



A project of  
**SaveCalifornia.com**  
Campaign for Children and Families

## **Documentation of MarijuanaHarmsFamilies.com Video 1 Released on August 17, 2010**

### **The #1 addiction for 65% of teens in drug rehab.**

Age at admission	Marijuana primary substance at admission
12 to 14 years	63.0%
15 to 17 years	68.8%

-- Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Treatment Episode Data Set (TEDS), page 51, Table 2.1b. Data received through 8.31.09  
<http://www.dasis.samhsa.gov/teds08/teds2k8natweb.pdf>

“Treatment Admissions with Marijuana as the Primary Substance of Abuse” (65.1% of persons ages 12-17 admitted to drug treatment centers had marijuana as their primary substance of abuse)  
-- 2005 Treatment Episode Data Set, Page 7, Figure 10, Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), United States Department of Health and Human Services  
[http://www.justice.gov/dea/statistics/Marijuana\\_2008.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/dea/statistics/Marijuana_2008.pdf)

### **A gateway drug to cocaine and meth.**

“Marijuana is a gateway drug. In drug law enforcement, rarely do we meet heroin or cocaine addicts who did not start their drug use with marijuana. Scientific studies bear out our anecdotal findings. For example, the Journal of the American Medical Association reported, based on a study of 300 sets of twins, that marijuana-using twins were four times more likely than their siblings to use cocaine and crack cocaine, and five times more likely to use hallucinogens such as LSD. Furthermore, the younger a person is when he or she first uses marijuana, the more likely that person is to use cocaine and heroin and become drug-dependent as an adult. One study found that 62 percent of the adults who first tried marijuana before they were 15 were likely to go on to use cocaine. In contrast, only one percent or less of adults who never tried marijuana used heroin or cocaine.”

-- "Marijuana: The Myths Are Killing Us," Community Alliances for Drug Free Youth, October 25, 2009 <http://www.cadfy.org.php5-13.websitetestlink.com/test/index.php/prevention-resources/item/4-marijuana-the-myths-are-killing-us>

“Conclusions: Associations between early cannabis use and later drug use and abuse/dependence cannot solely be explained by common predisposing genetic or shared environmental factors. The association may arise from the effects of the peer and social context within which cannabis

is used and obtained. In particular, early access to and use of cannabis may reduce perceived barriers against the use of other illegal drugs and provide access to these drugs.”

-- Michael T. Lynskey, PhD; Andrew C. Heath, DPhil; Kathleen K. Bucholz, PhD; Wendy S. Slutske, PhD; Pamela A. F. Madden, PhD; Elliot C. Nelson, MD; Dixie J. Statham, MA; Nicholas G. Martin, PhD. Missouri Alcoholism Research Center, Department of Psychiatry, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri.

Published: Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), Vol. 289, No. 4, January 22, 2003 <http://jama.ama-assn.org/cgi/content/full/289/4/427>

## **4 times more mind-altering than in the 1970's.**

“The average THC for tested marijuana during 2008 was 10.1 percent, according to the government, compared to 1983 when it was reportedly under 4 percent.”

-- “Marijuana potency surpasses 10 percent, U.S. says,” CNN, May 14, 2009  
<http://www.cnn.com/2009/HEALTH/05/14/marijuana.potency/index.html>

“Potency of Marijuana Seizures: 151% increase from 1983 to 2007”

-- 2005 Treatment Episode Data Set, Page 13, Figure 21, Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), United States Department of Health and Human Services  
[http://www.justice.gov/dea/statistics/Marijuana\\_2008.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/dea/statistics/Marijuana_2008.pdf)

“Marijuana is more potent than at any time since scientific analysis of the drug began in the 1970s, according to a report from the University of Mississippi’s Potency Monitoring Project. The average amount of THC in marijuana, the primary psychoactive ingredient in the drug, was tested at 9.6% --more than double the potency of marijuana in 1983. The highest concentration of THC found in a single sample was 37.2%.”

