STATE QUESTION NO. 2

Amendment to the Nevada Revised Statutes

Shall the Nevada Revised Statutes be amended to allow a person, 21 years old or older, to purchase, cultivate, possess, or consume a certain amount of marijuana or concentrated marijuana, as well as manufacture, possess, use, transport, purchase, distribute, or sell marijuana paraphernalia; impose a 15 percent excise tax on wholesale sales of marijuana; require the regulation and licensing of marijuana cultivators, testing facilities, distributors, suppliers, and retailers; and provide for certain criminal penalties?

Yes ☐  No ☐

EXPLANATION & DIGEST

EXPLANATION—This ballot measure proposes to amend the Nevada Revised Statutes to make it lawful for a person 21 years of age or older to purchase and consume one ounce or less of marijuana other than concentrated marijuana, or one-eighth of an ounce or less of concentrated marijuana. It would also make it lawful for a person 21 years of age or older to cultivate not more than six marijuana plants for personal use, as well as obtain and use marijuana paraphernalia.

The ballot measure would also allow for the operation of marijuana establishments, which would be regulated by the Department of Taxation. Regulated marijuana establishments would include marijuana cultivation facilities, marijuana testing facilities, marijuana product manufacturing facilities, marijuana distributors, and retail marijuana stores. For the first 18 months, the Department of Taxation would only accept license applications for retail marijuana stores, marijuana product manufacturing facilities, and marijuana cultivation facilities from persons holding a medical marijuana establishment registration certificate. Similarly, for the first 18 months, the Department of Taxation would only issue marijuana distributors’ licenses to persons holding a Nevada wholesale liquor dealers’ license, unless the Department determines an insufficient number of marijuana distributors would result from this limitation.

If the ballot measure is approved, no marijuana establishments would be allowed within 1,000 feet of a public or private K-12 school or 300 feet of a community facility. There would also be limits on the number of retail marijuana store licenses issued in each county by the Department of Taxation. In a county with a population greater than 700,000, up to 80 retail marijuana store licenses would be allowed; in a county with a population greater than 100,000 but less than 700,000, up to 20 retail marijuana store licenses would be allowed; in a county with a population greater than 55,000 but less than 100,000, up to 4 retail marijuana store licenses would be allowed; and in a county with a population less than 55,000, up to 2 retail marijuana store licenses would be allowed. At the request of a county government, the Department of Taxation may issue retail marijuana store licenses in excess of the number otherwise allowed.
In addition to licensing, the Department of Taxation would be charged with adopting regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this ballot measure. The regulations must address licensing procedures; licensee qualifications; security of marijuana establishments; testing, labeling, and packaging requirements; reasonable restrictions on advertising; and civil penalties for violating any regulation adopted by the Department.

Approval of the ballot measure would not prevent the imposition of civil or criminal penalties for driving under the influence of marijuana; knowingly selling or giving marijuana to a person under 21 years of age; possessing or using marijuana or marijuana paraphernalia in state correctional centers; possessing or using marijuana on school grounds; or undertaking any task under the influence of marijuana that constitutes negligence or professional malpractice. The measure would also not prevent employers from enforcing marijuana bans for their workers; marijuana bans in public buildings or on private property; and localities from adopting control measures pertaining to zoning and land use for marijuana establishments.

Under the provisions of the ballot measure, all applicants for a marijuana establishment license would be required to pay a one-time application fee of $5,000. Additionally, the Department of Taxation may require the payment of an annual licensing fee ranging from $3,300 to $30,000, depending on type of license. The measure would also impose a 15 percent excise tax on wholesale sales of marijuana in Nevada by a marijuana cultivation facility. Revenue from this excise tax, as well as revenue from licensing fees and penalties collected by the Department of Taxation related to the regulation of marijuana, would first go to the Department of Taxation and local governments to cover the costs of carrying out the provisions of this measure. Any remaining revenue would be deposited in the State Distributive School Account.

