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40% of fatally-injured drivers with a known test result tested positive for drugs, almost the same level as alcohol at any positive BAC.
Collaboration and Research are Essential

Drugged driving is more complicated than drunk driving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DRUGGED DRIVING</th>
<th>DRUNK DRIVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Hundreds of drugs</td>
<td>Alcohol is alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on Use by Drivers &amp; Crashes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Abundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use by Drivers</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impairment</td>
<td>Varies by type</td>
<td>Well-documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Risk</td>
<td>Varies by type</td>
<td>Precise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs &amp; Attitudes</td>
<td>No strong attitudes – public indifferent</td>
<td>Socially unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NHTSA National roadside survey: ~1-4 drivers tested positive for drugs 22.4% daytime weekday drivers and 22.5% weekend night time drivers (20% increase from 2007).

Percentage of drivers with marijuana in their system increased 50% (8.6% in 2007 to 12.6% in 2013-14).
May 29, 2017, 
~2:00 a.m. 
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Toxicological Report
Urine Drug Analysis

Hydrocodone
Hydromorphone (Vicodin)
Alprazolam (Xanax)
Zolpidem (Ambien)
Delta-9-Carboxy THC
STATE BY STATE:
Marijuana Possession and Use Laws
AS OF APRIL 2017

1 Louisiana has a medical marijuana law but implementation is limited; NCSL does not consider Louisiana a medical marijuana state.

Source: National Conference of State Legislatures
STATE BY STATE:
DUID ZT or Per se for Some Drugs
AS OF APRIL 2017

1 Pennsylvania has both a zero tolerance law for some drugs and a 1 ng per se law for THC. Pennsylvania’s 1 ng per se law is in effect a zero tolerance law*.
2 Illinois has both a zero tolerance law for some drugs and a 5 ng per se law for THC.

Click on a color to highlight the states in that category

- Orange: Per se limit greater than zero for some drugs
- Dark Purple: Zero tolerance for some drugs
- Light Purple: Reasonable inference law with a limit greater than zero for THC
STATE BY STATE:
Marijuana Drug-Impaired Driving Laws
AS OF APRIL 2017

1 South Dakota is a zero tolerance state only for drivers under the age of 21.

2 Pennsylvania is often classified as both a zero tolerance and per se state. A minimum threshold of 1 ng is needed for a chemical test to be admitted into evidence for prosecution purposes.

Click on a color to highlight the states in that category:
- Zero tolerance for THC and metabolites
- Zero tolerance for THC only
- THC per se
- Reasonable inference THC Law
- No zero tolerance or per se laws for marijuana
SIGNS AND SYMPTOMS OF MARIJUANA

- Relaxation
- Euphoria
- Relaxed Inhibitions
- Disorientation
- Altered time & distance perception
- Lack of Concentration
- Impaired Memory & comprehension
- Jumbled thought formation
- Drowsiness

- Mood changes, including panic and paranoia with high dose
- Heightened senses
- Body tremors (Major muscle groups: quads, gluts, and abs)
- Eyelid tremors
- Red, Bloodshot eyes
- Possible GVM or green coating on tongue
- Dilated pupils
FIRST COMES “MEDICAL”

- Approved by voter Initiative 692 in 1998
  - Granted:
    - Affirmative defense to criminal prosecution for:
      - Qualifying patients and primary caregivers who possess no more than a “sixty-day supply”
        - (what is a 60 day supply?)
- Key events:
  2007 - Definition of sixty-day supply SB 6032 - 24 oz. and 15 plants
  2009 - Change in federal government’s enforcement policy
  2010 - Physician assistants, advanced registered nurse practitioners and naturopaths added as authorizers
  2011 - SB 5073 passes but is partially vetoed by Gov. Gregoire
    - Made it legal if participant registered in data base – vetoed
This is what an ounce looks like.