-- “Marijuana more potent than ever,” Los Angeles Times, June 12, 2008  
[http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/booster\\_shots/2008/06/marijuana-more.html](http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/booster_shots/2008/06/marijuana-more.html)

“It’s like drinking beer versus drinking whiskey,” said Dr. Nora D. Volkow, director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse, a government agency and a strong opponent of legalizing marijuana. “If you only have access to whiskey, your risk is going to be higher for addiction. Now that people have access to very high potency marijuana, the game is different.” A 2004 study in the Journal of the American Medical Association suggested that the stronger cannabis is contributing to higher addiction rates. The study, conducted for the National Institute on Drug Abuse, compared marijuana use in 2001 and 2002 with use a decade earlier. While the percent of the population using the drug remained stable during that time, dependence or abuse on the drug increased significantly, particularly among black and Hispanic men. Higher concentrations of delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol, known as THC, the study said, was the likely reason for the growing dependency.

-- “Marijuana Is Gateway Drug for Two Debates,” New York Times, July 17, 2009  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/19/fashion/19pot.html>

## Harms the lungs faster than smoking cigarettes.

"Marijuana smoking leads to asymmetrical bullous disease, often in the setting of normal CXR and lung function. In subjects who smoke marijuana, these pathological changes occur at a younger age (approximately 20 years earlier) than in tobacco smokers."

-- Hii SW, Tam JD, Thompson BR, Naughton MT.

Department of Allergy, Immunology and Respiratory Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Published: Respirology, January 2008

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18197922>

"There were distinct differences in the degree and type of toxicity elicited by marijuana and cigarette smoke. Marijuana smoke caused significantly more damage to cells and DNA than tobacco smoke, the researchers note."

-- Published: Science Daily, August 5, 2009

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/08/090805110741.htm>

"Specifically, the marijuana condensates were all found to be more cytotoxic and more mutagenic in the presence of S9 than the matched tobacco condensates."

-- Rebecca M. Maertens, Paul A. White, William Rickert, Genevieve Levasseur, George R. Douglas, Pascale V. Bellier, James P. McNamee, Vidya Thuppal, Mike Walker and Suzanne Desjardins

Research and Radiation Protection Directorate and Tobacco and Drugs Directorate, Health Canada, Ottawa, ON, Canada, and Labstat International Inc., Kitchener, ON, Canada

Published: Chemical Research in Toxicology, July 17, 2009, Volume 22, No. 8, pp. 1406–1414

<http://pubs.acs.org/stoken/presspac/presspac/full/10.1021/tx9000286>

"We observed a remarkable increase in the number of young patients who presented with lung emphysema and secondary spontaneous pneumothorax (SSP) at our institution for over a period of 30 months; most of them have a common history of marijuana abuse....This obviously quite frequent condition in young and so far asymptomatic patients will have medical, financial, and ethical impact, as some of these patients may be severely handicapped or even become lung transplant candidates in the future."

-- Beshay M, Kaiser H, Niedhart D, Reymond MA, Schmid RA.

Division of General Thoracic Surgery, University Hospital Berne, Switzerland.

Published: European Journal of Cardio-thoracic Surgery, October 2007

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17931876>

"In conclusion, the results of the present study indicate that long-term cannabis use increases the risk of lung cancer in young adults."

-- S. Aldington<sup>1</sup>, M. Harwood<sup>1</sup>, B. Cox<sup>2</sup>, M. Weatherall<sup>3</sup>, L. Beckert<sup>1</sup>, A. Hansell<sup>4</sup>, A. Pritchard<sup>1</sup>, G. Robinson<sup>1</sup>, R. Beasley<sup>1,5</sup> and on behalf of the Cannabis and Respiratory Disease Research Group; <sup>1</sup>Medical Research Institute of New Zealand, <sup>3</sup>Wellington School of Medicine & Health Sciences, Wellington, <sup>2</sup>Hugh Adam Cancer Epidemiology Unit, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, <sup>4</sup>Imperial College London, London, and <sup>5</sup>University of Southampton,

Southampton, UK. Medical Research Institute of New Zealand  
Published: European Respiratory Journal, February 1, 2008, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 280-286  
<http://erj.ersjournals.com/content/31/2/280.full>