Lastly, this ballot measure would impose criminal penalties for certain violations related to the possession, use, sale, and cultivation of marijuana and marijuana plants. Criminal offenses would include violations of the marijuana cultivation laws set forth in the measure; public consumption of marijuana; a person falsely representing himself or herself to be 21 years of age or older in order to obtain marijuana; and knowingly giving marijuana to a person under 21 years of age.

A “Yes” vote would amend the Nevada Revised Statutes to allow a person, 21 years old or older, to purchase, cultivate, possess, or consume a certain amount of marijuana or concentrated marijuana, as well as manufacture, possess, use, transport, purchase, distribute, or sell marijuana paraphernalia; impose a 15 percent excise tax on wholesale sales of marijuana; require the regulation and licensing of marijuana cultivators, testing facilities, distributors, suppliers, and retailers; and provide for certain criminal penalties.

A “No” vote would retain the provisions of the Nevada Revised Statutes in their current form. These provisions prohibit the possession, use, cultivation, and sale or delivery of marijuana in the State of Nevada for non-medical purposes, as well as the possession, use, sale, delivery, or manufacture of marijuana paraphernalia for non-medical purposes.
DIGEST—Chapter 453 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, known as the Uniform Controlled Substances Act, concerns the classification, enforcement, regulation, and offenses related to marijuana. Approval of this ballot measure would amend the Nevada Revised Statutes to make it lawful for a person 21 years of age or older to purchase and consume one ounce or less of marijuana other than concentrated marijuana, or one-eighth of an ounce or less of concentrated marijuana. It would also make it lawful for a person 21 years of age or older to cultivate not more than six marijuana plants for personal use, as well as obtain and use marijuana paraphernalia. Approval of this ballot measure would increase public revenue due to revenue collections from license fees for marijuana establishments and the 15 percent wholesale marijuana excise tax.

The ballot measure would also allow for the operation of marijuana establishments, which would be regulated by the Department of Taxation. Regulated marijuana establishments would include marijuana cultivation facilities, marijuana testing facilities, marijuana product manufacturing facilities, marijuana distributors, and retail marijuana stores. In addition to licensing, the Department of Taxation would be charged with adopting regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this ballot measure. The regulations must address licensing procedures; licensee qualifications; security of marijuana establishments; testing, labeling, and packaging requirements; reasonable restrictions on advertising; and civil penalties for violating any regulation adopted by the Department.

Under the provisions of the ballot measure, all applicants for a marijuana establishment license would be required to pay a one-time application fee of $5,000. Additionally, the Department of Taxation may require the payment of an annual licensing fee ranging from $3,300 to $30,000, depending on type of license. The measure would also impose a 15 percent excise tax on wholesale sales of marijuana in Nevada by a marijuana cultivation facility. Revenue from this excise tax, as well as revenue from licensing fees and penalties collected by the Department of Taxation related to the regulation of marijuana, would first go to the Department of Taxation and local governments to cover the costs of carrying out the provisions of this measure. Any remaining revenue would be deposited in the State Distributive School Account.

Approval of this ballot measure would impose criminal penalties for certain violations related to the possession, use, sale, and cultivation of marijuana and marijuana plants. Criminal offenses would include violations of the marijuana cultivation laws set forth in the measure; public consumption of marijuana; a person falsely representing himself or herself to be 21 years of age or older in order to obtain marijuana; and knowingly giving marijuana to a person under 21 years of age.

Current Nevada law, found in Chapter 453 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, prohibits various actions related to marijuana. Under current law, possession of marijuana for personal use is prohibited. Current law also prohibits the sale or delivery of marijuana; the cultivation of marijuana plants; and the possession, use, sale, delivery, or manufacture of marijuana paraphernalia for non-medical purposes. Possession and use of hashish and marijuana
concentrates is also prohibited under current Nevada law. Criminal and civil penalties are provided for in current law for violations of the marijuana prohibitions established in Chapter 453 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes*.