1 OUNCE

60 JOINTS

DRUG POLICY RESEARCH CENTER
Imagine 15 of these plants
THEN COMES “RECREATIONAL”

- I-502, Nov. 6, 2012
- ACLU, Rick Steves & Peter Lewis
- $6 million Campaign Fund

Disclaimer – presentation is for historical and instructional purposes and is not intended to be pro or con on the issues.
I-502 SUPPORTERS SAY:

- 70 years of prohibition clogged jails, ruined lives
- Tax revenue $2 billion
- Well funded, well organized political campaign
- Those opposed: out spent, not organized
Approved by voter Initiative 502 in 2012
- Adults age 21 and older to:
  - Possess up to 1 oz “useable” MJ (bud)
    - 16 oz infused product (brownies)
    - 72 oz liquid (soda pop)
    - 7 grams concentrate (hash oil)
  - Obtained from a state licensed system of private producers, processors and retail stores
  - Approved 25% tax with 40% of new revenue going to state general fund.

Hallmarks of the legal marijuana market:
- Regulation and enforcement
- Seed to sale tracking
- Testing and labeling requirements
- Serving size limits
- Product restrictions
- Taxation
AND FINALLY...ALIGNMENT

- 2015 Legislative Session – Senate Bill 5052 and House Bill 2136 Create:
  - Regulation of the medical use of marijuana
  - Specific requirements for patients under the age of 18
  - A single system of licensed production, processing and retail sales by July 1, 2016
  - Consistent testing, labeling and product standards
I-502 - Liquor & Cannabis Board sets up regulatory system – Commercially sold

Department of Health establishing rules for medical marijuana
Regulations govern growing, processing, distribution, sales, pesticides, and testing of marijuana

505 approved licenses (as of June 20, 2017)

983 producers & or processors
Current grow canopy: 18 million square feet

Sales (as of June 20, 2017):
$ 4.7 million average daily sales
FY 2015 - $259,785,729 - tax obligation $65 million
FY 2016 - $972,729,675 - tax obligation $185 million
FY 2017 - $1,327,025,182 - tax obligation $305 million

## Licenses Issued by Licensed Privilege

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Producer/Processor</th>
<th>Processor</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Canopy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>18.5m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retail Locations**

**Producer/Processor Locations**

[Map of Retail Locations]

[Map of Producer/Processor Locations]
Cole Memo

- Federal, State, Local Policy
- Public perception
Medical Marijuana – Qualifying Conditions

Under Section 16 of the Cannabis Patient Protection Act, the legislature finds that there is medical evidence that some patients with terminal or debilitating medical conditions may, under their healthcare professional's care, benefit from the medical use of marijuana. 
http://www.doh.wa.gov/YouandYourFamily/Marijuana/MedicalMarijuana

Some of the conditions for which marijuana appears to be beneficial include, but aren't limited to:
• Nausea, vomiting, and cachexia associated with cancer, HIV-positive status, AIDS, hepatitis C, anorexia, and their treatments;
• Severe muscle spasms associated with multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, and other seizure and spasticity disorders;
• Acute or chronic glaucoma;
• Crohn's disease; and
• Some forms of intractable pain.

Humanitarian compassion necessitates that the decision to use marijuana by patients with terminal or debilitating medical conditions is a personal, individual decision, based upon their healthcare professional's professional medical judgment and discretion.
Under the new medical marijuana law, recognition cards are required if patients and designated providers 21 and older wish to have access to the following benefits:

- Purchase products sales-tax free.
- Purchase up to three times the current legal limit for recreational users.
- Purchase high-THC infused products.
- Grow more than four plants in their residence.
- Have full protection from arrest, prosecution, and legal penalties, although patients will still have an affirmative defense.
CONSUMER SAFETY

Accompanying materials (varies slightly by type of product)

- Warning: This product has intoxicating effects and may be habit forming. Smoking is hazardous to your health.
- This product is infused with marijuana or active compounds of marijuana.
- Caution: When eaten or swallowed, the intoxicating effects of this product may be delayed by two or more hours.
- There may be health risks associated with consumption of this product.
- Should not be used by women that are pregnant or breast feeding.
- For use only by adults twenty-one and older. Keep out of reach of children.
- Marijuana can impair concentration, coordination, and judgment. Do not operate a vehicle or machinery under the influence of this drug.
- Pesticides and growing medium
- Type of extraction method, including solvents, gases, or other chemicals
No More of These...

