



**TESTIMONY OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
TWENTY-EIGHTH LEGISLATURE, 2015**

---

**ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:**

**S.B. NO. 666, RELATING TO MARIJUANA.**

**BEFORE THE:**

**SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY AND LABOR**

**DATE:** Thursday, February 26, 2015 **TIME:** 9:00 a.m.

**LOCATION:** State Capitol, Room 016

**TESTIFIER(S):** Russell A. Suzuki, Attorney General, or  
Lance M. Goto, Deputy Attorney General

---

Chair Keith-Agaran and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General submits testimony in strong opposition to this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to decriminalize the possession of one ounce or less of marijuana or the drug paraphernalia used to consume marijuana, and make such conduct a civil violation subject to a fine not to exceed \$100.

The bill establishes a hearing process in district court to adjudicate the violations. It also allows a defendant, after judgment has been entered in favor of the State, to request a trial on the violation.

The Department has numerous concerns about this bill, which promotes the recreational use of marijuana. It has nothing to do with the limited use of marijuana for medical purposes. Under current law, the possession of a pound or more of marijuana is a class C felony. The possession of one ounce or more of marijuana is a misdemeanor. And the possession of less than an ounce of marijuana is a petty misdemeanor. This bill attempts to make the possession of an ounce or less of marijuana a non-criminal violation. If that were allowed, marijuana will be much more prevalent in the community and much more accessible to youth. Marijuana cigarettes usually contain about 0.5-0.75 grams of marijuana. An ounce contains 28.35 grams. That means that people will be able to carry around perhaps as many as forty to fifty marijuana cigarettes. If caught, a person would only be subject to a fine of \$100. The risk of a \$100 fine will not deter individuals from possessing that amount of marijuana. More people will likely be

engaging in a variety of conduct, like driving motor vehicles, while still under the influence of marijuana.

We strongly oppose this measure for the following reasons:

1. Marijuana is still illegal under federal law.
2. Marijuana use is harmful.
3. No justification for decriminalization.
4. Specific legal concerns about the bill.

**1. Marijuana possession, cultivation, and distribution is illegal under federal law.**

Marijuana is still a schedule I controlled substance under federal law. It is in violation of federal law to grow, distribute, or use marijuana. Although this bill could legalize conduct that is currently prohibited under state law, federal law cannot be ignored. Federal law enforcement agencies make arrests and conduct raids on medical marijuana dispensaries operating in other jurisdictions.

**2. Marijuana use is harmful.**

Marijuana is classified a dangerous drug for good reason. It is a harmful substance. Medical and drug treatment professionals are particularly aware of the dangers and continue to express their concerns.

As reported by the US News and World Report on November 20, 2013, the **American Medical Association's** 527-member House of Delegates decided, during its interim meeting, to retain the long-standing position that "cannabis is a dangerous drug and as such is a public health concern." It also chose to delete its prior policy recommendation that urged the "modification of state law to reduce the severity of penalties for possession of marijuana." In its place, the body expressed support for the "modification of state and federal laws to emphasize public health based strategies to address and reduce cannabis use."

The **American Psychiatric Association** issued a Position Statement on Marijuana as Medicine that was approved by its Assembly in November 2013, and approved by its Board of Trustees in December 2013. The Position Statement included the following:

There is no current scientific evidence that marijuana is in any way beneficial for the treatment of any psychiatric disorder. In contrast, current evidence supports, at minimum, a strong association of cannabis use with the onset of psychiatric disorders. Adolescents are particularly vulnerable to harm, given the effects of cannabis on neurological development.

The **National Association of Drug Court Professionals** (NADCP) issued a Position Statement on Marijuana that was approved by the External Policy Committee of the NADCP Board on December 14, 2012, and approved by unanimous vote by the NADCP Board of Directors on December 15, 2012. The NADCP opposes the legalization of smoked or raw marijuana, and opposes efforts to approve any medicine, including marijuana, outside of the FDA process. On its website, the following background is provided about the NADCP:

The National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP) is a national non-profit 501(c)(3) corporation founded in 1994 by pioneers from the first twelve Drug Courts in the nation.

