



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

MAJ. GEN. ONDRA BERRY, (RET.)
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”) 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 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. Workshops were held on December 2, 2025, and December 4, 2025, to discuss proposed changes to regulations 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 12. These workshops identified additional suggested changes, and a second workshop was scheduled for March 4, 2026.

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 January 27, 2026, the Cannabis Compliance Board (“Agency”) notified the public by posting a notice of workshop and proposed changes on the CCB website.

Draft language provided proposed changes to the following NCCRs:

- Regulation 1. Issuance of Regulations; Construction; Definitions
- Regulation 4. Disciplinary and Other Proceedings Before the Board
- Regulation 5. Licensing, Background Checks, and Registration Cards
- Regulation 6. Production and Distribution of Cannabis
- Regulation 7. Cannabis Sales Facility
- Regulation 9. Production of Cannabis Products
- 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 January 28, 2026, the CCB sent a thirty-three-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 February 9, 2026.

The survey and a link to the proposed language was distributed via Constant Contact email platform to 10,092 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 thirteen (13) days. During that time, ten (10) people completed the survey.

Responses received provided the following major themes:

- Concerns about the potential administrative burden introduced by new compliance requirements such as training of staff or oversight of internal compliance.
- Benefits to the overall industry by clarification of regulations and standards.

60% of respondents (6 individuals) identified themselves as owners/officers of cannabis establishments.

90 % of respondents identified as having less than 150 employees.

For each of the changes to Regulations 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12, respondents were asked whether the changes would have a direct or indirect adverse impact to their business, a direct or indirect 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 1.110 Adverse Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential adverse economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Facility closures for imminent health hazards, including loss of power, may result in less operations during the hazard and potentially lower sales (2 respondents).

Regulation 1.110 Indirect Adverse Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect adverse economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Facility closures for imminent health hazards would affect the scheduling of events and interruption of revenue during the closure (2 respondents).

Regulation 1 Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Clear expectations for imminent health hazard closures promote public health and creates consistency.

Regulation 1 Indirect Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Facility closures for imminent health hazards promote public trust and encourage participation in licensed markets.

Regulation 4 Adverse Impact

Four individuals (44% of respondents) indicated a potential adverse economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- May result in operational interruptions or holds (3 respondents).
- May increase potential for fines or civil penalties.

Regulation 4 Indirect Adverse Impact

Three respondents (33% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect adverse economic impact. 67% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- May increase potential for fines or civil penalties.
- May increase the possibility of limited operations due to administrative holds.
- May cause an increase to other administrative actions upon the facility.

Regulation 4 Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Clarity of enforcement and guidance may result in public confidence and remove operators that engage in non-compliant actions.

Regulation 4 Indirect Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Clarity of enforcement and guidance may result in public confidence and reduce unfair competition by facilities that fail to operate compliantly

Regulation 5 Adverse Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential adverse economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Increased administrative burden may be a barrier for entry into industry or on new businesses.
- May result in an increased administrative burden.

Regulation 5 Indirect Adverse Impact

Two individuals (31% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect adverse economic impact. 69% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- May introduce an increased administrative burden including documentation requirements or timelines for approval (2 respondents).

Regulation 5 Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Clearer regulatory standards provide an overall improvement to industry and prevent businesses from operating without sufficient preparation or resources leading to long term compliance.

Regulation 5 Indirect Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Clearer regulatory standards may result in stable markets due to reduced unprepared applicants.

Regulation 6 Adverse Impact

Five individuals (56% of respondents) indicated a potential adverse economic impact. 44% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- May result in an increased administrative burden for record keeping or other compliance requirements such as security training and inventory (2 respondents).
- The requirements for training on seed-to-sale system may be too broad to be a general requirement for all agents.
- Inventory tracking is too burdensome for laboratories.
- An increase in compliance requirements may be a barrier for entry into industry.

Regulation 6 Indirect Adverse Impact

Five individuals (56% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect adverse economic impact. 44% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- May introduce an increased administrative burden for documentation (2 respondents).
- May result in operational costs or time for implementation (2 respondents.)

