

California Philanthropy and the New Reality of Legal Weed

On November 8, 2016, California voters approved Proposition 64, launching a new era in the consumption, marketing, taxation and regulation of for what decades has been California's largest cash crop, marijuana. In this paper, I will explore how the policy issues emerging from the legalization of recreational marijuana intersect with racial justice, education, youth wellbeing, the built environment and economic development. In addition, I will offer some recommendations on how California philanthropy can contribute to insuring that this new legal industry does not lead to further criminalization and poor health among our most vulnerable children and families.

This paper is organized into three sections. Section #1 provides context in two areas: the role marijuana policy has played in increasing poverty and racialized inequality and the health effects of marijuana use. Section #2 identifies threats and opportunities related to a range of policy areas and Section #3 offers recommendations for California philanthropy on how to approach this new reality.

Section #1: Context

Racism, Poverty and Trauma

In *The New Jim Crow*, Michelle Alexander writes, “Arrests for marijuana... accounted for nearly 80% of the growth in drug arrests in the 1990’s.”¹ For decades, marijuana policy has been a primary driver of the War on Drugs and mass incarceration. Mass incarceration has broken apart families, separated children from parents, increased poverty and joblessness and created a lifelong second-class status for many due to felony convictions.

This devastation has particularly hit the African American community. According to the ACLU, African Americans have been arrested at rates 3.7 times greater than Whites for marijuana-related crimes.² A study conducted by the Sacramento Police Department showed that from 2012-2016, African Americans accounted for 43% of marijuana arrests while making up only 15% of the population.³ In Oakland, in 2015, African Americans made up 77% of marijuana arrests while consisting of 30% of the population.⁴

Millions of people experienced the trauma of incarceration and their families were driven into poverty for simply for possessing marijuana. ACLU research has shown that at the national level, of the 8.2 million marijuana arrests between 2001 and 2010, 88% were for simply having marijuana.⁵

Marijuana has negatively impacted some regions of California more than others. The North Coast, Emerald Triangle, and many tribal lands have been plagued by environmental damage,

violence, and sex trafficking connected to the illegal marijuana industry. Illegal growers have taken advantage of workers, filled streams and rivers with pollutants and used violence to advance their interests, including murder.⁶ The Emerald Triangle marijuana industry continues to generate enormous quantities of marijuana, about 13.5 million pounds annually, of which about 18% is consumed within California. The remaining marijuana, about 11 million pounds, is exported.⁷

The passage of Prop 64 marked a big step forward in a 20 year long process of legalization and represented a huge win for the primarily white-owned legal marijuana industry by opening up a legal market in the country's most populous state. However, for many of those whose lives were damaged by the War on Drugs, the legalization of marijuana presents a painful contradiction. The very product that separated and impoverished families of color is now creating wealth for mostly white entrepreneurs and investors, a population relatively untouched by the War on Drugs.

While Proposition 64 included provisions to decriminalize marijuana, in many communities, the dynamic created by legalization is leading to a more aggressive crackdown on illegal marijuana activity. Across the state, public officials and law enforcement, with the encouragement of the marijuana industry, are preparing to increase actions against illegal marijuana businesses, under the banner of extinguishing the illegal market and creating a fully legal industry.⁸ For families that depend on the underground economy to put food on the table, this crackdown represents a double whammy. Not only is the new wealth created by the legal industry likely to largely bypass communities of color, but the families that depend on the underground economy are at increased risk of criminalization and of being pushed deeper into poverty.⁹

Non-citizen immigrants are also at greater risk of criminalization as a result of legalization. Immigrants may assume that due to Proposition 64, they, like others, are able to work in the marijuana industry or use marijuana legally. However, possession of marijuana is still a federal offence and federal law controls immigration policy. The Immigrant Legal Resource Center is advising undocumented persons and legal residents to not use marijuana, to not work in the industry, to never admit marijuana use to an immigration official, and to not wear a marijuana T-shirt or carry cannabis paraphernalia.¹⁰

For health advocates, an analysis of marijuana policy from a racial justice perspective is relevant because of the roles poverty, trauma and racism play in determining poor health status.