This extraordinary group of innovative judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and clinical professionals created a common-sense approach to improving the justice system by using a combination of judicial monitoring and effective treatment to compel drug-using offenders to change their lives.

From those visionaries came the Drug Court movement and ultimately the broader “problem-solving court” principles taught in law schools and utilized in everyday court practice throughout numerous municipal, state and federal court systems nationwide. Today with 2,734 Drug Courts and another 1,122 problem-solving courts (mental health courts, community courts, reentry courts, DWI courts, etc.) in operation in all 50 states and U.S. territories, NADCP has forever changed the face of the justice system.

The NADCP Position Statement, in reaching its conclusions, referenced many concerns about marijuana, including, but not limited to, the following:

Marijuana is the most commonly abused illegal drug among adults and youths in the United States;

More youths are in treatment for marijuana abuse or dependence than for the use of alcohol and all other drugs;

Emergency room admissions for marijuana use now exceed those for heroin and are continuing to rise;

Marijuana is addictive for 1 in 9 adults and 1 in 6 adolescents who use the drug;

Marijuana continues to negatively affect attention, memory, learning, and intelligence after the intoxicating effects of the drug have subsided;

Marijuana negatively affects the development of the adolescent brain;



Marijuana use during adolescence is directly linked to the onset of major mental illness, including psychosis, schizophrenia, depression, and anxiety;

The use of marijuana triggers relapse to other drugs of abuse among participants in substance abuse treatment and increases failure rates in Drug Courts;

Marijuana use is consistently associated with poorer academic grades and a reduced likelihood of graduating from school;

Marijuana use by parents is strongly associated with child abuse and neglect;

Marijuana use consistently predicts a greater likelihood of involvement in crime and the criminal justice system;

A consistent link between frequent marijuana use and violent crime and property damage has been identified among juveniles; and

Marijuana impairs motor coordination and reaction time and is the second most prevalent drug (after alcohol) implicated in automobile accidents;

On February 16, 2013, Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) posted a statement by Mr. West Huddleston, the CEO for NADCP, regarding the NADCP position on marijuana. Mr. Huddleston stated:

Every dangerous and addictive drug was once believed to be safe and medicinal. Cocaine, heroin and nicotine were once advertised as being good for you, or at least not harmful. In every instance, we learned otherwise — the hard way. Marijuana is the newest “safe” and “medicinal” drug to reenact this tragic drama. Just as scientific research is documenting the unequivocal public-health and public-safety dangers of marijuana, states are moving rapidly towards legalization or decriminalization.

Drug Courts serve seriously addicted individuals with long criminal records who have alienated nearly everyone they love. In every case, they tell us it began with marijuana. Convinced that marijuana was safe, they learned it is, in fact, addictive, causes serious cardiovascular and respiratory disease, triggers mental illness and addiction to more serious drugs, and alienates friends, family and coworkers.

In the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), 2013 **Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN)** report on drug-related emergency department visits, it was reported that in 2011, there



were an estimated 455,668 visits to emergency rooms involving marijuana in the United States. That amounted to 146.2 visits per 100,000 population. In 2004, there were an estimated 281,619 emergency room visits involving marijuana. From 2004 to 2011, there was a 62 percent increase.

SAMHSA also issued a **Treatment Episode Data Set (TEDS)** report in 2013 on “Marijuana Admissions to Substance Abuse Treatment Aged 18 to 30: Early vs. Adult Initiation”. TEDS is a census of all admissions to treatment facilities reported to SAMHSA by state substance abuse agencies. Here are excerpts from the 2013 TEDS report:

Research increasingly confirms that marijuana use is harmful. Acute symptoms of marijuana intoxication include impaired short-term memory, attention, judgment, and cognitive function, as well as increased heart rate. Symptoms that can persist for weeks after the immediate effects of marijuana have worn off include insomnia and, possibly, impaired memory and learning. When continued over years, a pattern of heavy, daily, or almost daily use can increase some health risks, including marijuana dependence, chronic cough or respiratory impairment, cardiovascular disease, and adverse effects on psychosocial development and mental health.