### ARGUMENT FOR PASSAGE

*Initiative to Regulate and Tax Marijuana*

Vote Yes On 2! Question 2 will benefit Nevada by regulating marijuana in a manner similar to alcohol:

- It makes possession of small amounts of marijuana legal for adults 21 years of age or older;
- It establishes strict rules for the cultivation, production, distribution, and sale of marijuana in Nevada; and
- It will generate millions of dollars in new tax revenue to support K-12 education.

*Question 2 is a sensible change in law for the state.*

Marijuana prohibition is a failed policy in every sense of the word. Our government took a substance less harmful than alcohol and made it completely illegal. This resulted in the growth of a multi-billion-dollar underground market driven by drug cartels and criminals operating in our communities. We have forced law enforcement to focus on the sale and use of marijuana instead of on serious, violent, and unsolved crimes.

Question 2 is a better way. We need to eliminate the criminal market by shifting the production and sale of marijuana into the hands of tightly regulated Nevada businesses, who will be required to comply with state and local laws, including environmental standards.

By regulating marijuana like alcohol, marijuana businesses will be required to:

- Test marijuana products to ensure that they are safe and properly labeled;
- Sell marijuana products in child-resistant packaging; and
- Check identification of customers to ensure marijuana is not sold to minors.

*None of that occurs in the illegal market.*

The initiative provides for a 15% excise tax on marijuana, which will generate an estimated $20 million annually. This will cover the cost of enforcing regulations and will also support K-12 education in the state. In addition to this tax, legal marijuana sales will generate more than $30 million annually in state and local sales tax revenue.

To enhance public safety, the initiative:
Leaves in place Nevada’s strict laws against driving under the influence of marijuana;
Allows employers to have policies against the use of marijuana by employees;
Prohibits the use of marijuana in public; and
Imposes significant penalties for distribution of marijuana to minors.

It’s time to stop punishing adults who use marijuana responsibly. This initiative will accomplish that goal in a manner that protects consumers, enhances public safety, provides for local control, generates tax revenue, and creates thousands of new jobs in the state. Vote Yes on 2!

The above argument was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens in favor of this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Amanda Connor (Chair), private citizen; Riana Durrett, Riana Durrett PLLC; and John Ritter, Coalition to Regulate Marijuana Like Alcohol. This argument, with active hyperlinks, can also be found at www.nvsos.gov.

1 Marijuana is Less Harmful than Alcohol: It’s Time to Treat it that Way, Regulate Marijuana Like Alcohol in Nevada, https://www.regulatemarijuanainnevada.org/safer/.
3 Id.

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT FOR PASSAGE

Question 2 is nothing more than a power grab from mostly out-of-state special interests who want to get rich. It even legalizes pot candies and allows pot advertising.

This initiative lets marijuana businesses line their pockets while the black market thrives. Legalization has done nothing to end the black market in Colorado, and has even allowed Mexican cartels to hide in plain sight.1 In Denver, drug and narcotics crime rose an average of 13% per year since 2014.2

Question 2 also isn’t about personal freedom – instead, it makes it a crime to home-cultivate pot within 25 miles of a retail marijuana store, and it doesn’t even allow for local "opt-out" provisions as Colorado did.

Enriching marijuana business executives won’t be a boon for K-12 education, either. Projected annual tax revenues from pot sales won’t be enough to build even one Nevada middle school.3 Exposing our children to industrially-produced, kid-friendly pot gummy bears is not worth it.

Finally, Nevada taxpayers don’t need a new government-run bureaucracy with troubling long-term societal costs.
At the end of the day, Question 2 benefits Big Marijuana at your expense. Vote NO—it's bad for Nevada's children, families, and taxpayers.