- Children who grow up in poverty often lack access to quality health services, good schools, healthy food, safe places to play and clean air and water.
- Studies show that parental incarceration can be even more traumatic for children than even a parent's death or divorce.¹¹
- 15-20% of children in the foster care system have an incarcerated parent.¹² Children growing up in the foster care system suffer high rates of trauma and are at high risk for homelessness, incarceration, and sex trafficking.

A growing number of racial justice advocates are making the case that policymakers owe a debt to the black and brown communities that were disproportionately impacted during the Drug War

and that the new wealth generated by legal marijuana represents an opportunity to repair some of the harm. Policymakers can repair some of the past damage through 1) Ensuring that communities of color are able to participate fully in the marijuana industry through business start-ups and jobs and 2) Investing tax revenues in youth and families of color in impacted neighborhoods. This approach seeks to place reparations at the center of the evolving marijuana policy.

Adverse Health Effects of Marijuana Use

While medical marijuana has proven to help alleviate chronic pain, chemotherapy-induced nausea, and multiple sclerosis spasticity, the recreational use of marijuana is linked to a number of adverse health effects.¹³ The research on the effects of marijuana has been significantly limited by marijuana's classification as a Schedule 1 drug by the federal government. It's important to note that much of the research to date has yet to focus on the new realities of marijuana products, such as marijuana with much higher THC levels and concentrates such as dabs.

A recent review of research to date by the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine indicated marijuana use is linked to the following:¹⁴

- Lower birth weight of newborns when there is maternal use of marijuana.
- Development of schizophrenia or other psychoses, with highest risk among frequent users.
- Worse respiratory symptoms and more frequent chronic bronchitis episodes
- Impairment in cognitive domains of learning, learning and memory (with acute cannabis use)
- Increased incidence of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and suicide completion.
- Development of problem use particularly for young people who initiate use at a young age.
- Increased risk of motor vehicle accidents.

A 2014 research review published in *The New England Journal of Medicine* highlighted a range of adverse effects, including:

- Addiction in about 17% of those who begin using in adolescence and 25 to 50% of those who are daily users.
- Poor educational outcomes, with increased likelihood of dropping out of school.
- Cognitive impairment, with lower IQ among those who were frequent users during adolescence.¹⁵

Contrary to the views spread by cannabis proponents, marijuana smoke is very similar to tobacco smoke. Studies conducted in Europe have found links between marijuana use and increased risk for heart disease, stroke and heart attacks in young adults.¹⁶ Like tobacco, marijuana smoking not only affects the user but those nearby, including children, through secondhand smoke.¹⁷

In regard to the effects of marijuana use on young people, the most relevant research findings are:

- The earlier a child or adolescent starts using marijuana, the greater the risk of problem use and addiction
- Young people who are frequent users can experience delayed brain development, can struggle more in school and experience diminished life satisfaction.
- Young people who are heavy users are at greater risk for a range of mental health issues.

Prevalence of marijuana use among young people

Over the last few decades, public perception of marijuana has changed significantly. While tobacco use has declined and has become largely denormalized, marijuana has taken the opposite trajectory, toward greater use and normalization. Most young people view marijuana as harmless, even good for you, and marijuana use has risen steadily.

- Nationally among high school students in 2015, marijuana use exceeded cigarette use; 21.3 % of high school seniors reported using marijuana in the past 30 days, compared with 11.4% who smoked cigarettes.¹⁸
- In California from 2013-2015, 5 percent of 7th graders, 13.4 percent of 9th graders, and 20.1 percent of 11th graders reported using marijuana in the past 30 days.¹⁹
- The perceived risk of harm associated with marijuana use is decreasing. Nationally in 2015 only 31.9 percent of high school seniors thought regular marijuana use was harmful; in 2009 the rate was 52.4 percent.²⁰
- Nationally in 2012-2013, 30 percent of marijuana users met the criteria for marijuana use disorder. Young adults aged 18 to 29 were at the highest risk for marijuana use disorder.²¹

A recent report by the Department of Health Care Services shows that of young people under age 18 who undergo residential drug treatment in California public facilities, 78% do so for marijuana.²²

