

Date of Hearing: April 7, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS

Marc Berman, Chair

AB 2250 (Aguiar-Curry) – As Amended March 11, 2026

**NOTE:** This bill is double referred and if passed by this Committee will be re-referred to the Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation.

**SUBJECT:** Cannabis: cannabinoids.

**SUMMARY:** Makes various minor and technical changes to provisions of law providing for the regulation and enforcement of products containing cannabinoids derived from industrial hemp.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Beginning January 1, 2028, defines “concentrated cannabis” or “cannabis concentrate” to mean cannabis or industrial hemp that has undergone a process to concentrate one or more active cannabinoids, thereby increasing potency, and includes extracts, oils, hash, dab, shatter, rosin, wax, and the separated resin, whether crude or purified; excludes cannabidiol (CBD) isolate from that definition. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 11006.5)
- 2) Defines “cannabis” as all parts of the plant *Cannabis sativa* Linnaeus, *Cannabis indica*, or *Cannabis ruderalis*, whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin from glandular trichomes or extracted from any part of the plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of the plant, its seeds or resin; excludes industrial hemp from this definition. (HSC § 11018)
- 3) Defines “industrial hemp” as types of the plant *Cannabis sativa* Linnaeus or any part of that plant with a total tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) concentration of no more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis and is limited to only agricultural products, including seeds, propagated plant material, immature or mature plants, harvested plants, mature stalks of the plant, fiber produced from the stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of the plant, or any preparation that does not contain cannabinoids. (HSC § 11018.5)
- 4) Establishes a regulatory framework for industrial hemp under the Sherman Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law administered by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), under which manufacturers of products containing industrial hemp are required to obtain a process food registration and comply with good manufacturing practices. (HSC §§ 111920 *et seq.*)
- 5) Requires the distribution or sale of industrial hemp products to include documentation of a certificate of analysis from an independent testing laboratory that confirms that the industrial hemp raw extract, in its final form, does not exceed THC concentration of an amount determined allowable by the CDPH in regulation, or that the mass of the industrial hemp extract used in the final form product does not exceed a THC concentration of 0.3 percent. (HSC § 111921)
- 6) Authorizes the CDPH to exclude from the definition of “THC or comparable cannabinoid” isomers that do not cause intoxication, but that the CDPH may include any other cannabinoids that the CDPH determines do cause intoxication. (HSC § 111921.7)

- 7) Authorizes the CDPH to adopt regulations to determine maximum serving sizes for hemp-derived cannabinoids, hemp extract, and products derived therefrom, active cannabinoid concentration per serving size, the number of servings per container, and any other requirements for foods and beverages. (HSC § 111922)
- 8) Requires hemp manufacturers to register with the CDPH. (HSC § 111923.3)
- 9) Requires a manufacturer, distributor, or seller of an industrial hemp product to follow packaging, labeling, and advertising laws applicable to cannabis businesses. (HSC § 111926)
- 10) Requires industrial hemp products to meet specified packaging and labeling requirements. (HSC § 111926.3)
- 11) Provides the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) with responsibility for administering and enforcing laws governing the growing, cultivating, and distributing of industrial hemp. (Food and Agricultural Code §§ (FAC) 81000 *et seq.*)
- 12) Imposes limitations and prohibitions on the growth of industrial hemp and requires each crop of industrial hemp to be tested by a laboratory to determine the THC levels of a random sampling of its dried flowering tops. (FAC § 81006)
- 13) Enacts the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Licensing Act of 2003, which provides for the licensing of manufacturers, importers, distributors, wholesalers, and retailers of cigarettes and tobacco products by the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA). (Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§ 22970 *et seq.*)
- 14) Prohibits a seller of cigarettes or tobacco products from possessing, storing, owning, or making a retail sale of cannabis, cannabis products, or a product presumed to be a cannabis product due to its inclusion of a cannabinoid, regardless of the source of that cannabinoid, and authorizes the CDTFA to seize those products upon discovery. (BPC § 22980.6)
- 15) Provides that moneys in the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Compliance Fund are available for expenditure, upon appropriation by the Legislature, solely for the purpose of implementing, enforcing, and administering the California Cigarette and Tobacco Products Licensing Act of 2003, including the seizure and destruction of cigarettes and tobacco products. (BPC § 22990)
- 16) Enacts the Medicinal and Adult-Use Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act (MAUCRSA) to provide for a comprehensive regulatory framework for the cultivation, distribution, transport, storage, manufacturing, processing, and sale of medicinal and adult-use cannabis. (BPC §§ 26000 *et seq.*)
- 17) Defines “cannabinoid” as a chemical compound found in cannabis and industrial hemp that binds to or otherwise activates cannabinoid receptors in humans and animals, including THC and CBD. (BPC § 26001)
- 18) Excludes products that are regulated pursuant to and meet the requirements of the Sherman Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law, including products that do not contain cannabinoids other than CBD isolate, from MAUCRSA. (BPC § 26002)