The long-term effects of marijuana use on adults who initiated use as adolescents are especially striking. If marijuana use begins in adolescence when the brain is still developing, the negative impact of chronic marijuana use on cognitive function and structure can last several years and may be permanent. For example, one study of marijuana users who began using in adolescence revealed deficits in the areas of the brain responsible for learning and memory, which can, in turn, impact an adolescent’s ability to successfully function in the contexts of school, work, and family. Another study showed that among persistent adult marijuana users, those who started using marijuana in their youth lost as many as 8 IQ (intelligence quotient) points between the ages of 13 and 39. These lost cognitive abilities were not restored in those who quit using marijuana as adults. In contrast, among the study’s sample of persistent marijuana users who initiated use as adults, the same cognitive declines were not detected. Moreover, the risk for youth becoming dependent on marijuana is acute: it has been estimated that 9 percent of all marijuana users become dependent—this proportion increases to 17 percent among young initiates. Thus, age of marijuana initiation can impact marijuana dependency which in turn can have a bearing on overall health and future treatment needs.

According to TEDS, in 2010 there were 687,531 substance abuse treatment admissions aged 18 to 30. Of these, 340,212 reported marijuana abuse at treatment intake and the age of marijuana initiation. The majority of marijuana admissions reported early initiation (started using marijuana at age 17 or younger;

86.8 percent); the remaining 13.2 percent reported adult initiation (started using marijuana at age 18 or older). These proportions remained relatively constant between 2000 and 2010.

TEDS also provided state-specific data on substance abuse treatment admissions by primary substance of abuse. During the year 2012, in Hawaii, there were 1,989 substance abuse treatment admissions with marijuana as the primary substance of abuse. That amounted to 29 percent of the substance abuse treatment admissions for the year. Of those admitted for marijuana abuse, 68 percent were male and 32 percent were female. And of those admitted for marijuana abuse, 72 percent were between twelve and seventeen years of age.

### **3. No justification for decriminalization.**

To begin with, the Department questions the justification for this bill. The bill, on page 1, has the Legislature finding that “the costs to enforce criminal marijuana possession statutes are substantial.” It refers to a report completed by David C. Nixon in 2012, which found that “state and county law enforcement agencies spent \$9,300,000 in 2011 to enforce marijuana possession laws. The bill also referred to a QMark research survey conducted in 2012 suggesting that registered voters in Hawaii favor the decriminalization and legalization of marijuana. Both the Nixon report and the QMark survey were prepared for the Drug Policy Action Group, a pro-marijuana group that supports decriminalization and legalization. In other words, the report and survey were not solicited and directed by an independent and unbiased entity.

The cost assessments by the Nixon report are completely inaccurate and unreasonable. For example, there is no reasonable basis for the \$9,300,000 cost assessment for the enforcement of marijuana laws in 2011. On page 8, the cost estimate is explained as follows:

Following Boyd, marijuana possession enforcement costs are estimated as the average cost of arrest (total annual state and county police budgets divided by total annual arrests) multiplied by the annual number of misdemeanor marijuana possession arrests.

Nixon apparently totaled the total annual budgets of the county police departments and state law enforcement (unclear what state departments were included and what parts of the department budgets were included in his calculation). He then divided the total budget amount by the total annual arrests to get an estimated cost per arrest. He then multiplied that number by the total



number of misdemeanor marijuana arrests. There are many problems with this calculation method.

The budgets for the police include far more than the costs for criminal investigation and arrest. The budgets include, amongst other things, costs for administration, facilities, equipment, training, contract services, programs (e.g., firearms and sex offender registration), emergency response, security operations, patrols, traffic enforcement, response to 911 calls, enforcement actions, investigation of complaints, legislative assistance, and community outreach. These are just a few of the items that are covered by an agency's total budget, and none of them may have anything to do with arrests. It makes no sense to take an agency's total budget and divide it by the number of arrests it made in a year and conclude that the calculation is a reasonable estimate of the cost per arrest.