**In addition, regular marijuana smoking alters brain circuits and causes brain abnormalities in teenagers and young adults:**

"Despite the alarming increment in the use and abuse of cannabis preparations among young people, little is known about possible long-term consequences of targeting the endocannabinoid system during the critical developmental period of adolescence....A long-lasting decrease of CB1R binding levels was found in caudate-putamen, nucleus accumbens, ventral tegmental area and hippocampus, while an opposite increment was observed in the locus coeruleus. Present results provide evidence for long-lasting effects of adolescent URB597 administration. Activation of endocannabinoid transmission during the still plastic phase of adolescence may have implications for the maturational end-point of the endocannabinoid system itself, which could lead to permanent alterations in neuronal brain circuits and behavioural responses."

-- Marco EM, Rubino T, Adriani W, Viveros MP, Parolaro D, Laviola G.

Department Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Istituto Superiore di Sanita, Rome, Italy.

Study from February 2009

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19111160>

"There is growing evidence that adolescence is a key period for neuronal maturation. Despite the high prevalence of marijuana use among adolescents and young adults in the United States and internationally, very little is known about its impact on the developing brain. Based on neuroimaging literature on normal brain developmental during adolescence, we hypothesized that individuals with heavy cannabis use (HCU) would have brain structure abnormalities in similar brain regions that undergo development during late adolescence, particularly the fronto-temporal connection....Our results support the hypothesis that heavy cannabis use during adolescence may affect the trajectory of normal brain maturation. Due to concurrent alcohol consumption in five HCU subjects, conclusions from this study should be considered preliminary, as the DTI findings reported here may be reflective of the combination of alcohol and marijuana use. Further research in larger samples, longitudinal in nature, and controlling for alcohol consumption is needed to better understand the pathophysiology of the effect of cannabis on the developing brain."

-- Diffusion abnormalities in adolescents and young adults with a history of heavy cannabis use.

Ashtari M, Cervellione K, Cottone J, Ardekani BA, Kumra S.

The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA, United States.

Published: Journal of Psychiatric Research, January 2009

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19111160>

**Marijuana could be sold in grocery stores.**

**In addition to legalizing marijuana consumption, possession, cultivation and transportation for any California resident 21 and over, California's marijuana legalization proposal (Proposition 19) would allow cities and counties to license marijuana to be sold and smoked at any business establishment, including grocery stores, mini-marts, gas stations,**

restaurants, etc. (In addition, Prop. 19, with or without local government licensing, would allow marijuana to be smoked in all “non-public places,” which, according to a 2010 California state court ruling, includes grocery stores. Current California anti-smoking statutes only mention “tobacco products,” which does not apply to marijuana smoking).

*11301. Commercial Regulations and Controls.*

*Notwithstanding any other provision of state or local law, a local government may adopt ordinances, regulations, or other acts having the force of law to control, license, regulate, permit, or otherwise authorize, with conditions, the following:*

*(a) The cultivation, processing, distribution, safe and secure transportation, and sale and possession for sale, of cannabis, but only by persons and in amounts lawfully authorized.*

*(b) The retail sale of not more than one ounce per transaction,*

*(e) Consumption of cannabis within licensed premises.*

-- From the text of California’s marijuana legalization proposal (Proposition 19)

<http://www.voterguide.sos.ca.gov/pdf/english/text-proposed-laws.pdf>

Current law: Current law prohibits smoking “tobacco products” in the workplace. *See Cal. Lab. Code § 6404.5.*

Effect of Proposition 19: Because the current anti-smoking law only applies to tobacco products, the proposition would not prohibit employees from smoking marijuana in the workplace. In fact, employers would be required to allow marijuana smoking at work because Proposition 19 would prohibit denial of “any right or privilege” granted by the Act, without defining what that means. Just as confusing, the Act specifies that users can “possess” or “share” marijuana in a “non-public place,” but does not define what a “non-public place” is. In other contexts, California courts have interpreted “public place” narrowly, so most locations are “non-public places.” For example, recently, a California court found that even a grocery store was not a public place. *Ralphs Grocery Co. v. United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 8*, 2010 Cal. App. LEXIS 1171 (2010). So, users would be able to smoke in virtually any workplace.