The above rebuttal was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens opposed to this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Pat Hickey (Chair), Nevadans for Responsible Drug Policy; Pam Graber, private citizen; and Kyle Stephens, Nevadans for Responsible Drug Policy. Pursuant to NRS 293.252(5)(f), the Committee does not believe the measure will have any environmental impact. This argument, with active hyperlinks, can also be found at www.nvsos.gov.

3 Email correspondence, Clark County School District, July 25, 2016.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PASSAGE

Vote NO on Question 2. It's bad for Nevada children, bad for Nevada families, and bad for Nevada taxpayers.

Question 2 is about one thing—making out-of-state pot companies rich at your expense. It will bring marijuana stores to your neighborhood allowing kid-friendly, pot gummy bears and candies.1 It also allows the selling of high-potency pot—today's pot is more than 20 times stronger than the marijuana of the 1960s.2 It gives shadowy corporations and Nevada's alcohol industry special monopoly-like powers, at the expense of ordinary Nevadans. Question 2 is funded and supported by special interests in Washington, D.C.3, who simply want to get rich.

More specifically:

- Question 2 would allow marijuana shops in neighborhoods—where your children live—to sell pot-laced edibles that are easily mistaken for ordinary candy. Since Colorado legalized pot, marijuana use by youth is now ranked 56% higher than the national average.4 Studies show THC, the psychoactive component in today's marijuana has devastating effects on the developing teenage brain.5 So Question 2 isn't about protecting children, and would provide children with easier access to marijuana.
• Question 2 would permit new pot products with high potency levels. Fatal accidents involving stoned drivers have more than doubled in Washington where pot has been legalized.\(^6\) Question 2 isn’t about public health and safety. It’s about marketing a harmful drug to people for profit.

• Studies show teenagers who regularly use marijuana have lower IQs\(^7\) and higher dropout rates, and do worse on college entrance exams.\(^8\) Nevada is currently near the bottom of most U.S. rankings in education. At a time when skilled graduates are needed to fill Nevada jobs, we can’t afford to fall any further.

• Question 2 would give special treatment and benefits to corporate interests and select alcohol companies involved in recreational marijuana sales. So Question 2 isn’t about business opportunities for average Nevadans, but about corporate handouts to a privileged few.

The black market for pot will not go away by legalizing marijuana. "We have plenty of cartel activity in Colorado [and] plenty of illegal activity that has not decreased at all," said Colorado Attorney General, Cynthia Coffman.\(^9\)

Bottom line: Legalizing marijuana will send a message to Nevada's children and teens that drug use is acceptable.

Question 2 is bad for Nevada children, bad for Nevada’s families, and bad for Nevada taxpayers. Just say NO, to Question 2.

The above argument was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens opposed to this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Pat Hickey (Chair), Nevadans for Responsible Drug Policy; Pam Graber, private citizen; and Kyle Stephens, Nevadans for Responsible Drug Policy. Pursuant to NRS 293.252(5)(f), the Committee does not believe the measure will have any environmental impact. This rebuttal, with active hyperlinks, can also be found at www.nvsos.gov.

\(^1\) Reefer Sanity in the Marijuana Debate, Project SAM Presentation, Kevin A. Sabet. Ph.D.
\(^2\) Id.
\(^3\) Coalition to Regulate Marijuana Like Alcohol, Contributions and Expenses Report, Nevada Secretary of State web site available at: https://nvsos.gov/SOSCandidateServices/AnonymousAccess/CEFDSearchUU/GroupDetails.aspx?o=Yno8l9HPiEChJmkeEEJ7w%253d%253d.
\(^5\) Reefer Sanity in the Marijuana Debate, Project SAM Presentation, Kevin A. Sabet. Ph.D.
\(^7\) Reefer Sanity in the Marijuana Debate, Project SAM Presentation, Kevin A. Sabet. Ph.D.
REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PASSAGE

“Reefer Madness.” The term has been used for decades to describe exaggerated claims about marijuana that are designed to scare people into keeping marijuana illegal. We hope you recognize the argument above as modern-day Reefer Madness.