[Images of various candy bars and lollipops with the DEA logo at the bottom right.]
Recent meta-analyses shows driving high doubles crash risk

Affects focus, motor coordination, drowsiness and concentration

Drivers involved in fatal crashes show a high frequency of combining pot & alcohol = synergistic effect

Marijuana drug levels/specific type not shown in national FARS crash data

DUI citations are down in Washington State
DOES MARIJUANA USE INCREASE CRASH RISK??

Review of literature revealed varying crash risk
“NOT YOUR DADDY’S WOODSTOCK WEED”

1973

2008

2014
Marijuana being sold in stores

3%

10%

20% - 30%
THC POTENCY USED IN MOST GOVERNMENT STUDIES

3 – 6% THC
## ESTIMATED DURATION OF EFFECTS AFTER SMOKING OR INGESTING THC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peak Effects (After last smoking episode)</th>
<th>Duration of Effects</th>
<th>Behavioral and psychological effects return to baseline</th>
<th>Residual Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoked</td>
<td>1-30 minutes</td>
<td>2-3 hours</td>
<td>3-5 hours</td>
<td>Up to 24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral/Edible</td>
<td>1-3 hours</td>
<td>4-8 hours</td>
<td>Dose Dependent</td>
<td>Dose Dependent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A recent study showed that THC blood concentration decreased 73.5% in the first 30 minutes and 90.3% in first 1.4 hours (2.9 – 6.7% THC).


*Note: Additional research is needed to understand all methods of ingestion and the effects, durations, and long term-impacts*
MARIJUANA HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE DOMINATE DRUG IN FATAL CRASHES

Drug-Test Results of Drivers in Fatal Crashes, 2001-2015

By Year and Drug Class

- Narcotics
- Hallucinogens
- Depressants
- Stimulants
- Cannabinoids
- PCP, Steroids, Inhalants

Percent of drivers testing positive by drug type

Number of Drivers in Fatal Crashes
Under the Influence of Alcohol and/or Drugs

- POLYdrug (Drug Positive for two or more drugs OR any alcohol and drugs)
- BAC>=.08 ONLY
- ONE Drug Only (Drug Positive for one drug OR Alcohol less than .08)
• Reviewed all WA toxicology paper reports and manually entered full toxicology outcomes into a spreadsheet
• Worked with Dr. Couper to abstract the information for surviving drivers
• Abstracted full toxicology for everyone in fatal crashes who had toxicology testing (drivers, occupants, non-motorists)
• Married to the original FARS record for in-depth fatal crash analysis
• Initial report focused on data years 2010-2014, DRIVERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toxicology Outcomes</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015pre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Tested</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Drugs, No Alcohol</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Only &lt;.079</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Only &gt;.080</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC Only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carboxy-THC Only</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC + Alcohol &lt;.079</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC + Alcohol &gt;.080</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carboxy-THC + Alcohol</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC + Drugs + Alcohol &lt;.079</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC + Drugs + Alcohol &gt;.080</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carboxy-THC + Drugs + Alcohol</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC + Drugs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carboxy-THC + Drugs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Drugs Only</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Drugs + Alcohol Only</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Still too soon for answers/impact on traffic safety

- The frequency of drivers in fatal crashes that tested positive for active THC, alone or in combination with alcohol or other drugs, was highest in 2014 (75 drivers) compared to the previous four-year average (36 drivers).

- The frequency of drivers tested with alcohol greater than/equal to BAC .08 and no other drugs was lowest in 2014 (51 drivers) compared to the previous four-year average (98 drivers).

- In 2014, 84.3 percent of drivers positive for cannabinoids were positive for active THC, compared to only 44.4 percent of cannabinoid-positive drivers in 2010.