-- “Proposition 19: The Impact on the Workplace,” California Chamber of Commerce, August 2010

[http://www.calchamber.com/PressReleases/Documents/Prop\\_19\\_The\\_Impact\\_on\\_the\\_Workplace\\_F.pdf](http://www.calchamber.com/PressReleases/Documents/Prop_19_The_Impact_on_the_Workplace_F.pdf)

## **Skyrocketing usage among teens and young people.**

The Alaska Experiment and Other Failed Legalization Ventures

The consequences of legalization became evident when the Alaska Supreme Court ruled in 1975 that the state could not interfere with an adult’s possession of marijuana for personal consumption in the home. The court’s ruling became a green light for marijuana use. Although the ruling was limited to persons 19 and over, teens were among those increasingly using marijuana. According to a 1988 University of Alaska study, the state’s 12 to 17-year-olds used marijuana at more than twice the national average for their age group. Alaska’s residents voted in 1990 to recriminalize possession of marijuana, demonstrating their belief that increased use was too high a price to pay.

By 1979, after 11 states decriminalized marijuana and the Carter administration had considered federal decriminalization, marijuana use shot up among teenagers. That year, almost 51 percent of 12th graders reported they used marijuana in the last 12 months. By 1992, with tougher laws and increased attention to the risks of drug abuse, that figure had been reduced to 22 percent, a 57 percent decline.

Other countries have also had this experience. The Netherlands has had its own troubles with increased use of cannabis products. From 1984 to 1996, the Dutch liberalized the use of cannabis. Surveys reveal that lifetime prevalence of cannabis in Holland increased consistently and sharply. For the age group 18-20, the increase is from 15 percent in 1984 to 44 percent in 1996.

-- "Fact 6: Legalization of Drugs Will Lead to Increased Use and Increased Levels of Addiction. Legalization has been tried before, and failed miserably," Speaking Out Against Drug Legalization, May 2003, U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration  
<http://www.justice.gov/dea/demand/speakout/06so.htm>

[In December 2009], [a nationwide study of teen substance abuse from the University of Michigan](#) reported that youth marijuana use increased last year, despite a nationwide prohibition. The study found 27 percent of 10th graders and a full third of 12th graders had used marijuana.

Comparatively, the rates for having had any alcohol to drink in the past 30 days are 15 percent, 30 percent and 44 percent in 8th, 10th and 12th grade. When asked how easy it would be to get alcohol if they wanted some, the majority of students in all three grades said it would be "fairly easy" or "very easy."

"The facts show that marijuana legalization for adults will significantly increase marijuana smoking by teenagers," said Thomasson. "If something is legal, children can get their hands on it. Some very selfish adults are leading young people astray."

-- SaveCalifornia.com News Release, January 12, 2010  
<http://savecalifornia.com/ca-release-1-12-10-a-run-to-the-grocery-store-for-milk-eggs-and-marijuana.html>

Availability of marijuana, which might increase if the drug were legalized, clearly has been shown to affect adolescents' use. Adolescents who have been offered marijuana are 7 times more likely to use it than are those who have not been offered marijuana. Similarly, those who report that marijuana is easy to get are approximately 2.5 times more likely to use it than those who consider it hard to get.

Marijuana is cheap and easy to produce; if it were legalized, its price likely would decrease below current levels. Work by Pacula et al in the United States and Williams in Australia demonstrates clearly that a decrease in the price of marijuana is associated with a significant increase in the prevalence of use among adolescents.

Some advocates for the legalization of marijuana argue that it is safer than alcohol. They suggest that increased use of marijuana by young people might have a positive effect if some adolescents

switched from alcohol to marijuana (a substitution effect). This theory cannot be supported by recent studies on adolescent marijuana and alcohol use that incorporated the price of marijuana into the analysis. These studies conclude that an increase in use of marijuana by adolescents would result in an increased use of alcohol (ie, that the 2 drugs are economic complements).

From a public health perspective, even a small increase in use, whether attributable to increased availability or decreased perception of risk, would have significant ramifications. For example, if only an additional 1% of 15- to 19-year-olds in the United States began using marijuana, there would be approximately 190,000 new users.