- 19) Establishes the Department of Cannabis Control (DCC) within the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency for purposes of administering and enforcing MAUCRSA. (BPC § 26010)
- 20) Establishes grounds for disciplinary action against cannabis licensees, including failures to comply with state requirements as well as local laws and ordinances. (BPC § 26030)
- 21) Specifically provides that the unlicensed use of the cannabis universal symbol is a violation of MAUCRSA and empowers the CDTFA to seize unlicensed cannabis products bearing the universal symbol as contraband. (BPC § 26031.6)
- 22) Prohibits a person or entity from engaging in commercial cannabis activity without a state license issued by the DCC pursuant to MAUCRSA. (BPC § 26037.5)
- 23) Provides for various specified types of cannabis licenses including subtypes for cultivation, manufacturing, testing, retail, distribution, and microbusiness; requires each licensee except for testing laboratories to clearly designate whether their license is for adult-use or medicinal cannabis. (BPC § 26050)
- 24) Prohibits the sale of cannabis products that are alcoholic beverages, including through an infusion of cannabis or cannabinoids derived from industrial hemp into alcoholic beverages. (BPC § 26070.2)
- 25) Authorizes state and local prosecutors to bring an action for injunctive relief and civil penalties against licensed cannabis businesses or an industrial hemp registrants for violations of laws intended to restrict the advertising and marketing of cannabis products to minors by licensed cannabis businesses. (BPC § 26152.2)
- 26) Expresses that state cannabis laws shall not be interpreted to supersede or limit the authority of a local jurisdiction to adopt and enforce local ordinances to regulate cannabis businesses. (BPC § 26200)
- 27) Defines “industrial hemp” as a crop that is limited to types of the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. having no more than three-tenths of 1 percent tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) contained in the dried flowering tops, whether growing or not; the seeds of the plant; the resin extracted from any part of the plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of the plant, its seeds or resin produced therefrom; exempts industrial hemp from the provisions of MAUCRSA. (Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 11018.5)
- 28) Establishes the Cannabis Tax Law. (Revenue and Tax Code (RTC) §§ 34010 *et seq.*)
- 29) Provides the CDTFA with responsibility for administering and collecting taxes on cannabis businesses. (RTC § 34013)
- 30) Authorizes the CDTFA or a law enforcement agency to seize cannabis or cannabis products from a person who possesses, stores, owns, or has made a retail sale of those cannabis or cannabis products under specified circumstances, and provides that a product is presumed to be a cannabis product if it contains or purports to contain a cannabinoid, regardless of the nature or source of the cannabinoid. (RTC § 34016)

**THIS BILL:**

- 1) Aligns the definitions of “cannabis” and “cannabis products” for purposes of the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Licensing Act of 2003 with definitions established in the Health and Safety Code.
- 2) Exempts cannabidiol (CBD) isolate from the definition of “cannabis concentrate.”
- 3) Authorizes the CDTFA or a law enforcement agency to seize cannabis or cannabis products that are possessed, stored, offered for sale, or sold at an unlicensed premises.
- 4) Makes additional technical, clarifying, and conforming changes.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown; this bill is keyed fiscal by the Legislative Counsel.