In regard to the growing scope and influence of the still nascent marijuana industry, Dr. Rachel Ann Barry and Dr. Stan Glantz note:

The state of the marijuana market is similar to where tobacco was at the turn of the 20th century, before cigarettes were mass-produced using mechanization, heavily engineered to maximize addictive potential, and marketed using national brands and modern mass media.²³

It is still too early to know if the marijuana industry will take the mass-marketing, corporatized path of the alcohol and tobacco industries but given the profits involved, and the nature of the corporate sector, it is very likely. Alcohol and tobacco have developed predatory strategies to

increase use in communities of color, including developing particular products for communities of color (menthol cigarettes, malt liquor) and targeted marketing strategies.

The marijuana industry enjoys ripe conditions for rapid growth including:

1. Young people view marijuana as harmless
2. Marijuana, while less addictive than nicotine, still leads to problem use and addiction.
3. Local and state governments are desperate for a new revenue source
4. The marijuana sector is growing into an influential, politically powerful national industry.
5. California political leaders, including the leading candidate in the race for California governor, are receiving financial contributions from the marijuana industry.²⁴
6. No significant organized voice among health leaders exists.

To grow its profit margins, the industry's strategy will likely focus on expanding:

1. Use by young people
2. The number of daily users²⁵
3. The percentage of users who are low-income²⁶

Section #2: Threats and Opportunities

This section explores the intersection between marijuana legalization and several policy areas. The changes driven by an assertive cannabis industry will have a ripple effect on numerous aspects of life in our state. In some cases, these changes will create new opportunities, as in the new taxes generated at the local and state levels by marijuana sales and businesses. In other cases these changes represent threats, such as further criminalization and poorer health outcomes. The challenge is how to take full advantage of the opportunities and at the same time, to minimize the threats.

Youth Development and Prevention

For advocates concerned with the wellbeing of vulnerable youth and youth of color, marijuana tax revenues represent a new potential funding source for preventative health services and for youth development.

According to the Legislative Analyst's Office, recreational marijuana will generate tax revenues of up to \$1 billion within a few years.²⁷ Prop 64 created a Marijuana Tax Fund that will hold these new revenues starting in January of 2018. Within the fund there is a substantial set aside for youth services titled the Youth Education, Prevention, Early Intervention and Treatment Account. The Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) is to manage the fund and to determine how the funding will be allocated. Given the LAO projections, it's likely that within a couple years of tax collection, this account could hold more than \$400 million. Prop 64 indicated that the programs to be funded through this account could include a range of youth services including prevention, early intervention, treatment, dropout prevention, behavioral health, school-based programs, workforce development, and facilities.

Organizing and advocacy efforts in this area could serve to steer these dollars toward a trauma/racial equity-informed approach that prioritizes young people of color. For example, these dollars could fund early social/emotional and academic supports in schools and early childhood settings with high percentages of African American and Latino students. Rather than sprinkle the funding evenly over a huge geography, the Fund could prioritize prevention and bring a range of supports to children in neighborhoods that have historically experienced high arrest rates for marijuana possession.²⁸ Revenues could go to support services for foster youth and LGBTQ young people, two populations that show disproportionate rates of substance abuse. By building equity into the allocation of funding, California would be furthering the policy created in our school finance system (LCFF) of investing more supports in children of greatest need.

At the State Capitol, intense lobbying has already begun among interest groups to influence how these new funds will be allocated. The drug treatment industry and mental health providers have created a stakeholder process and are positioning themselves as primary shapers of the debate, with a focus on the need to expand youth substance abuse treatment. The danger is that the debate over these dollars will be limited to those already at the table who represent the interests of their institutions, and not necessarily be informed by a racial equity and a preventative health perspective. To date, the Department of Health Care Services has indicated to advocates that they intend to postpone any decision-making on the allocation of state tax revenues until the 2017-2018 or the 2018-2019 state budget process.