Then to take that calculation and multiply it by the number of misdemeanor marijuana arrests to get the cost for marijuana possession enforcement makes even less sense. There is tremendous variation in the cost to investigate different crimes. The costs for a complex white collar crime, organized crime, or difficult homicide case could be very large; while the costs for a shoplifting, disorderly conduct, harassment, or marijuana possession case would likely be very small. The cost for a complex investigation might be \$100,000, while the cost for a simple misdemeanor case might be \$500.

Nixon used similar methods to calculate the costs to enforce laws against the sale/manufacture/distribution of marijuana. In that calculation, he included prosecution costs, described as "average prosecution cost for state and county judiciary multiplied by number of marijuana distribution arrests." His reference to "state and county judiciary" for prosecution costs is just a reflection of his lack of understanding of criminal investigations, prosecutions, and the operations of the entire criminal justice system.

The QMark research survey, prepared for the Drug Policy Action Group, included just a telephone survey of 300 individuals on Oahu, and 100 individuals from each of the three other counties. It should be noted that in a telephonic survey, who participates in the survey may depend on the interviewer and how the survey is pitched. Many, who have no personal interest in the issues, will likely decline to participate.



**4. Specific legal concerns with the bill.**

The bill, on page 16, creates the civil violation:

Intentional or knowing possession by a legal adult of one ounce or less of marijuana, any mixture or preparation thereof, or the paraphernalia to consume the marijuana or mixture shall constitute a civil violation subject to a fine not to exceed \$100.

This provision decriminalizes any drug paraphernalia that may be used to consume marijuana. It is not clear what types of paraphernalia are included within this violation. And this provision does not address the overlap with the class C felony offense for the possession of drug paraphernalia, under section 329-43.5, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS).

On page 17, at lines 20-21, the bill creates an exception to the reporting requirements for criminal conduct committed in schools, by not requiring the report of crimes or law violations involving one ounce or less of marijuana in the school system. Even with the bill's proposed civil violation, the possession of one ounce or less of marijuana is still unlawful for adults and minors. There is no reason to exclude this unlawful conduct from school reporting requirements.

On pages 19 and 21, the bill amends parole and probation provisions that allow the authorities to require a parolee or probationer to undergo substance abuse treatment when the person has violated terms and conditions of parole or probation involving the possession or use of drugs, by providing that marijuana-related violations must involve more than an ounce of marijuana before authorities can require treatment. Based on this bill proposal, a sentenced defendant, prohibited from using drugs or marijuana, during probation or parole, cannot be required to undergo treatment if the violation does not involve more than an ounce of marijuana. The parole and probation authorities, trying to work with a sentenced defendant with substance abuse issues, should not be prevented from addressing those issues.

The proposed amendments on page 19, lines 9-10, page 20, lines 1-2, page 21, lines 11-13, and page 22, lines 1-2, may be beyond the scope of the title of the bill, Relating to Marijuana.

On page 24, lines 1-4, the bill amends the offense of promoting a detrimental drug in the second degree as follows:

Possesses one or more preparations, compounds, mixtures, or substances, of an aggregate weight of one ounce or more, containing ~~any~~ more than one ounce of marijuana;

This amendment will require the police and prosecutors to establish that a mixture or substance, weighing one ounce or more, contains more than one ounce of marijuana. That will be impossible to enforce. If police seized a large pan of brownies containing marijuana, the police would have great difficulty in determining the quantity of marijuana in that pan. This is why our currently law refers to a mixture or substance, of an aggregate weight of one ounce or more, containing marijuana.

On page 24, lines 9-12, the bill amends the offense of promoting a detrimental drug in the third degree as follows:

A person commits the offense of promoting a detrimental drug in the third degree if the person knowingly possesses [~~any~~] more than one ounce of marijuana or any Schedule V substance in any amount.

