabis product sold in a single and sets forth the maximum amount of THC that may be contained in an adult-use cannabis product sold as a pill that is sold in a single package.

Section 78 requires each individual serving of a medical edible cannabis product to be stamped or molded with a Nevada universal cannabis symbol.

Section 83 requires that a cannabis sales facility and cannabis consumption lounge to provide a copy of the soil amendment report and the certificate of analysis from the cannabis independent testing laboratory to the consumer immediately.

Section 83 revises the warnings that must be contained in a written or electronic notification provided for cannabis products sold by a cannabis sales facility and cannabis consumption lounge.

Section 84 addresses cannabis establishment advertisements and reorganizes certain requirements: warnings in advertisements are to be visible and legible; and advertisements which are posted inside a cannabis establishment are not subject to certain advertising requirements and limitations.

Section 85 increases the time frame in which a cannabis establishment agent transporting cannabis or cannabis products for such an adult-use cannabis distributor is required to report a motor vehicle crash, requires a cannabis establishment agent report to the Board any unauthorized stop within 24 hours after the stop and requires an adult-use cannabis distributor to report to the Board any loss or theft after any risk to public safety has been abated.

Section 89 repeals the packaging requirement that cannabis or a cannabis products treated with radiation must include statements and symbols indicating it has been treated with irradiation. Section 89 additionally repeals an obsolete provision regarding the applicability of certain regulations of the Board.

The proposed changes are available online as part of the June 18, 2026 meeting materials.

Chair Berry asked the board for questions or comments. Hearing none, he opened agenda item IX A.

A. Public Comment for Agenda Item IX
Will Adler, of Silver State Government Relations suggested language change to Section 72 (2)(a)(2) and stated it may be crucial for compliance. He explained that it is a reference for ASTM adherence and said there is a preference for the language "align with ASTM standards" rather than "adhere to ASTM" because it is difficult to adhere with the whole ASTM standard and comply with variations between states.

Layke Martin, Executive Director of the Nevada Cannabis Association thanked CCB staff for the extensive work on the proposed regulations. She commented and asked for clarification on Section 55, which allows dispensaries to sell branded merchandise. "Branded merchandise" became a subcategory of "Cannabis-related accessories" after a drafting change. "Cannabis-related accessories" are prohibited from having fruit on them which impacts companies where fruit is part of their branding. Ms. Martin said she understood this to be an inadvertent change which will be addressed in the next round of regulation updates. She asked for confirmation that companies will not be penalized during this time before the regulations are officially changed. Additionally, Section 55, she said "branded merchandise" refers to branding of a cannabis sales facility which would prevent vertically integrated companies from selling branded merchandise from affiliated brands. Ms. Martin said this could be prevented by changing "cannabis sales facility" to "cannabis facility" or "cannabis establishment" and this would allow a dispensary to sell branded merchandise of brands in store, not just their own brand. Continuing, Section 69 increases sample test size to 20 grams. She asked if it is the intention that licensees can test 15 pound lots with a 20-gram sample.

Mr. Miles clarified this has nothing to do with Senate Bill 157 (SB157) and the rules remain five-pound lot sizes, increased to a 20-gram sample size. Ms. Martin said this will require licensees to change testing procedures now, and again when regulations are changed and this would increase cost of business. Because of this, she objects to this change in Section 69.

Ms. Martin addressed Section 73 and asked for clarification if the required preapproval is a one-time approval of the post-harvest treatment or remediation rather than the same treatment must be approved each time it is used. Mr. Miles confirmed it is a one-time approval unless the treatment is materially adjusted.

Ms. Martin expressed her understanding of Section 62, stating it means licensees and employees are not expected to know every outside treatise unless there is specific reference in regulation to a requirement that is spelled out. She believes the best practice is to state in the regulation the requirements that must be followed.

Amanda Connor, of Connor and Connor expressed appreciation for the work on the regulations and expressed concern that regulations may be adopted which conflict with statutes passed in the 2025 legislative session. Citing Section 76 (1), she said it directly conflicts with SB 168, and expressed concern over guidance distributed in 2025 which provided a different limitation amount. Ms. Connor said that people need to know which regulations to pick and choose to follow, and it is difficult knowing which is the correct regulation. Mr. Miles said this is part of the APA process and there is a great amount of time before regulations that are adopted by CCB are approved. He said to bring any issues to CCB's attention and guidance will be distributed and reminded that regulations do not supersede what is in statute.