In addition to the state tax revenues, legal marijuana will generate millions in local taxes in communities that permit the operation of marijuana businesses. Numerous cities and counties, particularly along the coast, already have marijuana taxes in place and will experience significant increases in revenues as recreational marijuana goes online next year. In 2018 and 2020, it is likely that we will see numerous local ballot measures to establish and/or increase marijuana taxes at the local level as local governments pursue the new revenue source. In the communities with taxes already on the books, marijuana tax revenues flow to the general fund. With local organizing and advocacy, it is possible to steer a portion of these revenues to youth development, prevention and health services to help those communities most impacted by criminalization.

The window of opportunity is currently open to influence the allocation of marijuana tax revenues at the local and state levels and to win a potentially long term funding source for prevention and health. This window will not be open for long and once the state and local governments make decisions, it will be more difficult to redirect these dollars.

In the absence of organizing and advocacy, it is very possible that marijuana tax revenues could become a significant funding source for the expansion of law enforcement and thus continue the long history of marijuana policy and punishment/incarceration. Law enforcement makes up the biggest percentage of local government budgets and is often the most powerful voice in local budget negotiations. Across the state, law enforcement officials are making the argument that the establishment of marijuana businesses will lead to increases in crime and that they will need more resources in the era of legalized marijuana. To date, there is no evidence that legal marijuana businesses increase crime. In 2011, UCLA researchers studied the relationship between crime and medical marijuana dispensaries in Sacramento and found no correlation.

Education

The widespread use of marijuana among young people presents an obstacle to the goal of improving student achievement and to closing the opportunity gap. As with all issues related to young people, educators are on the front line and see the effects of marijuana use in their classrooms on a daily basis. If we are to reverse the trend toward normalization and increased use, educators, education advocates and funders who focus on student achievement will need to engage as a key partner in advocacy efforts.

As noted earlier, adolescents and young adults who use marijuana frequently can experience delays in cognitive development; they can find it harder to learn and process new information. As a result of their drug use, these young people can face additional challenges in school and are often at greater risk of dropping out. Students who use marijuana daily or a few times a day may be relying on marijuana to deal with untreated trauma and mental health issues. While their drug use may help them cope, it can also serve to significantly limit their life opportunities. In 2015, researchers in the Netherlands found that college students who were temporarily banned from entering cannabis coffee shops experienced significant improvement in their grades and ability to pass courses.²⁹

In addition to experiencing cognitive delays and learning challenges, students who use marijuana are also at greater risk of being suspended and expelled. Under Proposition 64, young people under 18 can only be charged with infractions for possession and/or sale of marijuana. Prop 64, however, did not address the rules used by school districts to suspend or expel students. Students who bring marijuana onto a school campus continue to be at risk of disciplinary action.

Teenage moms who use marijuana can experience a double risk. A teen mom can risk delays in her own brain development and can place her fetus at risk as well. Marijuana use during pregnancy has been shown to increase the risk of low birth weight and to cause developmental delays in young children. The First 5 Association of California recently commissioned a report that pulls together the research on the impacts of marijuana use on children 0 to 5 and is engaging local First 5's statewide in a dialogue on how to advocate on these issues.³⁰

If we are to succeed at gradually denormalizing marijuana use, schools will have to play a major role and will have to serve as one of the key institutions leading prevention efforts. Willie Sutton robbed banks because that's where the money was. Schools are where the young people are.

The Built Environment

In the coming years, the legalization of marijuana will generate a myriad of challenges for those seeking to create healthy and safe living environments.

- Marijuana businesses will tend to be more heavily concentrated in or next to low-income neighborhoods and communities of color. In Sacramento, for example, the city will allow for cultivation and manufacturing businesses only in industrially zoned land and on properties distant from schools or parks. The highest concentration of businesses will be

in Del Paso Heights, and South Sacramento, two of the lowest income communities in the city. Affluent neighborhoods rarely abut warehouse districts and thus are unlikely to have marijuana grow-houses or manufacturers as neighbors.