Here are just a few examples:

- The largest and most recent surveys of teen marijuana use showed that Colorado’s marijuana use rate among high school students is actually below the national average.¹

- Since Colorado regulated medical marijuana and then adult-use marijuana, high school dropout rates have actually fallen.²

- Regarding things like gummy bears, the argument above fails to mention that the Colorado legislature recently banned marijuana products shaped like animals (or other attractive figures)³ and we expect thoughtful Nevada lawmakers will do the same.

- The argument above suggest that Question 2 would allow marijuana sales “where your children live,” despite the fact that the measure gives all localities the ability to ban sales in residential districts.

Don’t let opponents of Question 2 scare you into keeping marijuana illegal. That would simply leave the marijuana market in the hands of drug cartels and criminals. Let’s put criminals out of business. Let’s regulate marijuana and generate tax revenue for schools.

Please vote Yes on Question 2!

The above rebuttal was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens in favor of this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Amanda Connor (Chair), private citizen; Riana Durrett, Riana Durrett PLLC; and John Ritter, Coalition to Regulate Marijuana Like Alcohol. This rebuttal, with active hyperlinks, can also be found at www.nvsos.gov.

FISCAL NOTE

FINANCIAL IMPACT – CANNOT BE DETERMINED

OVERVIEW
Question 2 proposes to amend the Nevada Revised Statutes to add several new sections that would require the Department of Taxation to regulate and administer the operation of facilities that cultivate, produce, and dispense marijuana products in the state. Question 2 additionally requires the Department to collect a 15 percent excise tax upon the wholesale value of marijuana sold by a marijuana cultivation facility in Nevada. The proceeds from the excise tax, less costs incurred by the Department of Taxation and counties, cities, and towns to carry out certain provisions of Question 2, must be deposited in the State Distributive School Account.

Question 2 also decriminalizes the personal use, possession, or cultivation of marijuana under certain circumstances and provides for criminal penalties related to the unlawful cultivation, consumption, manufacture, or distribution of marijuana.

FINANCIAL IMPACT OF QUESTION 2
State and local governments will receive additional revenue from the following provisions of Question 2:

1. The Department of Taxation shall collect a one-time fee of $5,000 from each applicant for a marijuana establishment license.
2. The Department of Taxation may impose fees for the initial issuance and annual renewal of marijuana establishment licenses for retail stores, cultivation facilities, product manufacturing facilities, distributors, and testing facilities, with the maximum fee that can be imposed for each license specified in Question 2.
3. An excise tax of 15 percent must be collected on the fair market wholesale value of marijuana sold by a marijuana cultivation facility and remitted to the Department of Taxation. The Department must establish regulations to determine the fair market wholesale value for marijuana in the state.
4. Marijuana, marijuana products, and marijuana paraphernalia sold as tangible personal property by a retail marijuana store would be subject to state and local sales and use taxes under current statute.

The proceeds from the application fee, license fees, and excise tax, less costs incurred by the Department of Taxation and counties, cities, and towns to carry out certain provisions of
Question 2, must be deposited in the State Distributive School Account. The proceeds from the state and local sales and use taxes generated on the retail sales of marijuana, marijuana products, and marijuana paraphernalia would be distributed to the state and local governments, including school districts, in the same manner these taxes are currently distributed.

The Department of Taxation and the Fiscal Analysis Division cannot determine the amount of revenue that will be generated for state and local governments, including school districts and the State Distributive School Account, from the application fee, licensee fees, excise tax, and sales and use taxes, because the following factors cannot be estimated with any reasonable degree of certainty:

1. The number of applications that would be received by the Department for marijuana establishment licenses;
2. The number of initial and annual licenses that would be issued by the Department and the amount of the fee that the Department would charge for each initial and annual license issued, if the Department decides to impose the license fees authorized within Question 2;
3. The quantity of marijuana that will be sold by marijuana cultivation facilities and the fair market value that will be established by the Department through the regulatory process that will be subject to the excise tax;
4. The quantity of marijuana, marijuana products, and marijuana paraphernalia and the price of these items that will be sold by retail marijuana stores that will be subject to state and local sales and use taxes.

