

Senate Executive Departments and Administration Committee

Ben Mickens 271-1403

SB 400, relative to duties and reporting requirements of the therapeutic cannabis medical oversight board.

Hearing Date: January 21, 2026

Time Opened: 10:00 a.m.

Time Closed: 10:24 a.m.

Members of the Committee Present: Senators Pearl, McGough, Gannon, Altschiller and Reardon

Members of the Committee Absent : None

Bill Analysis: This bill requires the therapeutic cannabis medical oversight board to annually review medical and scientific evidence relative to currently approved and additional qualifying conditions. The bill also requires the board's annual report to include citations to such medical and scientific evidence.

Sponsors:

Sen. Gannon

Sen. Birdsell

Sen. Rochefort

Sen. Pearl

Rep. Barbour

Rep. Creighton

Rep. Vose

Rep. L. Walsh

Who supports the bill: Senator Bill Gannon, Senator Howard Pearl, Senator David Rochefort, Representative Liz Barbour, Sue Hamola (SAM NH), Andrew Seefeld

Who opposes the bill: No one.

Who is neutral on the bill: Dr. Jerry Knirk. Chairman, (NH TCMO Board)

Summary of testimony presented in support:

Senator Gannon, Prime

- SB 400 is relative to the state cannabis oversight board, asking them to review new scientific studies and to detail them in reports.

Sue Homola, (SAM NH)

- This clarifies that there should be an annual review of listed qualifying conditions and that new studies and data used to decide this should be collected in the reviews.

- The boards current job already has to do with reviewing scientific and medical evidence relating to therapeutic uses of cannabis.
- Recommendations and discussions are included in their report.
- The board is required to meet twice but normally meet four times.
- The data is always changing and we need regular review.
- Given the new pushes and changes we are seeing at the federal level, we will be seeing a lot of new data coming out which we should proactively try and address this.
- This bill really adds and clarifies work the board is already doing.
- One way this bill would benefit card holders and legislators would be by giving people access to newest data regarding specific conditions each year.

Senator Gannon later asked for Sue Homola to come back and speak to the burden concerns.

Ms. Homola said this bill does not add additional requirements; it only gives a timeline for existing work. While the board does great work on proposed conditions, more work is needed on reviewing the existing conditions and allowances. I do not believe this is a heavy burden. The requirement would be to review studies, not to conduct any.

Rep. Liz Barbour, Hollis (HD 35)

- I am here in support. Research is constantly changing and we are expecting major changes to come soon. Periodic reviews allow for good updates and citations would create a transparent record.
- This bill matches language requirements for other similar boards at the federal level. Many boards will review data and information. Documentation of this process is standard.
- The bill strengthens consistency and transparency around the important work the committee is doing.

Senator Gannon asked if this was unduly burdensome for there to be a yearly requirement.

Rep. Barbour stated that she was appreciative of the work the board, but believes the citations should be simple. It was difficult to track down citations that I found in regular board meeting report. If citations were included there, that should satisfy that requirement. I am not in the medical field, but I believe these people are well qualified and capable.

Summary of testimony presented in opposition: None.

Neutral Information Presented:

Dr. Jerry Knirk, TCMO Board Chair

- We neither support nor oppose this bill. We simply feel it is unnecessary.

- The board's work is not quick and already addresses the substance in this legislation.
- There is not a need for a formal annual review of medical data, although I agree there will be plenty of data coming. For us to change current recommendations, we would need more than one year's worth of data. We do review periodically as it stands.
- This legislation would require a meta-analysis every year, which is a considerable undertaking. Doing this every year would be burdensome.
- The current statute does require considerable work as is, including hours of pre-work prior to meetings.
- This added burden may hinder our ability to get people on the board.
- This adds a significant amount of work for members. We would be open to working with the sponsor and others to help find balance.

Senator Altschiller thanked Dr. Knirk for reminding the committee that these are volunteer members. This legislation is asking for reviews with citations regarding changes in medical marijuana data. The senator asked if she was correct in understanding that this requirement is in particular burdensome, that is not applied to other parts of the medical community.

Dr. Knirk said this was correct. While reviews do happen periodically, for a formal systematic review it requires more time and papers to see if trends are emerging in literature. This is a major academic project, not normally done every year.

BM
Date Hearing Report completed: January 23, 2026