This is a petty misdemeanor offense. The offense of promoting a detrimental drug in the second degree, discussed above, is a misdemeanor offense. But, both prohibit the possession of more than one ounce of marijuana. Furthermore, this amendment to the third degree offense will make it legal for minors to possess one ounce or less of marijuana because under the proposed civil violation, only adults will be prohibited from possessing one ounce or less.

Section 12 of the bill, starting at page 24, makes amendments to the conditional discharge law to create exceptions for the proposed civil violation. But this is confusing and unnecessary because the civil violation will not result in a conviction.

The decriminalization provisions of this bill will only further the message to youth in Hawaii that there are no dangers or risks associated with marijuana use.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department respectfully requests that this bill be held.



Committee: Committee on Judiciary and Labor  
 Hearing Date/Time: Thursday, February 26, 2015, 9:00 a.m.  
 Place: Room 016  
 Re: Testimony of the ACLU of Hawaii in **Support of S.B. 666**, Relating to Marijuana

Dear Chair Keith-Agaran and Members of the Committee:

The American Civil Liberties Union of Hawaii (“ACLU of Hawaii”) writes in **support of S.B. 666**, which seeks to decriminalize marijuana possession.

Decriminalization is a safe and smart alternative approach to address the use of marijuana in Hawaii. Hawaii’s marijuana laws have damaged civil liberties in many ways – eroding protections against searches and seizures, putting large numbers of non-violent individuals behind bars, and targeting people of color. Eliminating criminal penalties for low-level marijuana possession will prevent thousands of people from becoming entangled needlessly in the criminal justice system, eliminate many collateral consequences that flow from marijuana arrests and allow Hawaii to reinvest the money it saves for important community needs.

Decriminalization takes a step towards ending Hawaii’s participation in the nation’s failed War on Drugs, which has cost taxpayers \$1 trillion but has produced little to no effect on the supply of or demand for drugs. Instead, the War on Drugs has resulted in our status as the world’s largest jailer: there are over 2.2 million people behind bars in this country — triple the amount of prisoners we had in 1987 and more than all of Europe combined — and 25 percent of those incarcerated are locked up for drug offenses.<sup>1</sup> It’s time to end the unjust and unsuccessful war on drugs and implement a more responsible drug policy in Hawaii by passing S.B. 596.

1. *Decriminalization will allow Hawaii to shift its resources towards more serious threats to public safety and direct savings and revenue towards health care, drug prevention and public health education and other community concerns.*

Decriminalizing possession of small amounts of marijuana will (1) redirect law enforcement resources to more serious threats to public safety; (2) direct savings and revenue

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Nation Behind Bars: A Human Rights Solution. *Human Rights Watch*, May 2014, available at [http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/related\\_material/2014\\_US\\_Nation\\_Behind\\_Bars\\_0.pdf](http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/related_material/2014_US_Nation_Behind_Bars_0.pdf).

American Civil Liberties Union of Hawaii  
 P.O. Box 3410  
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96801  
 T: 808.522.5900  
 F: 808.522.5909  
 E: [office@acluhawaii.org](mailto:office@acluhawaii.org)  
[www.acluhawaii.org](http://www.acluhawaii.org)



towards health care, drug prevention and public health education and other community concerns; (3) reduce the number of unreasonable arrests for marijuana possession; and (4) reduce the targeting of communities disproportionately impacted by Hawaii's current marijuana laws.

David Nixon, an independent University of Hawaii economist, was commissioned to update a 2005 study on the state of marijuana law enforcement in Hawaii. Nixon was asked to examine the costs of current law enforcement policies, and to predict the economic impacts if Hawaii were to decriminalize or legalize, tax and regulate marijuana. According to Nixon, by decriminalizing marijuana, Hawaii could redirect over \$9 million annually in law enforcement costs.<sup>2</sup>

2. *The decriminalization of small amounts of marijuana will reduce the number of unreasonable arrests for marijuana possession in our already bloated criminal justice system.*

Arrests for possession of marijuana in Hawaii have increased almost 50% since 2004.<sup>3</sup> Arrests for possession of small amounts of marijuana constitute one of the most common points of entry into the criminal justice system. Removing criminal penalties for marijuana possession will keep people out of jail for probation and parole violations, and will eliminate the many collateral consequences that flow from marijuana arrests, thereby reducing the gross number of people entering or otherwise harmed by the criminal justice system.