Additionally, businesses that receive marijuana establishment licenses from the Department may also be subject to additional taxes and fees imposed by the state of Nevada or by local governments, including, but not limited to, the Modified Business Tax, the Commerce Tax, and state and local business license fees, which would increase revenues from these tax sources dedicated to the state or local government entity imposing the tax or fee. However, because the Fiscal Analysis Division cannot estimate the number of licenses that will be issued, the revenue that may be generated by the marijuana establishments, or the wages that may be paid to persons employed by the establishments, the resultant increase in revenues dedicated to the state and local governments cannot be determined with any reasonable degree of certainty.

The Fiscal Analysis Division has identified the following areas that may affect expenditures for state and local governments as a result of Question 2:

1. The Department of Taxation has indicated that it will incur one-time costs for equipment and programming of its computer system totaling approximately $600,000. The Department has also indicated that it will need an additional 14 positions to implement and administer these provisions, beginning on January 1, 2017, which, along with associated operating costs, would result in a cost of approximately $637,000 for the last six months of Fiscal Year 2017 (January 1, 2017–June 30, 2017) and approximately $1.1 million in each
The Department has indicated that some expenditures will be required before revenue from the excise tax and fees authorized in Question 2 are collected; however, the Fiscal Analysis Division cannot determine how the Department will choose to implement Question 2, the timing of expenditures that will be incurred by the Department, or the method that will be used to fund these initial costs.

2. Question 2 requires the Department of Taxation to conduct a background check of each prospective owner, officer, and board member of a marijuana establishment license applicant. Question 2 also requires the operator of each marijuana establishment to determine the criminal history of each worker or volunteer for suitability of employment as established in Question 2. The Department of Public Safety has indicated that if it will be required to process the background checks, the caseload increase will require one to two additional positions, which would cost approximately $50,000 to $100,000 per fiscal year. However, the Fiscal Analysis Division cannot determine the process that the Department of Taxation will choose to conduct these background checks.

3. The provisions of Question 2 that criminalize and decriminalize certain actions related to marijuana will require changes to the Nevada Offense Codes used in the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History maintained by the Department of Public Safety. The Department of Public Safety has indicated that an independent contractor may be required to implement the changes to the Nevada Offense Codes, which would result in a financial impact of approximately $10,000 to $40,000, based on previous contracts for these types of services. The Fiscal Analysis Division has determined that a financial impact on state government may occur only if an independent contractor is used to make the changes to the Nevada Offense Codes.

4. The provisions of Question 2 that criminalize and decriminalize certain actions related to marijuana may increase or decrease the workload of various state and local government agencies with respect to enforcement, investigation, incarceration, probation, and parole. The Fiscal Analysis Division cannot determine the net effect of these provisions on the workload of these agencies with respect to these functions.

The Fiscal Analysis Division cannot determine what actions may be taken by state and local governments to carry out the provisions of Question 2, the amount of expenditures that may be incurred, or how those expenditures would be funded. However, Question 2 specifies that excise tax revenues, fees, or penalties collected must first be used to defray certain costs incurred by the Department of Taxation and counties, cities, and towns, with the excess revenue to be deposited in the State Distributive School Account. Additionally, state and local governments, including school districts, will receive sales and use tax revenue from the retail
sales of marijuana, marijuana products, and marijuana paraphernalia, as well as from other taxes and fees that may be paid by businesses that receive marijuana establishment licenses. Therefore, the Fiscal Analysis Division cannot determine the financial impact upon state or local governments, including school districts and the State Distributive Account, because the revenues and expenditures resulting from Question 2 cannot be estimated with any reasonable degree of certainty.

*Prepared by the Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau – August 12, 2016*