Adam Fulton appeared on behalf of Digipath Labs, MA Associates, NV Cann Labs, RSR Analytical, Ace Analytical Laboratories, 374 Labs and G3 Labs. He said seven of eight laboratories in Nevada are in support of a brief previously submitted to the CCB and summarized as follows:

Section 62(1): language is adopted by reference, but there are thirty-six standards being adopted and thirty-six different regulations, 6,900 pages of regulation being adopted from the scientific standpoint. There is concern over the adoption of all the regulations, and whether all standards must all be followed and enforced. Section 66 commands labs to adhere to nearly all ASTM standards, AOAC methods and other publications by reference in Section 62. Section 66 does not contain a limiting directive. Mr. Fulton impressed that there are contradictions and no direction regarding how to address these issues. He stated that labs want the ability to follow scientific standards that are direct, on point and which can be improved. Mr. Fulton provided several specific examples of noted contradictions. Also, he noted that the standards list a publication date, but not a publication standard, which will specify what the labs have to follow. Addressing Section 62, he suggested adding a request that CCB has the authority to approve the scientific processes and standards. Section 62 (4) addresses the safety program reference; however, it is unworkable. It does not give a standard for what the lab must do, and he suggested changing the language to make it work. Mr. Fulton thanked CCB staff for their work and expressed appreciation for the changes that were made to address issues. Finally, he said Section 74 (3) makes a cultivation or production facility or laboratory responsible for all costs of a board request of investigative testing, even if there was no violation. He believes it to be inappropriate to make them responsible for the cost of testing when no wrongdoing is identified.

Mr. Miles said CCB believes Section 62 is clear and said the reason the standard is not listed with a year appending the file name is because at the end of Section 62 is a procedure which allows CCB to update to a newer standard. This action would likely require a workshop and if it is agreed the standard applies, a list would be created to state which standards apply.

Mr. Fulton asked if the board's position is that all thirty-six standards, 6,900 pages are provided, and labs don't have to follow them unless CCB specifically states the standard that must be followed. He asked for it to be very clear and on record, that it is the legal opinion of the labs and their lawyers that the language as drafted requires labs to follow all the standards.

Chair Berry asked for additional public comment; hearing none he asked the board for questions or comments.

Member Durrett asked Mr. Miles to confirm that the board or agency position is that although the ASTM standards are incorporated by reference, not every word applies because they contradict each other, and apply only if specific terms or provisions are referenced. Mr. Miles agreed with her statement.

Member Durrett mentioned Section 69 (3) and asked where twenty grams versus 10 grams came from and why it would be changed. Mr. Miles replied that it is a more representative sample of the five-pound lot size and said CCB's lab and health and safety team pushed to increase that size in 2023-2024.

Member Durrett requested language for the motion to adopt these regulations: the lot size amount is amended from twenty grams to ten grams, and it should not be changed until changes from SB157 are adopted. Mr. Miles commented that it is optimistic that a change will occur in the next two to twelve months. He said the submission of SB157 includes a twenty-gram testing size sample, along with an overall sixty gram pull, and will likely come up in the 2027 session, noting that CCB's lab team did not randomly pull a twenty-gram testing size sample, rather, they evaluated other states and believe that 10 grams is an underrepresented sample of a five-pound lot size. Increasing to twenty grams assists with the testing of microbials and other issues.

Member Rath spoke in support of adopting the increase to twenty grams due to the time before SB157 is approved. Mr. Rath asked CCB Lab Staff if they work with industry to clear up any concerns with new regulations. Lynette Kogler, Lab Compliance Supervisor replied that the team works with labs routinely to clarify compliance and regulatory issues, and the team is always available to assist and answer questions. Member Rath asked how the increase to twenty grams would increase accuracy of testing results.

Ms. Kogler thanked Mr. Rath for the question and explained that the increase in sample size from ten to twenty grams in Section 69 is not related to anything in SB157. Section 69 (4) clarifies the language to explain a minimum of one gram of sample must be used for each microbial test and removed the previous word "any" which was ambiguous. The increase from ten to twenty grams is to ensure the laboratories have enough sampled for all the chemical and microbial tests combined.

Member Durrett asked if the increase to twenty grams would be for a five pound or larger lot size?
Ms. Kogler clarified that SB157 and the standard adopted requires a composite sample of sixty grams to be collected, and that sample will be divided into three twenty-gram portions. Twenty grams will be used for initial compliance testing, and the other two twenty-gram portions are available for retesting within or outside the laboratory. The laboratory will still use twenty grams for testing, but it will be a larger sample size when collected under the provisions of SB157.

Chair Berry asked about cost impact increasing from ten to twenty grams. Ms. Kogler replied that the labs will use larger sample collection portion sizes and the facilities will part with more of their sample, but ten grams of flower is not a lot – it will fit in a small Tupperware container.

Amanda Connor said the industry anticipates the testing costs will increase due to the larger sample size, and since the sample size is doubled for the same lot size, cultivators will lose more flower with each five-pound lot. SB157 discussed a twenty-gram sample from a fifteen-pound lot. Increasing testing costs will impact a struggling industry.

Adam Fulton acknowledged the sample size has been discussed for six years. He said a minimum twenty-gram sample from a five-pound lot should be maintained because it is the lowest defensible testing portion needed to preserve the representative reproducible and legally supportable laboratory results.

Chair Berry asked if fifteen grams could be a compromise. Ms. Kogler replied that as a minimum fifteen grams would be acceptable, but it should be noted that if that if the laboratory needs to collect additional material for a test, twenty grams, maybe more than twenty grams, the regulation also allows for that.

Chair Berry moved to adopt the regulations as written in LCB file number R152-24-RP1 with the amendment to Section 69(3) usable sample being changed to fifteen grams from twenty grams as outlined. Member Rath seconded.
Ms. Bordelove, Senior Deputy Attorney General, noted her concern that LCB may consider this a substantive change due to where this is in the process.
Mr. Miles said he does not believe that LCB will care if ten, fifteen or twenty grams is specified.