-- Legalization of Marijuana: Potential Impact on Youth, PEDIATRICS, Vol. 113, No. 6, June 2004, pp. e632-e638. Alain Joffe, MD, MPH, W. Samuel Yancy, MD, the Committee on Substance Abuse and Committee on Adolescence

<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/cgi/content/full/113/6/e632>

### **“Drugged driving” on streets and freeways.**

As a senior at San Jose State University – in the year of our Lord, 1985 – I was tight with the hippie lettuce. Sadly, I also drove while stoned. I was absolutely impaired while doing so and thankfully never hurt anyone or myself. On Friday, an elementary school teacher was killed near Chico when hit by a motorist who police suspect was stoned. It was a reminder that legalized pot would only increase the number of reckless drivers in California. The suspect in the traffic fatality has a medical marijuana garden in Butte County, authorities said. Just imagine the hazards when anyone 21 and older can get legally high for the fun of it. Pot advocates claim alcohol is more deadly than marijuana but fail to mention the decades of science and law regulating alcohol. In California, a 0.08 blood-alcohol level means you're legally drunk. What's the equivalent to measure marijuana intoxication? There isn't one. "This is why it's going to be so dangerous and challenging if Proposition 19 passes," said Susan Manheimer, president of the California Police Chiefs Association. There is little consistency in "drugged driving" laws compared with DUI laws. Drugs like marijuana are harder to detect by police officers and in drug tests. Manheimer said that because DUI laws are more developed, California cops are allowed to force DUI suspects to take drug tests. That is not so for "drugged driving" suspects, she said.

-- Marcos Breton: California isn't ready to handle stoned drivers if Prop. 19 passes, Sacramento Bee, Sunday, July 25, 2010

<http://www.sacbee.com/2010/07/25/2913017/marcos-breton-california-isnt.html>

We all know the devastating impact drunk driving has as each year claiming thousands of innocent lives. Yet in some areas today, "drugged driving" may soon challenge drunk driving as the No. 1 killer of young adults on our roads. Get this: If this proposed initiative passes, California drivers will be able to operate a car while under the influence of marijuana. The initiative states smoking marijuana while driving is impermissible, but it would be perfectly legal to smoke or ingest marijuana immediately prior to driving. And because marijuana stays in the body so long, police officers will have virtually no way to prove if someone just ingested marijuana 10 minutes ago or 10 hours ago. Unlike with alcohol, there is no current test to show the level of marijuana intoxication. All authorities can currently do is test for the presence of marijuana. If this initiative passes, it is perfectly fine to have marijuana in your system at any

time – even while driving a school bus, taxi or light-rail train. I would never again feel safe sending any member of my family into a vehicle where I cannot be assured that the driver is not under the influence of marijuana, plain and simple. The fact that Mothers Against Drunk Driving opposes this initiative should send strong signals to anyone thinking of supporting this measure. -- Dr. Ron Allen, “The devil is in the details: Pot initiative carries unseen dangers,” Sacramento Bee, June 25, 2010

<http://www.sacbee.com/2010/06/25/2847670/the-devil-is-in-the-details-pot.html>

Marijuana: THC affects areas of the brain that control the body’s movements, balance, coordination, memory, and judgment, as well as sensations. Because these effects are multifaceted, more research is required to understand marijuana's impact on the ability of drivers to react to complex and unpredictable situations. However, we do know that:

- A meta-analysis of approximately 60 experimental studies, including laboratory, driving simulator, and on-road experiments, found that behavioral and cognitive skills related to driving performance were impaired in a dose-dependent fashion with increasing THC blood levels.
- Evidence from both real and simulated driving studies indicates that marijuana can negatively affect a driver's attentiveness, perception of time and speed, and the ability to draw on information obtained from past experiences.
- A study of over 3000 fatally-injured drivers in Australia showed that when marijuana was present in the blood of the driver they were much more likely to be at fault for the accident. And the higher the THC concentration, the more likely they were to be culpable.
- Research shows that impairment increases significantly when marijuana use is combined with alcohol. Studies have found that many drivers who test positive for alcohol also test positive for THC, making it clear that drinking and drugged driving are often linked behaviors.

