

## Seritalla, Freda

---

**From:** Timothy Macierowski <tmacier@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 16, 2018 3:53 PM  
**To:** JudTestimony  
**Subject:** Bill 487 Concerning Legalization of Marijuana

Dear Committee Members:

I am opposed to Raised Bill 487 AN ACT CONCERNING THE LEGALIZATION, TAXATION AND REGULATION OF THE RETAIL SALE AND RECREATIONAL USE OF MARIJUANA AND CONCERNING THE PRODUCTION AND REGULATION OF HEMP. I have done literature searches in clinical journals and can find no positive outcomes for recreational use, only potential health consequences. I have also done searches online and found plenty of concerning news reports on marijuana that impact children primarily (i.e. overdosing on edibles meant for adults).

Proponents like to tout that marijuana offenses are unjust and prohibition should end, but with the decriminalization of marijuana I can't understand this argument. According to the Marijuana Policy Project website they state: *Since 2011, possession of a half-ounce or less of marijuana has been a civil violation in Connecticut, punishable by a fine of up to \$150, meaning it is not a jailable offense. Subsequent offenses are subject to increased fines ranging from \$200-\$500. Upon a third violation, offenders are referred to a drug awareness program. In addition to the fine, anyone under 21 who is found in possession of less than a half-ounce of marijuana faces a 60-day suspension of his or her driver's license.* This seems like a sensible approach to marijuana law for non-medical purposes. If people are getting caught with marijuana without a medical reason in public they should be fined as even this act does not support public use. I am afraid of a slippery slope affect here, were this will in time lead to legal public drug use, and the eventual legalization and regulation of all illicit drugs.

I am also concerned with the risks to public safety especially on the roadways, since there is no way to measure marijuana impairment accurately. This act allows for "Marijuana lounges" for on-site consumption by means other than smoking. This sounds like a dangerous proposition to me. Lounges for consumption would logically lead to some people driving after using the product. The Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment released a report on the effects of marijuana and Colorado-specific health outcomes and use patterns (link to the report: <https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cdphe/marijuana-health-report>) were they translated major findings into public health statements. Of particular interest to me were their statements that were officially approved by their Retail Marijuana Public Health Advisory Committee:

1. *Driving soon after marijuana increases the risk of a motor vehicle crash.*
2. *Using alcohol and marijuana together increases impairment and the risk of a motor vehicle crash more than using either substance alone.*
3. *The typical marijuana cigarette or joint in Colorado contains approximately 0.5 grams of marijuana, and the THC content in marijuana ranges from 12-23% THC; therefore, a typical joint contains between 60-115 mg THC. The standard serving size for a marijuana edible is 10 mg.*
  1. *For less-than-weekly marijuana users, smoking, eating, or drinking marijuana containing 10 mg or more of THC is likely to cause impairment that affects your ability to drive, bike, or perform other safety-sensitive activities.*

2. Wait at least 6 hours after smoking marijuana containing less than 35 mg THC before driving, biking, or performing other safety-sensitive activities. If you have smoked more than 35 mg, wait longer.
3. Wait at least 8 hours after eating or drinking marijuana containing less than 18 mg THC before driving, biking, or performing other safety-sensitive activities. If you have consumed more than 18 mg, wait longer.
4. Use caution when driving, biking, or performing other safety-sensitive activities after using any form of marijuana or marijuana product.

Do you actually expect people to stay at a lounge for 6-8 after consumption before driving?

This leads me to another concern with this bill:

*Sec. 2. (2) (B) On and after January 1, 2020, a consumer pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection may possess one ounce of usable marijuana, not including marijuana concentrates; five grams of marijuana concentrates; marijuana products containing no more than five hundred milligrams of delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol; six marijuana plants and any additional marijuana produced by the person's marijuana plants; provided any amount of marijuana in excess of one ounce in plant form and five grams of concentrated marijuana may only be possessed at the same residential location where the plants were cultivated pursuant to section 8 of this act.*

500 milligrams of THC, sound way too high. According to a publication by the American Public Health Association (APHA) they reported the state regulated concentrations (i.e. limits to potency to protect consumers) of THC for Alaska, Colorado, Oregon, and Washington to be much lower than this bill. In Alaska, no more than 5 mg of THC in a single serving of cannabis or cannabis product; and no more than 50 mg of THC (10 servings) in a single edible retail product. In Colorado, no more than 10 mg THC in a single serving of cannabis or cannabis product; and no more than 100 mg of THC (10 servings) in a single edible retail product. In Oregon, no more than 5 mg THC in a single serving of cannabis edibles; and no more than 50 mg (10 servings) in a single edible product. Cannabis capsules may contain up to 10 mg of THC and may be sold in packages of 10. In Washington, no more than 10 mg THC in a single serving of cannabis or cannabis product; and no more than 100 mg of THC (10 servings) in a single edible retail product. (Link to report with this data and other policies of these states as reported by APHA: [https://www.apha.org/~media/files/pdf/topics/state\\_cannabis\\_policy.ashx](https://www.apha.org/~media/files/pdf/topics/state_cannabis_policy.ashx)).

## Cannabis Policies in Four States - apha.org

www.apha.org

Cannabis Policies in Four States 1 Non-medical use of cannabis was illegal in the United States at the start of 2012, though today, over 20 percent of the country's ...

Connecticut should not be in a hurry to usher in legislation on recreation marijuana at the risk of losing potential revenue to Massachusetts. I see no urgency on this issue. Connecticut's government has a duty to protect and serve its residents. I don't think it is in the best interest of the public for our government to be supporting recreational marijuana retailers and lounges.

Bobbie Macierowski

Town of Colchester, CT 06415