



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

MICHAEL MILES
Executive Director

MAJ. GEN. ONDRA BERRY, (RET.)
Chair

Nevada Cannabis Advisory Commission Subcommittee on Scheduling Hemp Meeting Minutes August 28th, 2026

The Nevada Cannabis Advisory Commission Subcommittee on Scheduling Hemp held a meeting via Teams on **August 28th, 2026**, at 3:00p.m.

Members Present:

Chair - Layke Martin
Bob Ragar
Michael Cathcart
Brittany Miller
Mike Edgell

Member's Absent:

Chair Martin called the meeting to order at 3:00p.m.

- I. Public Comment
 - a. There was no one online to provide public comment.
- II. Consideration of Approval of the CAC Subcommittee on Scheduling Hemp March 24th, 2026, Meeting Minutes (for possible action)
 - a. Member Miller moved to approve the minutes from the June 18th, 2026 meeting, Member Cathcart seconded and the motion was approved.
- III. Discussion of Draft Report and Recommendations of the Subcommittee on Scheduling Hemp to the Cannabis Advisory Commission (for discussion only)
 - a. Chair Martin introduced this meeting as a working session for the draft report she sent out earlier in the week. The report will be finalized and approved by the subcommittee during their next meeting on September 2nd. Chair Martin had a discussion with the Chair of the CAC Subcommittee on Taxation as that subcommittee is working on a report with a similar timeline regarding taxation of both cannabis and hemp products.
 - i. Chair Martin gave a summary of the report, pulling together information that the subcommittee discussed, which includes expertise from the guests who gave testimony during previous meetings and research on relevant statutes with the help of the Attorney General's office and the Deputy Attorney Generals (DAGs) from the CCB. Member Edgell has recently provided additional information to be incorporated, and Chair Martin invited feedback from all members to finalize the report.

1. Member Cathcart asked if the report would rely specifically on the federal law that is going to be moving forward in November or if there any standards the subcommittee would include.
 - a. Chair Martin responded that because the hemp situation is in flux at the federal level, the report takes that into consideration and recommends a contingency plan. Specifically, the report poses a question for legislators to consider: would Nevada want to align with federal law as it exists today, with upcoming changes, or be more restrictive as a state? For example, federal changes would restrict intoxicating hemp products to 0.4 milligrams of THC by container and would remove most beverages and gummies that are on the market. What other states have done is align their state statutes to match that. Chair Martin expressed that if Nevada creates language that just says to follow restrictions at the federal level that would be too up in the air and her recommendation would be to move forward with the law as it's currently written and restrict hemp products in Nevada to 0.4 milligrams of THC per container unless the subcommittee deems otherwise.
2. Member Edgell asked if the subcommittee could suggest putting a limit on the size of the container for intoxicating hemp products.
 - a. Chair Martin responded that yes, defining “container” through statute is already being discussed as a proposal so that legislators can decide on the size limit.
3. Member Cathcart included that the subcommittee’s recommendation should request legislators define compliant labeling and testing, possibly using the Clark County ordinance as a model, and incorporate technical ability at the state level to test these products for assurance, whether it be through the CCB or Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDA).
 - a. Member Ragar responded that NDA’s Plant Division can test THC on industrial hemp so there could be possible retooling of that ability if state-run testing is required. Member Ragar contemplated what that would change if cannabis was rescheduled from Schedule I to Schedule III and how legislators would need to address that.
4. Member Ragar asked if Chair Martin received the information she requested regarding recent solicitation for a Bill Draft Request (BDR) updating language in Senate Bill 466 (SB466) (2025). Member Ragar commented that a bill to transfer responsibility to the NDA would require a fiscal note.
 - a. Chair Martin provided further context, stating SB466 moved certain responsibilities for food safety from Department of Human Services (DHS) to the NDA. However, some of the language didn’t change from DHS to NDA and continues to refer to the DHS as the responsible agency, so while the personnel transferred from DHS to NDA, the authority to regulate did not. Chair Martin reflected on whether that comes with broader agency oversight by the NDA of

consumable hemp products and if cleaning up language would put the responsibility for oversight of testing and labeling under NDA.

5. Member Miller requested clarification concerning whether the report would be voted upon by the entire advisory committee and what the role of the report would be in the entire regulatory and legislative process.
 - a. Chair Martin responded that the reports would be discussed and voted on by the entire cannabis advisory committee. Similarly, to maintain the timeline that the legislature set for the subcommittees in 2025, it complicates the process as things are changing constantly and was introduced before any changes happened at the federal level. What this committee is approving of is a report on recommendations, policy ideas, best practices, etc. The corresponding legislation will hopefully be based on the policy ideas in this report and that legislation will have its own path.
6. Chair Martin summarized that she is now confirming a handful of factual legal points, tidying up the footnotes, incorporating the feedback from today, and then she will circulate a draft by the beginning of next week. That draft will be voted on September 2nd and then it will go before the broader Advisory Commission on September 14th.
7. Member Cathcart asked for clarification regarding what the subcommittee's recommendations are for hemp beverages and whether the subcommittee suggests legislation restricts sales of those products in Nevada other than in dispensaries and licensed cannabis establishments.
 - a. Chair Martin responded that the report does not currently include that recommendation and asserts that there isn't a current regulatory pathway for hemp beverages specifically. If the legislature wanted to bring these to Nevada, they would have to set up an entire framework that isn't quite cannabis and isn't quite alcohol. She reflected that Nevada has a decentralized system for regulating alcohol and so if THC beverages were to move through alcohol regulatory channels, then regulatory authority over THC cannabis products would be incorporated into that system. On the other hand, if the CCB or the NDA is the primary agency for regulating cannabis that would add many retailers that are not currently within their purview. Similarly, the legislature would have to maneuver further tax implications as hemp is not taxed like cannabis or alcohol. Ultimately, there would need to be a bill that addresses all those items to move forward with regulating hemp beverages.

IV. Public Comment

- a. There was no one online to provide public comment.

V. Adjournment

- a. Chair Martin adjourned the meeting at 3:21pm.