- The cultivation and manufacturing of marijuana will likely generate environmental issues related to the use of pesticides and other harmful chemicals and could lead to greater water and air pollution in the communities in which they are located.
- Communities may experience conflicts between existing tobacco use ordinances and the legal right to use marijuana. For example, under Proposition 64 marijuana use cannot be used in public, nor can it be used in places where tobacco use is prohibited. How do people legally use marijuana who live in apartment buildings that prohibit indoor use of tobacco?³¹
- The Emerald Triangle, rural areas and tribal lands will likely continue to experience significant land use and environmental issues as a result of the illegal, unregulated marijuana industry. As mentioned previously, California exports approximately 11 million pounds of illegal marijuana to other states. This industry is unlikely to go away any time soon.
- Public health leaders who have analyzed Prop 64 consider its public health provisions to be inadequate when it comes to protecting youth from the industry.³² One land use issue is advertising. Tobacco control research has shown that young people are highly susceptible to marketing. The existing medical marijuana industry uses marketing techniques that promote marijuana as form of pain and stress relief. In the Sacramento, for example, there is a large billboard in Oak Park that children and young people pass every day for a marijuana shop called “HUGS.” On the east side of town, people are greeted by a billboard that carries the message “FEEL BETTER.” Sacramento’s free youth-oriented newspaper, *The Sacramento News and Review*, carries multiple pages of marijuana shop ads, including ads that show marijuana buds and other marijuana products and women standing behind the counter of a marijuana shop dressed in form-hugging dresses covered with marijuana leaves.

Popular culture has long glamorized marijuana use. For example, the recent Netflix series chronicling the lives of African American college students, *Dear White People*, included multiple scenes in which the attractive, successful students use marijuana for fun and stress relief.

Decriminalization and Reentry Supports

Proposition 64 changed how marijuana is treated in the criminal justice system. The possession of 28.5 grams or less of marijuana for people 21 and older is now legal. Possession of more than 28.5 grams is a misdemeanor. Possession of 28.5 grams or less for 18 to 21 year olds and for under 18 is an infraction. People with a criminal record for marijuana-related offenses have the opportunity to have their record expunged or reclassified. People currently in prison for marijuana may be able to go through resentencing.³³ The Drug Policy Alliance estimates that

close to one million Californians qualify for changes to their sentences under Prop 64. As of March 30th of this year, 515 Californians had applied or petitioned the courts to have their marijuana convictions reduced or dismissed. As with Proposition 47, we have a huge opportunity here to help people remove felony convictions and dramatically change the trajectory of their lives.

As noted earlier, the major youth-focused funding stream created by Prop 64 lacks a racial equity focus and makes no reference to reparations or the history of criminalization. However, Prop 64 did create a much smaller funding stream specifically targeted at impacted communities, the Community Reinvestments grant program. This new grant program will fund local health departments and CBOs to support job placement, mental health and substance abuse, system navigation, legal supports for reentry and linkages to medical care for communities disproportionately impacted by past federal and state drug policies. The program will begin with \$10 million initially but will grow to \$50 million by 2022. The program will be managed by the Governor's Office of Business Development and Economic Development and the Department of Social Services. This funding stream represents a significant new opportunity to repair some of the damage created by the War on Drugs and to assist community-based organizations that serve ex-offenders.

While Proposition 64 represented a major advance in efforts to reduce mass incarceration, it is very possible that marijuana will continue to be a nexus for criminalization. Law enforcement agencies are making the argument that they will need more resources to crack down on the underground economy and to increase arrests of those involved in the illegal market. In addition, we will see increased policing of driving under the influence, and it is likely that we will see a growth in racial profiling practices. Finally, noncitizen immigrants who are involved in marijuana in any way will be at greater risk of deportation.

Economic Development

With legalization, marijuana is projected to become a \$6.5 billion industry in California by 2020. A study of the potential economic growth of the sector for the Sacramento region was recently conducted by the University of the Pacific Center for Business and Policy Research.³⁴ It examined the various aspects of the industry, including cultivation, processing, testing, distribution and retail. This study projects that if the Sacramento region were to implement policies that support cannabis as a growth industry, the industry would create 20,000 new jobs, \$4.2 billion in annual output, and \$1.4 billion in labor income. In this high growth scenario, marijuana cultivation in the Sacramento area would be similar in value to wine grape cultivation in Sonoma County.