**COMMENTS:**

**Purpose.** This bill is sponsored by the author. According to the author:

Last year, I authored AB 8 (Aguiar-Curry, Chapter 248, Statutes of 2025) to protect public health and licensed businesses by strengthening enforcement against illegal hemp products, ensuring that all intoxicating cannabinoids are regulated and taxed as cannabis, and creating a pathway for responsible hemp and cannabis operators to participate in the federal and state legal markets. AB 2250 is a technical clean up bill that will make sure that AB 8 can be implemented effectively. These changes are needed to ensure that state agencies have the tools they need to provide oversight and enforcement for California’s cannabis marketplace.

**Background.**

*Cannabis versus Hemp.* Botanically speaking, both industrial hemp and what has historically been referred to as marijuana are members of the same plant species, *Cannabis sativa*. Under California law, the term “cannabis” typically refers to varieties of the species that contain sufficient levels of the cannabinoid THC to produce an intoxicating psychoactive effect, or “high”; this plant and its associated products are regulated by the DCC under MAUCRSA. Hemp, meanwhile, is commonly regarded more as an agricultural plant and has historically been used for products such as paper, textiles, cosmetics, and fabric. California law has historically required industrial hemp to contain less than 0.3 percent THC, which is considered trace amounts compared to psychoactive cannabis (which frequently contains between 15-40 percent THC). Hemp is regulated by the CDFA for agricultural purposes, and by the CDPH when it is used in food, beverage, and cosmetic products.

While industrial hemp does not share the same psychoactive properties as cannabis due to its significantly lower amount of THC, both hemp and cannabis contain another cannabinoid known as CBD. According to the National Institute of Health, CBD has pain relieving, anti-inflammatory, anti-psychotic, and tumor-inhibiting properties. There are currently over 100 clinical trials of CBD listed on the National Library of Medicine’s website. These trials are testing CBD’s utility in treating epilepsy, substance use disorders, pain, psychosis, and anxiety, among other disorders and conditions. Similar research is being conducted on the cannabinoid CBN, with early studies exploring its potential positive effects on sleep, inflammation, and neuroprotection.

*Regulation of Cannabis.* Consumption of cannabis was first made lawful in California in 1996 when voters approved Proposition 215, the Compassionate Use Act. Proposition 215 protected qualified patients and caregivers from prosecution relating to the possession and cultivation of cannabis for medicinal purposes, if recommended by a physician. This regulatory scheme was further refined by SB 420 (Vasconcellos) in 2003, which established the state's Medical Marijuana Program. However, a lack of a uniform regulatory framework led to persistent problems across the state due to cannabis's continued illegality under the federal Controlled Substances Act, which classifies cannabis as a Schedule I drug ineligible for prescription.

After several prior attempts to improve the state's regulation of cannabis, the Legislature passed the Medical Marijuana Regulation and Safety Act—subsequently retitled the Medical Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act (MCRSA)—in 2015. MCRSA established, for the first time, a comprehensive statewide licensing and regulatory framework for the cultivation, manufacture, transportation, testing, distribution, and sale of medicinal cannabis. While entrusting state agencies to promulgate regulations governing the implementation of the state's cannabis laws, MCRSA preserved local control. Under MCRSA, local governments could establish their own ordinances to regulate medicinal cannabis activity, or choose to ban cannabis activity altogether.

Not long after the Legislature enacted MCRSA, California voters passed Proposition 64, the Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA). The passage of the AUMA legalized cannabis for non-medicinal adult use in a private home or licensed business; allowed adults 21 and over to possess and give away up to approximately one ounce of cannabis and up to eight grams of concentrate; and permitted the personal cultivation of up to six plants. The proponents of the AUMA sought to make use of much of the regulatory framework and authorities set out by MCRSA while making a few notable changes to the structure still being implemented.