- In 2014, among the 75 drivers involved in fatal crashes positive for active THC, approximately half (38) exceeded the 5 ng/ml THC per se limit.
DRUG TESTING AMONG DRIVERS INVOLVED IN FATAL CRASHES, 2008-2016
Cannabinoid-Positive Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes, 2008-2016

- Delta-9 THC Positive
- Total Cannabinoid-Positive Drivers
- Percent Delta-9 THC Among Cannabinoid-Positive Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Delta-9 THC Positive</th>
<th>Total Cannabinoid-Positive Drivers</th>
<th>Percent Delta-9 THC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proportion of Drivers in Fatal Crashes Positive for THC, 2008-2016

- Percent Tested Drivers THC+
- Percent TOTAL Drivers THC+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>THC+ Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Massachusetts Supreme Court Rules Field Sobriety Tests Are Not Conclusive For Marijuana Cases.

The AP (9/19) reports the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court “ruled that field sobriety tests typically used in drunken driving cases cannot be used as conclusive evidence that a motorist was operating under the influence of marijuana.” The justices “said there is currently no reliable scientific test for marijuana impairment.” The Springfield (MA) Republican (9/19) reports, “Due to the physical and mental effects of marijuana varying from person to person, a police officer cannot offer an opinion on whether an individual was ‘high’ in court cases involving a driver accused of operating under the influence of marijuana, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court said in a ruling issued Tuesday.” The court held that officers can testify to observations of the individuals, but the officer “cannot offer an opinion on whether those mean the driver was under the influence of marijuana.”
The drivers who said they’d used marijuana within two hours of driving were also asked: *when you used marijuana and drove, how do you think it affected your driving?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of drivers:</th>
<th>Total number:</th>
<th>T = 84 (87%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not make any difference in my driving:</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made me a better driver:</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know:</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made my driving worse:</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions or Realities...

I drive better when I’m stoned, I’m slower, and that’s safer.
2014 FARS data revealed that speeding occurs in 35.8% of all fatal marijuana driving cases compared to 25.9% of no-alcohol or drugs cases.

"DRUG RECOGNITION EXPERT (DRE) EXAMINATION CHARACTERISTICS OF CANNABIS IMPAIRMENT"
ACCIDENT ANALYSIS AND PREVENTION, APRIL 2016

Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) examination characteristics of cannabis impairment

Rebecca L. Hartman a, Jack E. Richman b, Charles E. Hayes c, Marilyn A. Huestis a,c

a Chemistry and Drug Metabolism, Intramural Research Program, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health, 251 Bayview Boulevard, Suite 200 Room 054721, Baltimore, MD 21224, USA
b Marlboro Police Department, 212 Central Street, Wingham, MA 02576, USA
c International Association of Chiefs of Police, 44 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 200, Alexandria, VA 22314, USA
72% of cases involved one or more moving violations. (DTD – Disobeyed Traffic Device)
REASON FOR THE TRAFFIC STOP

![Bar chart showing reasons for traffic stops.]

- **< 5 ng/ml**
- **5+ ng/ml**

- Crash: [Bars for each category]
- Speed: [Bars for each category]
- Weave: [Bars for each category]
- ImpTurn: [Bars for each category]
- DTD: [Bars for each category]
- Fail...: [Bars for each category]
- Equip: [Bars for each category]
- Lic Viol: [Bars for each category]
- Crim...: [Bars for each category]
- Other: [Bars for each category]
Among the drivers surveyed, 877 answered the question: “How likely do you think it is that marijuana impairs a person’s ability to drive safely if used within two hours of driving?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage:</th>
<th>Number of Respondents:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T= 877

(88%)
881 Survey respondents answered the question: “How likely do you think it is that a person could be arrested for impaired driving after using marijuana within two hours of driving?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage:</th>
<th>Number of Respondents:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T= 881

T= 783 (89%)
Among daytime drivers, there was a statistically significant increase in THC-positive drivers in both waves 2 and 3 compared to wave 1. Those exceeding the 5ng per se significantly decreased in wave 2 from wave 1. All other results were not statistically significant but still serve as prevalence.