-- InfoFacts: Drugged Driving, October 2009, National Institute of Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health

<http://www.nida.nih.gov/Infofacts/driving.html>

## **The “right” to get high while on the job.**

Imagine a workplace where employees show up to work high on marijuana and there is nothing you can do about it. That’s what employers can look forward to if Proposition 19 passes.

Proposition 19 seeks to legalize the cultivation, processing, transportation, distribution, and sale of marijuana for personal use in California. This vaguely worded proposition will make sweeping changes in the way employers do business, and require employers to offer extra protections to marijuana users.



If Proposition 19 became law:

- Employers would have to permit employees to smoke marijuana at work.
- Employers would lose millions in valuable federal contracts and grants because they would be unable to comply with federal laws outlawing marijuana use.
- Employers would not be able to make workplace decisions based on marijuana use.
- Employers would have to provide a reasonable accommodation to marijuana users.
- Employers would be required to pay for marijuana-related accidents through workers' compensation insurance premiums and liability to third-parties.
- Employers would have to warn others about marijuana use in the workplace through a "Prop 65" warning.
- Employers would be unable to comply with their obligations to provide a safe workplace.

-- Proposition 19: The Impact on the Workplace, California Chamber of Commerce, August 2010

[http://www.calchamber.com/PressReleases/Documents/Prop\\_19\\_The\\_Impact\\_on\\_the\\_Workplace\\_F.pdf](http://www.calchamber.com/PressReleases/Documents/Prop_19_The_Impact_on_the_Workplace_F.pdf)

Proposed section 11304, subsection (c) provides that: "No person shall be punished, fined, discriminated against, or be denied any right or privilege for lawfully engaging in any conduct permitted by this Act."

Cooley writes: "Since this provision protects all 'conduct permitted by the Act,' a California employer will no longer be able to screen job applicants for marijuana use; regulate any employee conduct related to the use, transportation, or cultivation of marijuana, unless the employer can prove job impairment; or choose to maintain a drug-free workplace consistent with federal law."

Proposition 19 proponents claim that the second half of Section 11304 — "provided, however, that the existing right of an employer to address consumption that actually impairs job performance by an employee shall not be affected" — protects employers' ability to fire workers for being stoned on the job. But that places the burden of proving what "actually impairs job performance" onto the employer. Even advocates for marijuana legalization see this as a huge loophole.

National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Law Stash Blog writer Russ Belville said in his analysis of this section: "This is a big one. You can't be punished or denied privileges based on pot smoking. The only exception is employers preventing you from smoking pot on the job. Note the 'actually impairs job performance' language. This is the loophole through which some attorney is going to drive a big truck delivering us freedom from workplace pee testing for cannabis. Pee test metabolites do not prove workplace impairment." (July 17, 2010).

-- Ed Rullman: Prop. 19's 'pretty clear' intent is not good enough, Redding Record Searchlight, Aug. 15, 2010 <http://www.redding.com/news/2010/aug/15/prop-19s-pretty-clear-intent-is-not-good-enough/>

## Higher insurance premiums as addictions soar.

### EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY INSURANCE AND WORKERS' COMPENSATION INSURANCE

CalChamber's employment law advisor Jennifer Shaw, who prepared the analysis, points out that the measure establishes a new, higher, but yet undefined standard of "actual impairment." According to Shaw, under this standard, an employer cannot take any action related to an employee's use of marijuana and their potential threat to workplace safety as is currently the case for alcohol. For example, if a forklift driver showed up reeking of marijuana smoke, an employer could not take disciplinary action until it could be proven that the employee's job performance was 'actually impaired' by the marijuana use (for example, after an accident occurred). Under Proposition 19, marijuana would be more protected than alcohol. "Imagine a workplace where employees show up to work high and there's nothing an employer can do about it," said Shaw. "It is pretty clear that Proposition 19 will lead to many unfortunate outcomes including compromised workplace safety, discrimination lawsuits filed by employees who use marijuana but got fired for poor performance, and increased costs of liability insurance," she said.