Member Mazzorana asked if LCB will not care, why not leave it as ten.

Matthew Feeley, Senior Deputy Attorney General responded that although LCB may not care about the actual numbers, they care that it is a substantive change as far as procedure goes.

Member Rath expressed concern that changing from twenty to fifteen would cause a delay.
Ms. Bordelove said the concern is that in November 2025 when the regulations were voted on and Chapter 11 was held, LCB said the file must remain as one file, not held. Changing from twenty grams to fifteen is a substantive change and counsel is concerned the vote would delay.

Mr. Feeley noted the twenty-gram amount was already presented by CCB to LCB and it is late to change.

Mr. Miles acknowledged that it is late in the APA process to make this change, and these regulations must be submitted by mid-June 2026. He agreed with counsel and said it should be left at twenty grams.

Ms. Bordelove summarized that the change would put CCB beyond the two years translated by statute, and the concern is there would be an amendment and then a new "R" number attached, and we want to avoid issues with passage.

Mr. Miles said these proposed changes will not be in place for another six months to one year, because they must go before the legislative commission as part of the process.

Member Rath expressed concern about the delay and withdrew his second on the motion.

Member Durrett asked if the legislative commission could change it at the hearing. Mr. Miles said it is the first time through the APA process, and it may be possible for the commission to change it. Member Durrett offered support for the motion, allowing it to be raised with the legislative commission.

Member Mazzorana agree with Vice Chair Durrett. Member Rath agreed in support of a new motion.

Chair Berry moved to adopt the regulations as contained in LCB file number R152-24.
Member Rath seconded. Members Durrett, Merritt and Mazzorana said aye. Motion carried.

X. Briefing from the Chair and Executive Director

Chair Berry expressed appreciation for everyone's comments and impressed that industry suggestions are taken seriously. He said decisions on anything that may impact cost or ability to drive business is greatly considered. He was glad to attend the Cannabis Regulation Association conference and hear what is happening in the industry around the nation and he learned about good practices and the challenges. Chair Berry opined that discussion and debate between industry and regulators is necessary and he is impressed by Nevada. He said CCB has the best staff, and he expressed hope for the future of Nevada's cannabis industry.

Chair Berry issued a reminder that board meetings will occur every other month rather than monthly, beginning in August 2026.

He thanked the board for their subject matter expertise and said he is hopeful the board will continue to do the best for the state of Nevada.

Executive Director Miles thanked industry and participants for public comments and providing opinion and input on the regulations and expressed appreciation for every discussion. Mr. Miles noted that the Nevada Cannabis Compliance Regulations (NCCRs) have switched to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) and NAC will be referenced on CCB's website as the transition is made on the website, partner portals and agency documentation. NAC 678A through D is available now. CCB will distribute a link that will be updated on the website. CCB will provide a conversion document showing the old NCCRs and the new NACs. The NCCR archive will be on CCB's website. The new NACs will mirror the NCCRs, and the change is anticipated to be complete by August 1, 2026.

Statements of Deficiency (SODs) will be guided by NAC, not NCCR.
NCCRs will be used for disciplinary actions occurring prior to NACs going live.

Mr. Miles announced that CCB will host a resource fair in Reno on June 24, 2026, from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. with local jurisdictions and CCB staff to answer questions. Department of Taxation will be available to discuss the new cannabis tax permit process.

He provided an update on federal rescheduling stating the Department of Justice's April 2026 final order placed FDA approval and state licensed medical marijuana into Schedule III, while recreational cannabis remains Schedule I and subject to 280E restrictions.

Mr. Miles noted two developments:

- The final order is under active challenge in the US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit and petitioners have filed a motion asking the court to stay the order. If a stay is granted, the federal landscape could shift again, including a potential return of medical marijuana to Schedule I and the restoration of Section 280E liability.
- The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) is scheduled to convene an expedited administrative hearing beginning June 29th, 2026, to consider whether marijuana more broadly, including adult use, recreational, should be moved to Schedule III. That hearing is set to conclude no later than July 15, 2026.

Finally, Mr. Miles reminded licensees that the DEA's expedited registration window closes soon. CCB staff understand that licensees may still apply after the date, but these applications would no longer receive expedited review. Although the DEA's registration website references dispensaries, it is CCB staff's understanding that the registration process is open to all license types. The board is aware of anecdotal reports of applications for other license types being rejected and it is monitoring the issue.

Licensees with questions about timing and eligibility should consult qualified legal and tax council before making business decisions based on the federal order and continue meeting all Nevada state licensing and compliance obligations. The board will continue to monitor both the litigation and the hearing.

VII. Next Meeting Date: <u>August 20, 2026</u>

VIII. Items for Future Agendas
None noted.

IX. Public Comment

Timothy Eli Addo representing Kora Cannabis Consumption Lounge expressed condolences for Michael Covington and said his energy will be greatly missed. He advised the board he is dealing with unfortunate issues and is seeking time to navigate them.

There was no additional public comment.

X. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.