Regulation 6 Beneficial Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential beneficial economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Consistent rules may provide for long-term market stability for compliant operators.

Regulation 6 Indirect Beneficial Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect beneficial economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Standardized procedures may reduce uncertainty and result in a stable operating environment.

Regulation 7 Adverse Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential adverse economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Increased regulatory requirements may cause operational expenses.
- May introduce increased burden for compliance including documentation and labeling.

Regulation 7 Indirect Adverse Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect adverse economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Implementation may take time to adjust and affect operations and require staff training.
- May require an increase in administrative burden without a direct operational benefit

Regulation 7 Beneficial Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential beneficial economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Standardized requirements improve operations and lead to a stable market.
- Changes may result in an increase in curbside sales.

Regulation 7 Indirect Beneficial Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect beneficial economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Changes may result in an increase in curbside sales.

Regulation 9 Adverse Impact

Three individuals (33% of respondents) indicated a potential adverse economic impact. 67% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Increase in documentation may cause operational delays and introduce administrative burden (3 respondents).

Regulation 9 Indirect Adverse Impact

Three individuals (33% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect adverse economic impact. 67% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- May increase documentation requirements and require staff training or otherwise increase administrative burden (3 respondents).

Regulation 9 Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Standardized requirements may reduce uncertainty, improve operations, and may lead to market stability.

Regulation 9 Indirect Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Clearer operating standards may improve consumer confidence and support growth.

Regulation 10 Adverse Impact

Three individuals (33% of respondents) indicated a potential adverse economic impact. 67% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Increase in compliance requirements may be an obstacle for new businesses.
- May introduce increased administrative burden and resources for training.

Regulation 10 Indirect Adverse Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect adverse economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- May increase operational burdens for destruction of root balls (2 respondents).
- May introduce an increased administrative burden and resources for training.

Regulation 10 Beneficial Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential beneficial economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Updates provide an easier mechanism for destruction of some parts of the plant.
- Clearer operational standards help with business stability.

Regulation 10 Indirect Beneficial Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect beneficial economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Updates provide an easier mechanism for destruction of some parts of the plant.
- Clearer operational standards help with long-term business viability.

Regulation 12 Adverse Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential adverse economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Additional compliance requirements may limit market participation.
- May increase operational burden including internal quality control which may lead to labor costs and training.

Regulation 12 Indirect Adverse Impact

Two individuals (22% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect adverse economic impact. 78% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- May introduce an increased administrative and operational burden including labeling (2 respondents).

Regulation 12 Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Clear standards may create consistency and improve consumer trust.

Regulation 12 Indirect Beneficial Impact

One individual (11% of respondents) indicated a potential indirect beneficial economic impact. 89% responded no or unsure/not affected.

Explanations included:

- Standardized oversight may increase public confidence which may support market growth.

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 to determine the impact to small cannabis businesses. The Agency reviewed its current inventory requirement for labs and current packaging guidelines. The proposed permanent regulations refine and clarify existing requirements. Regulations regarding imminent health hazards also reflect other public health agencies and are in line with current protocols. The Agency consulted with the Senior Deputy Attorneys General for additional input on the regulations.

In addition to reviewing current regulatory procedures, 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 identified. 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 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 such as training minimums and inventory procedures.

Direct and indirect beneficial effects

The Agency anticipates cannabis businesses which may be impacted will realize the beneficial economic impacts of clarity in regulatory language. Additional clarification on imminent health hazard voluntary closures allows for clarity on when establishments may safely resume operations without administrative action by the board. Additional staff training and inventory procedures will provide added protection for businesses.

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.

As many of these new standards are statutory, the Agency needs, welcomes, and will consider feedback from the public during the workshop process. Results from the workshops will determine what revisions are made to the regulations with the focus of minimizing any negative impact the proposed language may have 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 there will be no adverse impact to small cannabis businesses, as set forth above. Conversely, the Agency has determined that there may be a beneficial impact to small cannabis businesses based on 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 13th day of February 2026.



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 – 02/9/26
Cannabis Compliance Board
700 E. Warm Springs Road #100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Email: regulations@ccb.nv.gov