In the absence of policy advocacy, the new wealth generated by legal marijuana will likely bypass the communities that paid the price during the War on Drugs. Below are at least a few of the areas ripe for equity-focused advocacy:

- *Permits, licensing and lending*: In 2018, local governments and the state will begin issuing licenses to allow for various types of recreational marijuana businesses. Who will receive the licenses? The City of Oakland has created policies that set aside a percentage

of licenses for people convicted of drug offense and/or who live in neighborhoods with high marijuana arrests. Similarly the City of Sacramento is developing policies that would defer or waive fees for business start-up's led by people from the neighborhoods that experienced the most criminalization. Starting a new business requires sufficient capital. Who will receive the loans to launch new marijuana businesses?

- *Hiring and training:* Will there be hiring preferences put in place for the range of new jobs created by the industry? What investments in training will take place and who will have access to those programs? Who will gain access to the higher paying jobs in the sector?

Section #3: Opportunities for California Philanthropy

I have three recommendations for California funders regarding how to respond to the new reality of legal weed.

1. Become aware

The first step is to educate yourselves and to hold conversations inside your foundation about what this all means for your priorities for grantmaking. In my experience, many people are not up to speed about the new reality and continue to hold outdated views of marijuana use and its effects. I have found that it can take more than one conversation for people to accept the new reality and to consider how they might respond to it.

2. Spread awareness

I recommend that funders facilitate ways through which their grantees can get up to speed and can get connected to organizations and networks that are working on marijuana policy. Funders have a unique ability to get the attention of the nonprofit sector and to act as a convenor. Community foundations could serve as a meeting place for public health advocates, children's organizations, and racial justice organizers to have a dialogue regarding these critical issues.

3. Make grants

Finally, I suggest that funders make strategic investments in this area. Philanthropy is a primary funder of research, policy development, organizing and advocacy and is one of the few sectors that has the financial ability to counter the influence of the marijuana industry. If philanthropy sits on the sidelines, the marijuana industry will be more able to grow and develop without constraints. An unfettered cannabis industry will be more likely follow the path of tobacco and alcohol by taking a predatory approach to low-income communities of color and by having little regard for its impacts on young people and families.

Appreciations

In researching marijuana policy and in writing this paper, I was greatly assisted by many individuals and would like to express my gratitude to the following friends and colleagues:

- Malaki Seku Amen, the California Urban Partnership
- Jody Johnson, Blacks Making a Difference
- Harold Goldstein and Flo Cofer, Public Health Advocates
- Margaret Brodtkin, Funding the Next Generation
- Lynn Silver and Alisa Padon, Public Health Institute
- Dr Stan Glantz, Candace Bowling and Dan Orenstein, UCSF School of Medicine
- Marice Ashe, ChangeLab Solutions
- Dr Brad Rowe, CEO, BOTEC Analysis.

¹ Michelle Alexander, *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness* (New York: The New Press, 2011), 60.

² <https://www.aclu.org/issues/mass-incarceration/smart-justice/war-marijuana-black-and-white>

³ City of Sacramento data, statistics compiled by the Sacramento Police Department.

⁴ City of Oakland report February 23rd 2017 City Council Agenda item.

⁵ <https://www.aclu.org/issues/mass-incarceration/smart-justice/war-marijuana-black-and-white>

⁶ Josh Harkinson, “The Landscape Scarring, Energy-Sucking, Wildlife-Killing Reality of Pot Farming,” *Mother Jones*, March/April 2014. Shoshanna Walter, “In Secretive Marijuana Industry, Whispers of Abuse and Trafficking,” *Reveal*, Center for Investigative Reporting, September 8, 2016.

⁷ Laurel Rosenhall, “After legalizing weed, California’s black market could remain huge,” *CALmatters*, August 2, 2017.

⁸ Nashelly Chavez, “Growing weed illegally in your home; a SWAT team may pay you a visit,” *Sacramento Bee*, August 19, 2017.

⁹ Jody Johnson of Blacks Making A Difference, an African American youth organizing effort, has raised this concern regarding the young people he works with. If the underground marijuana economy goes away, how do young people with few options make a living?