In the spring of 2017, SB 94 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) was passed to reconcile the distinct systems for the regulation, licensing, and enforcement of legal cannabis that had been established under the respective authorities of MCRSA and the AUMA. The single consolidated system established by the bill—known as the Medicinal and Adult-Use Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act (MAUCRSA)—created a unified series of cannabis laws. On January 16, 2019, the state's three cannabis licensing authorities—the Bureau of Cannabis Control, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, and the California Department of Public Health—officially announced that the Office of Administrative Law had approved final cannabis regulations promulgated by the three agencies respectively.

In early 2021, the Department of Finance released trailer bill language to create a new Department with centralized authority for cannabis licensing and enforcement activities. This new department was created through a consolidation of the three prior licensing authorities' cannabis programs. As of July 1, 2021, the DCC has been the single entity responsible for administering and enforcing the majority of MAUCRSA. New regulations went into effect on January 1, 2023 to effectuate the consolidation and make other changes to cannabis regulation.

*Regulation of Hemp.* SB 566 (Leno) of 2013 established the Industrial Hemp Farming Act, which would provide a regulatory scheme for the cultivation and processing of industrial hemp in California upon approval by the federal government. SB 566 required growers of hemp for commercial purposes to register with the county agricultural commissioner of the county in which the grower intends to engage in industrial hemp cultivation among various provisions. Established agricultural research institutions were exempted from these requirements.

The U.S. Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (known as the Farm Bill) federally legalized the growing, cultivating, and the transporting of industrial hemp between states. However, the Farm Bill resulted in CBD containing products that have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to be removed from the list of Schedule I substances under the CSA and reclassified as a Schedule V drug. This policy was enacted because of the findings that it does not contain any psychoactive or addictive properties and has a very low abuse potential. This separates industrial hemp from marijuana specific cannabis products, which remains a Schedule I drug on the federal level. The Farm Bill also classifies CBD as a food product.

Importantly, the Farm Bill also requires states to devise their own sale restrictions and regulations, of which the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is responsible for overseeing. SB 153 (Wilk) of 2019 revised provisions in SB 566 regulating the cultivation and testing of industrial hemp to conform to the requirements for a state plan under the 2018 Farm Bill. SB 292 (Wilk) of 2021 additionally conformed state law to the USDA Interim Final Rule regarding reporting and testing of industrial hemp in the United States.

In 2021, AB 45 (Aguiar-Curry) was enacted to significantly expand and clarify the framework under which CBD derived from industrial hemp can be used in food, beverages and dietary supplements. The bill revised or added various definitions relating to hemp products and placed new requirements on hemp manufacturers in exchange for more explicit authority to produce manufactured goods containing CBD derived from hemp. In doing so, the bill expressly specified that foods, beverages, dietary supplements, cosmetics, and pet food are not adulterated by the inclusion of industrial hemp cannabinoids.

*Integration of Cannabis and Hemp.* Notwithstanding the biological and chemical similarities of cannabis and hemp, hemp products are considered “non-cannabis goods” for purpose of MAUCRSA. Under Section 15407 of the DCC’s regulations, licensed cannabis retailers are prohibited from selling any non-cannabis goods besides cannabis accessories, branded merchandise, and, subject to local authorization, prepackaged non-cannabis infused and food and beverages. While presumably an individual or entity could both engage in a licensed cannabis business and in a business involving hemp, it is understood that the two supply chains must remain fully distinct.

Whether hemp and cannabis products should be allowed to coexist in a regulatory context has been debated consistently over the past several years. Because both plants contain the same cannabinoids, it is often the case that two essentially identical products—CBD gummies, for example—are regulated and sold differently based on whether the CBD was derived from cannabis or industrial hemp. Many cannabis retailers may wish to also sell products derived from hemp. However, some in the cannabis industry may see hemp as an unwelcomed competitor, and concerns have been expressed that the difference in regulatory systems and consumer safety requirements should keep the two products separated.