3. *Decriminalization will reduce the targeting of communities disproportionately impacted by Hawaii's current laws.*

Hawaii's marijuana laws disproportionately impact people of Hawaiian descent, who are arrested for marijuana possession **six times more often** than their share of Hawaii's population.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> David Nixon, Update to: Budgetary Implications of Marijuana Decriminalization and Legalization for Hawai'i (2013), available at [http://acluhawaii.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/econreptmarijuana1\\_2013.pdf](http://acluhawaii.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/econreptmarijuana1_2013.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

Seventeen states and the District of Columbia have decriminalized the adult possession of marijuana.<sup>5</sup> In November 2012, voters in Colorado and Washington made history when they took a stand for a safe and smart alternative to marijuana prohibition and chose to legalize small quantities of marijuana for persons over 21 years of age or older. We respectfully ask that the Committee pass this measure and implement sensible marijuana law reform in Hawaii.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Sincerely,

Daniel Gluck  
Legal Director  
ACLU of Hawaii

*The mission of the ACLU of Hawaii is to protect the fundamental freedoms enshrined in the U.S. and State Constitutions. The ACLU of Hawaii fulfills this through legislative, litigation, and public education programs statewide. The ACLU of Hawaii is a non-partisan and private non-profit organization that provides its services at no cost to the public and does not accept government funds. The ACLU of Hawaii has been serving Hawaii for 50 years.*

---

<sup>5</sup> Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington. See Marijuana Policy Project, State Laws with Alternatives to Incarceration for Marijuana Possession, available at <http://www.mpp.org/assets/pdfs/library/State-Decrim-Chart.pdf>.

Feb 25, 2015

Committee on Judiciary and Labor

Re: Bill #SB666, 708, 879

Hawaii State Capitol

415 S. Beretania Street

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Subject: Testimony in Opposition of only civil penalties for the possession of Marijuana under 1oz.

To the Committee on Judiciary and Labor,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed Civil penalties for possession of Marijuana under 1 oz. Although I support the use of medical marijuana (taken orally instead of smoked) I am firmly against recreational marijuana. I believe that any lessening of the penalties against recreational marijuana use will only promote recreational use.

The physical consequences of marijuana use, especially for children teens and adults under the age of 21 should in itself be reason enough to make harsher consequences. As we all know that marijuana use can affect brain development in children, teens, and adults under 21 and cause paranoia and psychosis.

Marijuana is not innocuous. It is harmful to individuals and to society.

I know of people whose use of marijuana has dulled their critical thinking skills and lessened their sense of ambitiousness and responsibility. I believe that marijuana does have some medical purposes but as with all medical drugs, it also has side effects that are not worth the trade just for recreational use. Again, I feel that lessening the consequences will only promote its use and am strongly opposed to civil penalties for Marijuana possession under 1 oz.

Sincerely,  
Patricia Hubner  
Mt View, HI



**From:** [mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov)  
**To:** [JDL Testimony](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Submitted testimony for SB666 on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 25, 2015 7:42:45 PM

