

Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board

Regulatory Workshop

NCCRs 1-15

March 4, 2026

Minutes

The Nevada Cannabis Compliance Board (CCB) held a public workshop at Nevada Legislative Council Bureau, 2120 Amigo Street, Room 6, Las Vegas, Nevada beginning at 9:00 a.m. on March 4, 2026.

Deputy Director Michael Miles called the meeting to order.

Division Chief – Health & Safety Kara Cronkhite, and Division Chief – Administration Steve Gilbert were present on behalf of the CCB in Las Vegas.

Deputy Director Miles stated that the regulatory workshop would be for all regulations, open to changes and suggestions for any regulations.

Instructions to provide public comment online were read aloud.

I. Public Comment

There were no public comments unrelated to NCCRs 1-15 in Las Vegas or online.

II. Proposed Amendments and Additions to Nevada Cannabis Compliance Regulations 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 & 12.

Deputy Director Miles advised that discussion is open for NCCRs 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 & 12 and asked Kara Cronkhite, Division Chief – Health & Safety to summarize each of the proposed changes to the regulations.

Chief Cronkhite summarized changes in regulations 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 & 12:

Regulation 1: Definitions of “derived,” “label,” and “packaging” were removed from regulations as they are incorporated into statute by SB168. In response to public comment, the definition of “derived” was incorporated into the definition of “synthetic cannabinoids” in statute. Definition of “imminent health hazard” was changed to mean “a substantial hazard to the public health” as it is now referred to in statute, while still requiring immediate cessation of operations. No language was removed; language was added for clarification and instructions on how to resume operations.

Regulation 4: Proposed definition of “time” was struck. Definition of “imminent health hazard” was clarified that power outages exceeding two (2) hours would be an imminent health hazard and clarified that the Board must be notified prior to resuming operations.

Deputy Director Miles offered clarification that the definition of “time” was removed, but it is still defined elsewhere.

In response to public comment received regarding administrative hold orders, the words “or safety risk” and “possible” were removed before “threat to public health.” In subsection (1)(a), the word “or” was changed to “and.” In subsection (2)(b), the phrase “are not limited to” was clarified. Clarifying language was added to subsection (4) and a typo was acknowledged and was marked for correction. NCCR 4.095(3) is supposed to read “the hearing officer, within 30 days of the last date of the hearing, shall issue findings of fact and conclusions of law”; a portion of this subsection was cut off. No other changes were made in subsection (4) since the last workshop; in response to public comment, NCCR 4.105 was revised to be compliant with AB76, to be consistent with state and local health department procedures. A written emergency operating plan would allow a licensee to continue operating under an approved plan during an imminent health hazard, and proof of correction of an imminent health hazard prior to resuming operation is a current requirement. These are the same as current requirements.

Regulation 5: no changes made since previous workshop.

Regulation 6: no changes made since previous workshop. In response to public comment, a “designated trainer” as specified in NCCR 6.072 is a badge agent training an individual. This change allows a facility to train an employee before they technically start working. They must be trained in Metrc and on proper handling, matching current requirements. There is also a specific training available to non-Metrc users, which can be used to prevent logging and tracking violations. In NCCR 6.08(7), an exception was added for testing labs regarding the inventory control system, and in response to public comment, clarified “as applicable” to the type of cannabis maintained in inventory. Added subsection 12 to clarify the requirements for labs only, specific to their operation. In response to public comment, clarification was provided that this does not require labs to weigh out every sample every day; rather, it just means that if the disposition of any inventory changes while in the facility’s possession, the change must be updated in Metrc within twenty-four hours. Clarification was provided for NCCR 6.095 for hand sinks to reduce confusion. For 6.120, the requirement to maintain advertising documents for five years was removed.

Regulation 7: In NCCR 7.015, provided clarification on where to scan and verify IDs to reduce confusion. In NCCR 7.030, in response to public comment, “branded merchandise” was added to the list of items a dispensary may sell.

Regulation 9: In NCCR 9.025, in response to public comment, language was added regarding flavoring and terpenes.

Regulation 10: In NCCR 10.080, clarification was provided that root balls must be separated from stalks of the plant. This is an existing requirement and policy, but was added to regulation. Amounts for destruction apply to all facility types; there is no reduced risk of diversion if it is at a different facility type.

Regulation 12: no additional changes were made. In response to public comment regarding packaging limit for pills, this has been added to statute per AB76.

Deputy Director Miles opened discussion about Regulations 1-15.

Amanda Connor of Connor & Connor provided comment on NCCR 5.039(5) that language should be adjusted to reflect the intent of the regulation: a lottery should only be used in the event of a tie.

Deputy Director Miles stated that the requested language does exist, but that it will be added to the section in question for additional clarity.

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. Relating to NCCR 6.080(12), labs are mandated to maintain daily beginning and ending inventory in the seed-to-sale system, with physical quarterly counts. Subsection 7 of the same regulation exempts them. Mr. Fulton explained that the current regulations are not possible for labs to follow, as following the regulation would impede the labs' ability to perform proper testing. Mr. Fulton submitted a written proposal to replace the current language for various regulations, including NCCR 6.080(12). Mr. Fulton requested that the CCB review his proposal.

In response, Chief Cronkhite suggested Mr. Fulton speak after the meeting with Keoki Allen, Audit Supervisor with the Cannabis Compliance Board.

Mr. Fulton brought up concerns regarding expanded training requirements under NCCR 6.072, which require all cannabis establishment agents to complete the seed-to-sale training before performing duties independently. Mr. Fulton stated that most bench scientists never use the seed-to-sale system, and the training requirements should therefore be limited to those personnel whose duties actively involve interaction with the seed-to-sale system.

Mr. Fulton brought up NCCR 1 and the definition of "substantial hazard to public health." Mr. Fulton expressed that the definition appears to be too broad, and staff at the laboratories is unsure how the definition applies. Mr. Fulton requested additional clarification on what constitutes a "substantial hazard to public health" as related to laboratory testing and analysis.

Chief Cronkhite explained that the terminology referenced in Mr. Fulton's comment came from SB 168, and the definition was chosen by legislators. She went on to explain that the definition of "imminent health hazard" was defined as "substantial hazard to public health." Chief Cronkhite advised Mr. Fulton to review the definition of "imminent health hazard," and that nothing was changed in the regulation; clarification was simply added.

Layke Martin with the Nevada Cannabis Association requested clarification regarding NCCR 9 and whether it would be forward-facing, or whether a production facility would be required to acquire an attestation for already-approved menu items that the items comply with state law.

Chief Cronkhite advised that the change to NCCR 9 would be forward-facing only. Anything that has already been approved would remain approved.

Ms. Martin also asked, in the event that a company not based in Nevada must acquire such attestation, would the applicable forms specify which laws the company must follow?

Chief Cronkhite advised that the CCB can create a form that outlines specifically what information a company must acquire, and the form can be used by national and international companies.

Amanda Connor with Connor & Connor, following up on the previous question, stated that it seems that the production facility itself must complete the signed attestation, and that this may be burdensome. Ms. Connor stated that it appears third-party companies are being asked to attest to their own flavors and terpenes.

Chief Cronkhite clarified that the burden is on the supplier to provide the attestation. The production facility would not be expected to have that information.

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 9:21 a.m.