AB 45 included language requiring the DCC to prepare a report to the Governor and the Legislature outlining the steps necessary to allow for the incorporation of hemp cannabinoids into the cannabis supply chain. The report is required to include, but is not be limited to, the incorporation of hemp cannabinoids into manufactured cannabis products and the sale of hemp products at cannabis retailers. Language in AB 45 also stated the intent of the Legislature to consider, in light of the DCC’s report, “whether and how to take legislative action concerning the incorporation of hemp into the cannabis supply chain.”

The DCC published *The Hemp Report: Steps and Considerations for Incorporating Hemp Into the Commercial Cannabis Supply Chain* and submitted it to the Legislature in January of 2023. The report submitted by the DCC stated that “incorporating hemp into the regulated commercial cannabis supply chain presents both policy and implementation challenges. From the policy perspective, several determinations would need to be made to move forward with the inclusion of hemp.” In the report’s conclusion, the DCC summarized its determinations and conclusions as follows:

As detailed in this report, the inclusion of hemp into the commercial cannabis supply chain is complex and requires careful consideration of significant policy questions to arrive at an approach that is in the best interests of California. The approach utilized to accomplish this end would directly impact the cannabis industry, hemp industry, standard commercial market, medicinal and adult-use consumers, and the Department and other responsible California state agencies. While this report raises significant policy considerations to inspire and support deliberations between policy makers and stakeholders, it should not be interpreted as containing every single issue that may need to be considered and addressed by policy makers to determine when or if to incorporate hemp into the cannabis supply chain. If California chooses to allow hemp into the commercial cannabis supply chain, irrespective of which approach California adopts, implementation will likely require significant time and resources.

*Intoxicating Hemp.* Concerns have grown over the past several years regarding the perceived proliferation of intoxicating hemp products. In 2022, the California Cannabis Industry Association (CCIA) issued a white paper in October 2022 titled *Pandora’s Box: The Dangers of a National, Unregulated, Hemp-Derived Intoxicating Cannabinoid Market*. The CCIA report argued that loopholes in the 2018 Farm Bill, which defined industrial hemp as having no more than 0.3 percent delta-9 THC content by dry weight, inadvertently created led to the proliferation of intoxicating hemp products. Specifically, the white paper points to a Ninth Circuit decision that the CCIA says “unleashed a Wild West of intoxicants when it ruled that products containing delta-8 THC meet the statutory definition of industrial hemp.”

According to the FDA, delta-8 THC is a cannabinoid typically synthetically manufactured from hemp-derived CBD that has significant psychoactive and intoxicating effects. The FDA has expressed concern that delta-8 THC products “likely expose consumers to much higher levels of the substance than are naturally occurring in hemp cannabis raw extracts.” There were reportedly 104 reports made to the FDA of adverse events in patients who consumed delta-8 THC products between December 1, 2020, and February 28, 2022, over half of which resulted in medical intervention or hospital admission.

In April 2023, the Cannabis Regulators Association (CANNRA), a coalition of regulatory agencies overseeing cannabis and hemp industries in more than 40 states and territories in the United States, wrote a letter to congressional leadership requesting action at the federal level provide a regulatory framework for products containing THC derived from hemp. CANNRA specifically called attention to the fact that a 0.3 percent threshold of delta-9 THC by weight is a relatively small amount of THC in a hemp plant, but is significantly more when included as an ingredient in edible products and beverages. A 50-gram chocolate bar, for example, would have around 150 milligrams of THC at the 0.3 percent THC limit – 30 times the standard 5 milligram THC dose established by the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

In February 2025, a white paper titled *The Great Hemp Hoax* was published with funding by the San Diego/Imperial Counties Joint Labor Management Cannabis Committee, UFCW, and March and Ash. This paper discussed findings that out of more than 100 intoxicating hemp products from 68 brands available to California consumers through online purchases, 95 percent contained synthetic cannabinoids prohibited under California law. Additionally, over 88 percent of tested products exceed the maximum amount of THC allowed to be classified as hemp products in California. The white paper found that on average, vape products supposedly derived from hemp had THC equivalency levels 268 percent above the state's threshold for adult-use cannabis.

