1. Working group name:

*Taxation/Revenue/Regulatory Structure Working Group*

1. Individual sponsor(s):

*John Ritter, Nevada Dispensary Association & Owner*

*Amanda Connor, Attorney Connor & Connor - Marijuana law*

1. Describe the recommendation:

*The Taxation/Revenue/Regulatory Structure Working Group recommends that the impartial and numerically scored bidding process as described in IP1 for "retail marijuana stores" include the following criteria and weighting to be used for scoring applications. IP1 also requires the department to adopt regulations that include "qualifications for licensure that are directly and demonstrably related to the operation of a marijuana establishment.” Therefore we also recommend that the applicable criteria and weighting shown below that demonstrate those qualifications be included in the regulations.*

*The following criteria and weighting should be included:*

1. *Applicant has an existing temporary recreational marijuana establishment license that is operational (as defined in the temporary regulations) and in good standing (as defined in the temporary regulations). – Very heavily weighted*
2. *Applicant has a medical marijuana establishment license that is operational (as defined in the temporary regulations) by December 31, 2017 and is in good standing (as defined in the temporary regulations) - Very Heavily weighted.*
3. *Owners, officers and/or the management team have direct experience with a medical and/or recreational marijuana establishment for the specific type of marijuana establishment license the applicant is seeking and have demonstrated a track record of operating that establishment in a manner that complies with the requirements of the applicable State regulatory authority overseeing such establishment. Experience in a Nevada marijuana establishment is preferred. – Very Heavily weighted*
4. *Applicant has demonstrated a track record of paying taxes to the Department of Taxation generated by the operation of a medical or recreational marijuana establishment. - Very heavily weighted*
5. *Owners, Officers and/or Board members have a demonstrated track record of employing Nevadans and paying state and local taxes and fees in Nevada. - Heavily Weighted*
6. *Owners, Officers and/or Board members have a demonstrated track record of giving back to the community through their civic and/or philanthropic involvement in Nevada. - Heavily Weighted*
7. *Owners, Officers, and/or Board members have experience operating another kind of business(s) that has given them applicable experience to running a marijuana establishment in the State of Nevada. - Medium weighted.*
8. *Applicant has submitted a business plan for the operation of the marijuana establishment that demonstrates knowledge and experience with the license type that is being applied for and addresses how the establishment will be operated under the requirements established by regulation of the Department as required by NRS 453D.200 - Medium weighted.*
9. 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.*

1. What provision(s) of Question 2 does this recommendation apply to?

*Question 2 states that there is to be an impartial and numerically scored bidding process for "retail marijuana stores" and that the Department has a duty to use "qualifications for licensure that are directly and demonstrably related to the operation of a marijuana establishment”. The recommendation addresses criteria and weighting to apply to each of those provisions.*

1. What issue(s) does the recommendation resolve?

*This recommendation resolves the issue of how to determine what criteria and weighting should be considered for issuance of a license.*

1. Was there dissent in the group regarding this recommendation? If yes, please provide a summary of the dissenting opinion regarding the recommendation.

*There was no dissent regarding this recommendation.*

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

*There would need to be adoption of regulations to address this recommendation.*

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

*None.*