1. Working group name:

 *Operations - Production/ Manufacturing*

1. Individual sponsor(s):

*Tommy Robinson, Deputy Police Chief, Reno Police Department*

*Alex Woodley, Director of Code Enforcement, City of Reno*

*Jacob Ward, Pure Tonic Concentrates*

*Jennifer Lazovich, Kaempfer Crowell*

1. Describe the recommendation:

*The intent of this recommendation is to ensure that there is consistency in regulation throughout the State for certain matters involving recreational marijuana.*

1. Which guiding principle(s) does this recommendation support?

*Guiding Principle 1 – Promote the health, safety, and well-being of Nevada’s communities*

*Guiding Principle 2 – Be responsive to the needs and issues of consumers, non-consumers, local governments and the industry*

*Guiding Principle 4 – Propose efficient and effective regulation that is clear and reasonable and not unduly burdensome*

*Guiding Principle 5 - Begin a discussion between the State and local governments regarding the costs of carrying out Question 2*

*Guiding Principle 6 – Establish regulations that are clear and practical, so that interactions between law enforcement (at the local, state and federal levels), consumers, and licensees are predictable and understandable*

1. What provision(s) of Question 2 does this recommendation apply to?
2. *NRS 453D.020 (3) (c) Cultivating, manufacturing, testing, transporting and selling marijuana will be strictly controlled through* ***state*** *licensing and regulation*
3. *NRS 453D.200  Duties of Department relating to regulation and licensing of marijuana establishments; information about consumers.*
4. What issue(s) does the recommendation resolve?

*This recommendation would provide guidance to local governments as to issues that should be deferred to State regulation. Certain matters involving edibles, packaging, concentrates, dosing, potency and serving size limitations should be consistent throughout the State to ensure consumer safety. Some other resolutions offered by this recommendation are:*

* *Ensures uniformity for the industry & predictability with set regulations*
* *Provides opportunity for state regulators to become subject matter experts*
* *Reduces costs of regulation to local jurisdictions*
* *Minimizes ongoing training of the local jurisdictions by the State*
* *Minimizes possibility of contradictory regulations between the state and local governments*
* *Provides for local and state interactions similar to that related to existing gaming regulations*
1. Was there dissent in the group regarding this recommendation? If yes, please provide a summary of the dissenting opinion regarding the recommendation.

*No dissent*

1. What action(s) will be necessary to adopt the recommendation? Will statute, policy, regulations, etc. need to be addressed?

*A regulation should be adopted that makes it clear that local governments may regulate recreational marijuana establishments on zoning, general business license matters, fire and building code compliance. However, local governments must defer to State regulation on matters involving edibles, packaging, concentrates, dosing, potency, serving size limitations, and products types.*

*Essentially, the State should carry out the provisions outlined in 453D.200 and the local governments should not add to or take away from the subject matter in those same provisions at the local level. 453D.200 (1) (h) will be exempt from this regulation.*

1. Additional information (cost of implementation, priority according to the recommendations, etc.).

*None*