*Efforts to Integrate and Regulate Hemp Products Containing Cannabinoids.* In 2023, AB 420 (Aguiar-Curry) was introduced to as a vehicle for continued discussions around how California might integrate industrial hemp into the supply chain for cannabis. Initially, the bill contained a statement that nothing in MAUCRSA prohibits integration. Subsequent amendments to the bill that were made in the Senate provided for greater details regarding how integration would be achieved. The amendments also expanded prohibitions against industrial hemp containing synthetic THC or similar cannabinoids. However, the bill was ultimately held under submission on the suspense file in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The following year, AB 2223 (Aguiar-Curry) was introduced to again seek to strengthen California laws governing the cultivation, manufacturing, and sale of hemp products. Language in the bill would have expressly allowed for the integration of industrial hemp into the licensed cannabis supply chain, with additional requirements to ensure that integration occurs safely. The bill also sought to close loopholes created in federal law by explicitly prohibiting intoxicating hemp products from being manufactured and sold in California. However, this bill was also held under submission on the suspense file in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

In September 2024, Governor Gavin Newsom announced that the CDPH was issuing emergency regulations banning the sale of consumable hemp products containing any detectable levels of THC or other intoxicating cannabinoids in California. The regulations additionally prohibited sales of hemp products to individuals under 21 and limited servings to five per package. State regulators indicated that sellers would be required to implement purchase restrictions and remove consumable hemp products containing any levels of detectable THC from shelves immediately upon the effective date of the regulations.

The Governor's emergency regulations were challenged in court by a coalition led by the U.S. Hemp Roundtable and several hemp businesses, who sought to halt enforcement and argued that the ban exceeded CDPH's rulemaking authority, specifically pointing to the failure of AB 2223 to pass the Legislature. However, in October 2024, the request for a temporary restraining order was denied by the Los Angeles County Superior Court, who found that the state had a compelling interest in protecting public health, especially that of children, from unregulated intoxicating hemp products. In March 2025, the CDPH extended the ban for through June 2025.

In 2026, the Legislature enacted AB 8, which was intended to build on the state's prohibition against the sale of intoxicating hemp products while allowing products containing cannabinoids derived from hemp to be manufactured and sold through the cannabis supply chain. The bill expanded the definition of "cannabis products" in the Uniform Controlled Substances Act, and aligned that definition with MAUCRSA, to include any product containing cannabis or cannabis concentrate including, but is not limited to, edible, topical, and inhaled products, and products intended for use on, or consumption by, an animal.

Under the framework established in AB 8, any product containing a concentrated cannabinoid derived from hemp, with the exception of pure CBD isolate, would fall under the definition of a cannabis product. Under that reclassification, cannabis products derived from industrial hemp are eligible for integration into the cannabis supply chain. Various provisions of MAUCRSA would apply to those products, including track and trace identification, advertising restrictions, security and transportation safety requirements, quality assurance standards, and laboratory testing. Industrial hemp or cannabis products derived exclusively from industrial hemp may still be shipped through California without entering the licensed cannabis market, provided they are not sold in California, or shipped out of California by a cannabis licensee. AB 8 also subjected cannabis products derived from industrial hemp to the state's 15 percent cannabis excise tax.

In addition to language classifying products containing concentrated cannabinoids derived from industrial hemp as cannabis products and incorporating those products into the cannabis supply chain, AB 8 made a number of additional technical and corresponding changes to ensure that regulators are able to oversee and enforce MAUCRSA and other state laws governing cannabis and hemp. A majority of the bill will not go into effect until January 1, 2028, allowing time for the industry and the state to prepare for the changes proposed by the bill. During that interim period, licensed cannabis manufacturers are only allowed to use cannabinoid concentrates and extracts that were manufactured or processed exclusively from cannabis obtained from a licensed cannabis cultivator and are not allowed to possess, transport, distribute, manufacture, or sell industrial hemp on or from a licensed premises, except that a licensed testing laboratory may test industrial hemp.