In this chart, only the points that are connected by a line are statistically significant changes - the stand alone points can be described as 'point in time prevalence estimates with variation due to chance'.

- Wave 1 (pre-sales)
  - Daytime: 7.8%
  - Over 5ng per se: 14.5%
  - All Times: 17.5%
  - Nighttime: 5%

- Wave 2 (six mos. Post-sales)
  - Daytime: 18.4%
  - Over 5ng per se: 14.6%
  - All Times: 19.4%

- Wave 3 (one year post-sales)
  - Daytime: 19.4%
  - Over 5ng per se: 9.2%
  - All Times: 22.2%
Drug-Positive Drivers in Washington State
(Average Prevalence Estimates Wave1 - Wave3)

Differences between waves were not significant so we took an average of the three different values to display this general prevalence chart for drugs.
Prevalence of Marijuana Involvement in Fatal Crashes: Washington, 2010-2014

An Evaluation of Data from Drivers Arrested for Driving Under the Influence in Relation to Per se Limits for Cannabis

Cannabis Use among Drivers Suspected of Driving Under the Influence or Involved in Collisions: Analysis of Washington State Patrol Data

Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol and Marijuana: Beliefs and Behaviors, United States, 2013-2015

Drug-Impaired Driving: A Guide for What States Can Do

https://www.aaafoundation.org/impaired-driving-and-cannabis

TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

WHEREAS, upon the sworn complaint heretofore made and filed and/or the testimonial evidence given in the above-entitled Court and incorporated herein by this reference, it appears to the undersigned Judge of the above-entitled Court that there is probable cause to believe that, evidence of intoxicating liquor, marijuana, or any drug as defined by RCW 46.61.540, in violation of the laws of the State of Washington, evidence of the crime(s) of:

- Vehicular Homicide, RCW 46.61.520
- Reckless Manner
- Under the Influence of Liquor or Drugs
- Disregard for the Safety of Others

STATE OF WASHINGTON, Plaintiff,
v.

NO.

SEARCH Warrant FOR EVIDENCE OF A CRIME, TO WIT:

- VEHICULAR HOMICIDE, RCW 46.61.520
- VEHICULAR ASSAULT, RCW 46.61.522
- DRIVING WHILE UNDER THE INFLUENCE, RCW 46.61.502
- DRIVER UNDER TWENTY-ONE CONSUMING ALCOHOL OR MARIJUANA, RCW 46.61.503
- PHYSICAL CONTROL OF VEHICLE WHILE UNDER THE INFLUENCE, RCW 46.61.504

Defendant.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, COUNTY               COURT

Plaintiff.

Defendant.

TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

WHEREAS, upon the sworn complaint heretofore made and filed and/or the testimonial evidence given in the above-entitled Court and incorporated herein by this reference, it appears to the undersigned Judge of the above-entitled Court that there is probable cause to believe that, evidence of intoxicating liquor, marijuana, or any drug as defined by RCW 46.61.540, in violation of the laws of the State of Washington, evidence of the crime(s) of:

- Vehicular Homicide, RCW 46.61.520
- Reckless Manner
- Under the Influence of Liquor or Drugs
- Disregard for the Safety of Others
CAMPAIGN MESSAGES USED IN WASHINGTON ABOUT YOUNG DRIVERS AND DRUGGED DRIVING:

Listen To Your Selfie – Remember What’s Important, Forget Marijuana
http://listen2yourselfie.org/

Start talking now
http://www.starttalkingnow.org/

Dr. Leslie Walker – Adolescent Substance Abuse
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hhVDf8MEiDA
I’m Not Driving – TV ad
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=li6WPeTQPeA

Drive High, Get A DUI - TV ads
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6wHqby9o6cl
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=13DwO022CMk
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4_qsZoS-wM0

Washington State Marijuana Laws
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R3P0X6Ft9as
http://www.starttalkingnow.org/
http://www.gssac.org/
Darrin T. Grondel  
Director  
Washington Traffic Safety Commission  
360-725-9899  
dgrondel@wtsc.wa.gov