¹⁰ <https://www.ilrc.org/community-flyers-marijuana>

¹¹ Sarah D. Sparks, “Parents’ Incarceration Takes a Toll on Children, Studies Say,” *Education Week*, (February 24, 2015).

¹² *Ibid*

¹³ The National Academies Press, “The Health Effects of Marijuana: An Evidence Review and Research Agenda,” (January 12, 2017), 13.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, Summary.

¹⁵ Nora Volkow, MD, Ruben D Baler , PhD, Wilson M Compton, MD, and Susan RB Weiss, PhD, “Adverse Health Effects of Marijuana Use,” *NEMJ*, June 5, 2014, 2220.

¹⁶ Rachel Ann Barry MA and Stanton Glantz, PhD, “Lessons from Tobacco for Developing Marijuana Legalization Policy,” January 11, 2017.

¹⁷ To learn about the range of issues related to secondhand marijuana smoke, read “Protecting Nonsmokers from Secondhand Marijuana Smoke,” Americans for Nonsmokers’ Rights, April 2017.

¹⁸ California Department of Public Health, “Marijuana and Tobacco Use Fact Sheet,” November 2016, 2.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 2.

²⁰ *Ibid*,3.

²¹ *Ibid*, 3.

²² Department of Health Care Services, Substance Use Disorder Program, Draft Youth Substance Use Disorder Treatment Services Needs Assessment, 25.

²³ “Lessons from Tobacco for Developing Marijuana Legalization Policy,” January 11, 2017, 2.

²⁴ Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsome was a primary leader of the campaign for Proposition 64. Earlier this year, Arcview Market Research, a leading firm advising investors on the marijuana industry, held a fundraiser

for Newsome in the Oakland offices. The cannabis industry has several major lobbying firms to represent their interests to the California Legislature.

²⁵ In “The Real Dangers of Marijuana,” Jonathan P Caulkins notes that roughly 20% of marijuana users account for about 80% of marijuana consumed. The marijuana industry depends on daily users. *National Affairs*, Winter 2016, 28.

²⁶ In “Evolution of the United States Marijuana Market in the Decade of Liberalization Before Full Legalization,” Steven S. Davenport and Jonathan P. Caulkins conclude that “marijuana use, like that of cigarettes, is concentrated in lower-economic strata, whereas alcohol is a relatively upscale drug.” *Journal of Drug Issues* 2016, Vol, 46 (4), 417.

²⁷ Legislative Analyst’s Office, “Proposition 64: Marijuana Legalization, Initiative Statue”: online, Internet. Available: <http://www.lao.ca.gov/BallotAnalysis/Propositions>

²⁸ It’s important to note that any efforts to reduce marijuana use by children and adolescents must also address the use by their parents. Marijuana use is normalized among young parents, and efforts focused only on youth will likely have little impact if the effort doesn’t also reach parents. The First 5 Association is exploring how home visiting programs and parent education that reach new parents could serve as a high impact strategy to increase awareness of adverse health effects of marijuana and to ultimately reduce usage.

²⁹ Olivier Marie, Ulf Zolitz, “High Achievers? Cannabis Access and Academic Performance,” Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Discussion Paper No. 8900, March 2015.

³⁰ First 5 Association, “Impacts of Marijuana Exposure on Children 0-5: The Urgency to Act,” July 2017.

³¹ Thanks to Marice Ashe, CEO, ChangeLab Solutions, for informing of this issue.

³² Rachel A. Barry, MA and Stanton A. Glantz, PhD, “A Public Health Analysis of Two Proposed Marijuana Legalization Initiatives for the 2016 California Ballot: Creating the New Tobacco Industry,” Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education, February 2016.

³³ For more information on the decriminalization policy changes enacted by Prop 64, go to myprop64.org.

³⁴ University of the Pacific Center for Business and Policy Research, “Economic Impact Study of the Cannabis Sector in the Greater Sacramento area,” (October 17, 2016): online, Internet. Available:

http://www.pacific.edu/Documents/school-business/BFC/CannabisStudy/Sacramento%20Area%20Legal%20Cannabis%20Sector%20Impact%20Study_2016_10_12.pdf