This bill would make a series of technical and clarifying changes to provisions of law enacted or amended through AB 8 in anticipation of the January 1, 2028 implementation date. Language in the bill would specifically clarify statutory cannabinoid definitions (to ensure consistency across code sections), seizure authority, and rules for tobacco retailers. These changes are intended to ensure that regulators are able to clearly and equitably enforce the law once AB 8 fully goes into effect.

**Prior Related Legislation.** AB 8 (Aguiar-Curry), Chapter 248, Statutes of 2025 required products containing concentrated cannabinoids other than CBD isolate that are derived from industrial hemp to comply with provisions of MAUCRA; established a framework for industrial hemp to enter the licensed cannabis market; revised various definitions for purposes of MAUCRSA and other state cannabis laws; prohibited the sale of synthetic cannabis products and inhalable cannabis products containing cannabinoids derived from hemp; placed restrictions on the incorporation of industrial hemp raw extract into food and beverage products; and expanded the authority for state and local enforcement agencies to inspect, seize, and destroy unlawful cannabis products.

AB 2223 (Aguiar-Curry) of 2024 would have allowed for cannabis licensees to manufacture, distribute, or sell products that contain industrial hemp and placed additional restrictions on industrial hemp products containing THC or comparable cannabinoids. *This bill died on suspense in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.*

AB 420 (Aguiar-Curry) of 2023 would have authorized the integration of industrial hemp into the licensed cannabis supply chain and strengthened prohibitions against industrial hemp containing synthesized cannabinoids. *This bill died on suspense in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.*

AB 1656 (Aguiar-Curry) of 2022 would have authorized the integration of industrial hemp into the licensed cannabis supply chain. *This bill died on the Senate inactive file.*

AB 45 (Aguiar-Curry), Chapter 576, Statutes of 2021 established a regulatory framework for industrial hemp under the Sherman Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law.

SB 292 (Wilk), Chapter 485, Statutes of 2021 conformed current state law to the United States Department of Agriculture’s Interim Final Rule regarding reporting and testing of industrial hemp.

SB 153 (Wilk), Chapter 838, Statutes of 2019 revised provisions regulating the cultivation and testing of industrial hemp to conform to the requirements for a state plan under the 2018 Farm Bill.

AB 228 (Aguiar-Curry) of 2019 would have established a regulatory framework for industrial hemp under the Sherman Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law. *This bill was held on suspense in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.*

SB 94 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review), Chapter 27, Statutes of 2017 combined AUMA and MCRSA into a unified system for the regulation of cannabis, MAUCRSA.

SB 566 (Leno), Chapter 398, Statutes of 2013 allowed hemp to be grown in California, upon federal approval, by excluding “industrial hemp” from the definition of “marijuana.”

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

The *California Cannabis Operators Association (CaCOA)* supports this bill, writing: “CaCOA was proud to sponsor AB 8 (Aguiar-Curry, 2025), landmark legislation that fundamentally restructured California’s approach to intoxicating hemp-derived cannabinoids by codifying emergency regulations prohibiting the manufacture and sale of these products outside the regulated cannabis supply chain. The measure also strengthened enforcement authority, clarified regulatory jurisdiction, and reinforced the state’s commitment to public health, consumer safety, and market integrity. As with any comprehensive statutory reform of this scale, technical and conforming amendments are both expected and necessary to ensure consistent interpretation and effective implementation across agencies. AB 2250 serves precisely that purpose.”

**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:**

None on file.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT:**

California Cannabis Operators Association  
Good Farmers Great Neighbors  
NUG, Inc.

**REGISTERED OPPOSITION:**

None on file

**Analysis Prepared by:** Robert Sumner / B. & P. / (916) 319-3301