-- "CalChamber Sounds Alarm on Employer Impact of Proposition 19: Legal Analysis Reveals Serious Workplace Issues If Measure Becomes Law," August 12, 2010, California Chamber of Commerce

<http://www.calchamber.com/Headlines/Pages/CalChamberSoundsAlarmonEmployerImpactofProposition19.aspx>

### AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE, PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE, AND GOVERNMENT HEALTHCARE COSTS WILL LIKELY INCREASE

"If access to marijuana is easier and social stigmas to marijuana are reduced, there will be more marijuana use and that will lead to more 'drugged driving' on the road, resulting in increased liability for automobile insurance, which will quickly lead to higher insurance premiums for all drivers. And, given that the Legislative Analyst's Office is already predicting that marijuana legalization will increase the financial burdens of taxpayer-funded drug treatment clinics, you can expect private health insurance to go up, too. Marijuana for everyone means costlier insurance for everyone."

-- Tom Hudson, Executive Director of the California Taxpayer Protection Committee  
August 16, 2010

Other Fiscal Effects on State and Local Programs. The measure could also have fiscal effects on various other state and local programs. For example, the measure could result in an increase in the consumption of marijuana, potentially resulting in an unknown increase in the number of individuals seeking publicly funded substance abuse treatment and other medical services.

-- California Legislative Analyst's Office, Analysis of Proposition 19, July 15, 2010

[http://lao.ca.gov/ballot/2010/19\\_11\\_2010.aspx](http://lao.ca.gov/ballot/2010/19_11_2010.aspx)

## **Marijuana operatives could buy thousands of acres of farmland.**

*11301. Commercial Regulations and Controls.*

*Notwithstanding any other provision of state or local law, a local government may adopt ordinances, regulations, or other acts having the force of law to control, license, regulate, permit, or otherwise authorize, with conditions, the following:*

*(a) The cultivation, processing, distribution, safe and secure transportation, and sale and possession for sale, of cannabis, but only by persons and in amounts lawfully authorized.*

*(1) Such larger amounts as the local authority deems appropriate and proper under local circumstances, than those established under subdivision (a) of Section 11300 for personal possession and cultivation, or under this section for commercial cultivation, processing, transportation, and sale by persons authorized to do so under this section.*

-- From the text of California's marijuana legalization proposal (Proposition 19)

<http://www.voterguide.sos.ca.gov/pdf/english/text-proposed-laws.pdf>

The Board of Equalization analysis takes into consideration that prices will fall if pot is legalized. It estimates a drop of 50 percent, but states that consumption could increase by 40 percent as a result of the price drop. The decline in prices is expected to take much of the profit out of pot, a concern for some underground operators. They also fear that big tobacco companies will step in and begin growing pot on farmland in the Central Valley, effectively killing North Coast production.

-- "Mendocino County resident mull their options as 'cannabis county' destination,"

CalPotNews, April 1, 2010

<http://calpotnews.com/government/ballot-initiatives/mendocino-county-residents-mull-their-options-as-cannabis-country-destination/>

Some experts think special zoning will be required for commercially grown marijuana, as well as distinct water rights to protect connected farm lands and forests. The California Coastal Commission, which regulates property development near the Pacific coastline, likely will interfere with ambitions to grow as well, in an effort to protect the environment. Owning land that could commercially grow marijuana may not prove lucrative without proper permits. Still, pot billionaires and hemp empires are expected to be forged after legalization. There will likely emerge a Robert Mondavi of the marijuana business. Agriculture companies will race to build marijuana harvesters, tractors and seeders. New pot-specific fertilizers and pesticides will be sought. Commercial development catering to hemp outfitters and smoke shops, like those in Amsterdam, will break ground and revitalize infrastructure. Counties will immediately see the benefits of increased tourism, which industry experts expect to surge in the region.

-- "Marijuana crop could bring cash to California's next Napa," The Daily Caller, January 14, 2010

<http://dailycaller.com/2010/01/14/marijuana-crop-could-bring-cash-to-californias-next-napa/>