---

**SB666**

Submitted on: 2/25/2015

Testimony for JDL on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 016

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Maika Woods	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments: To the Committee on Judiciary and Labor, I am writing in opposition to the proposed Civil penalties for possession of Marijuana under 1 oz. Although I support the use of medical marijuana (taken orally instead of smoked) I am firmly against recreational marijuana. I believe that any lessening of the penalties against recreational marijuana use will only promote recreational use. The physical consequences of marijuana use, especially for children teens and adults under the age of 21 should in itself be reason enough to make harsher consequences. As we all know that marijuana use can prohibit brain development in children, teens, and adults under 21. I also believe that it is ridiculous to lessen penalties for the selling of marijuana just because they are caught selling less than 1 oz. Basically you are telling people that it is okay to sell recreational marijuana as long as you only carry less than 1oz with you at a time. It is also alarming to see that it is being suggested that when Teenagers are caught with less than 1 oz at school it no longer needs to be reported. It is a medical fact that marijuana use before the brain is fully developed (typically age 21) will prohibit the brain from developing fully. How could you just turn your head the other way on this???? I know of people whose use of marijuana has dulled their critical thinking skills and lessened their sense of ambitiousness and responsibility. I believe that marijuana does have some medical purposes but as with all medical drugs, it also has side effects that are not worth the trade just for recreational use. Again, I feel that lessening the consequences will only promote its use and am strongly opposed to civil penalties for Marijuana possession under 1 oz. Sincerely, Maika Woods Paho, HI

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)

**From:** [mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov)  
**To:** [JDL Testimony](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Submitted testimony for SB666 on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 25, 2015 8:39:41 PM

---

**SB666**

Submitted on: 2/25/2015

Testimony for JDL on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 016

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Janet Kuester	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments: I am opposed to legalizing marijuana and this bill does essentially that as long as the person possessing the drug has less than one ounce. Depending upon the amount of marijuana that is used per joint, just under an ounce can mean anywhere from 30 to nearly 100 joints. Changing the possession of marijuana from a criminal offense to a civil offense means that individuals who are members of critical professions, e.g., police officers, medical professionals, school bus drivers and etc., who use marijuana will not have a criminal record available to certifying organizations/boards to review. The public, especially those at greatest risk, such as children and those who are ill, will be put at even greater risk. Parents of school aged children/teenagers will also not be reliably notified if their child is caught using the drug. This undermines the ability of a parent to raise the child he/she is responsible to and for. If parents are held liable for their children's actions, then they must be given notification of a child's drug use. This bill will violate this. Please do not pass this measure.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)

**From:** [mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov)  
**To:** [JDL Testimony](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** \*Submitted testimony for SB666 on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM\*  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 25, 2015 10:00:52 PM

---

**SB666**

Submitted on: 2/25/2015

Testimony for JDL on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 016

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Joshua E. Forde	Individual	Support	No

## Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)



## LATE TESTIMONY

**From:** [mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov)  
**To:** [JDL Testimony](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Submitted testimony for SB666 on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM  
**Date:** Thursday, February 26, 2015 6:03:58 AM

---

### **SB666**

Submitted on: 2/26/2015

Testimony for JDL on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 016

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Roxanne Jim	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments: Dear Members of the Committee on Judiciary & Labor: Thank you for this opportunity to communicate my strong opposition to this bill. We need to show that we value our children and the future generations by providing a safe community for them to thrive and develop. This bill will not make a positive impact on our children, families or community. Aloha, Roxanne Jim

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)

**From:** [mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov)  
**To:** [JDL Testimony](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** \*Submitted testimony for SB666 on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM\*  
**Date:** Thursday, February 26, 2015 8:47:51 AM

---

**SB666**

Submitted on: 2/26/2015

Testimony for JDL on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 016

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Leslie J.	Individual	Oppose	No

## Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)

**From:** [mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov)  
**To:** [JDL Testimony](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Submitted testimony for SB666 on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM  
**Date:** Thursday, February 26, 2015 10:35:44 AM

---

**SB666**

Submitted on: 2/26/2015

Testimony for JDL on Feb 26, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 016

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Dawn O'Brien	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments: Aloha Statesmen & Stateswomen, I stand in strong opposition of decriminalizing marijuana in the State of HI due to its long- & short- term ills upon our people. What good can come of this other than profit\$ for the wrong parties. Please do not entertain this folly any longer than you already have. Stand up for what is right, not for profits from drug money. Aloha always, Dawn O'Brien, voting citizen & media personality

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)