

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from electronic originals  
(may include minor formatting differences from printed original)

SEN. DAVE MIRAMANT, CHAIR  
SEN. BRAD FARRIN  
SCOTT GAGNON  
ANN GIBBS  
ERIK GUNDERSEN  
HANNAH KING  
ROY MCKINNEY  
ALYSIA MELNICK

SAM PRAWER, LEGISLATIVE ANALYST  
DAN TARTAKOFF, LEGISLATIVE ANALYST



REP. TERESA PIERCE, CHAIR  
REP. PATRICK COREY  
JONATHAN POOLE  
JOSH QUINT  
JOHN RISLER  
MEGAN SCOTT  
LENNY SHARON

STATE OF MAINE

MARIJUANA ADVISORY COMMISSION

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Ned Claxton, Chair  
Representative Michele Meyer, Chair  
Joint Standing Committee on Health and Human Services  
  
Senator Louis Luchini, Chair  
Representative Chris Caiazzo, Chair  
Joint Standing Committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs

FROM: Senator Dave Miramant, Chair <sup>DM</sup>  
Representative Teresa Pierce, Chair <sup>TP</sup>  
Marijuana Advisory Commission

DATE: December 6, 2021

SUBJ: Marijuana Advisory Commission annual report pursuant to Title 28-B, section 903, subsection 5

---

On behalf of the Marijuana Advisory Commission, we are submitting this letter as our annual report pursuant to Title 28-B, section 903, subsection 5.

As you know, Public Law 2021, chapter 363 – “An Act To Ensure Equity in the Membership of the Marijuana Advisory Commission” – made a number of changes to the membership of the Commission, including adding 6 new members. The Commission delayed meeting this interim until November 9, 2021 to allow time for the appointment of those new members following that law’s effective date of October 18, 2021. Unfortunately, as of the date of this report, those 6 new seats remain vacant. For this reason, we have decided to forego any additional meetings of the Commission until the 2022 interim when we anticipate having received all new appointments.

Prior to the November 9 meeting, Commission staff were directed to solicit public comments regarding law enforcement contacts with citizens pursuant to the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 28-B, section 903, subsection 2. The Commission received one comment, submitted by the ACLU of Maine, which is appended to this letter.

### November 9, 2021 Meeting

At the November 9 meeting, the Commission received presentations from the Office of Marijuana Policy (OMP) regarding the status of the adult use and medical marijuana programs and from the Maine Municipal Association (MMA) regarding local regulation of marijuana businesses. As you know, a number of laws were enacted by the Legislature last session in response to the OMP's proposed new rules for the medical marijuana program. Among other things, those laws changed the designation of the medical marijuana program rules to major substantive, provided that the medical marijuana program rules as of February 28, 2021 remain in effect and required the OMP to convene a stakeholder group to review proposed changes to the medical marijuana program. From the OMP's presentation, we understand this stakeholder group was convened, has held a number of meetings and is developing a report to the Legislature for submission in early 2022. OMP Director Gundersen described these meetings as productive and noted that his office is considering forming a permanent cannabis working group to continue these stakeholder discussions on matters affecting the medical marijuana program as well as the adult use marijuana program.

The Commission also received a presentation from the MMA, which had in preparation for our meeting surveyed its member municipalities on a range of questions regarding local regulation of medical and adult use marijuana. Although a number of municipalities reported few barriers to or issues with such local regulation, it was noted by the MMA representative Kate Dufour that many municipalities expressed a need for more technical support, education and other assistance from the State on these matters.

### Note from the Commission Chairs – Issues for Future Discussion

While we recognize there are many specific and substantive issues facing both the adult use and medical marijuana programs that merit further Commission discussion, some of which were raised by Commission members at the November 9 meeting, there are additional issues relating to the Commission itself, described below, that we as the Commission chairs anticipate raising for discussion in 2022.

*Solicitation of Public Comment* – as noted above, the Commission is required by statute to annually solicit comments regarding law enforcement contacts with citizens. Since its formation in 2018/19, the Commission has performed this solicitation 3 times and received only 2 total comments. It is unclear to us whether either of those comments received are the types of comments sought by statute, however, it is clear that this solicitation does not appear to be generating sufficient information for the Commission to draw any conclusions regarding law enforcement contacts with citizens. We anticipate discussing next interim whether this statutory solicitation should be revised in law to better generate responses or whether the information sought could be better acquired by a different entity, perhaps the OMP as it already collects a variety of marijuana-related information.

*Commission Staffing* – per 28-B MRSA §904(1), “The Legislative Council shall provide staffing services to the commission, except that Legislative Council staff support is not authorized when the Legislature is in regular or special session.” Although we understand the necessity of this staffing restriction, it does limit the Commission to meeting only during the legislative interim. This unfortunately prevents the Commission from providing meaningful and timely input on pending legislation under consideration by the Legislature and its committees. Given the varied backgrounds and expertise of our members, we believe the Commission is uniquely suited to provide critical input on legislation during the committee process. We anticipate discussing next interim whether the Commission should consider requesting legislative funding for contract staffing to allow it to meet during the legislative session or, alternatively, to identify other resources that would allow the same, such as utilizing existing staffing resources at the OMP.

*Future Work of Commission* – recognizing the work that is currently being done at the OMP, including the ongoing medical marijuana program stakeholder discussions and the OMP’s proposed formation of a permanent cannabis working group and given the staffing restrictions described above, we anticipate discussing next interim whether the Commission’s duties and responsibilities are duplicative of other efforts in the State and whether there are ways better facilitate the Commission’s purpose for which it was created in 2018.

To help direct our work next year, we would encourage both of your committees to submit to the Commission any recommendations for matters relating to the medical marijuana or adult use marijuana programs that you believe merit further discussion by our members.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact us directly or through our Office of Policy and Legal Analysis staff, Sam Praver and Dan Tartakoff.

Enc.

Cc: Members, Marijuana Advisory Commission  
Members, Joint Standing Committee on Health and Human Services  
Members, Joint Standing Committee on Veterans and Legal Affairs  
Danielle Fox, Director, Office of Policy and Legal Analysis

October 4, 2021

Daniel Tartakoff  
Legislative Analyst

Samuel Prawer  
Legislative Analyst

Office of Policy and Legal Analysis  
Marijuana Advisory Commission  
13 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333-0013  
Daniel.Tartakoff@legislature.maine.gov  
Samuel.Prawer@legislature.maine.gov  
*Submitted Electronically*

RE: Solicitation of Public Comment Regarding Law Enforcement Contacts With  
Citizens, Pursuant to 28-B M.R.S. § 903(2).

Dear Mr. Tartakoff and Mr. Prawer:

The American Civil Liberties Union of Maine (the “ACLU of Maine”) advocates for the civil rights and liberties of people in Maine. In particular, we have long advocated for the legalization of drugs, due to the serious civil liberties violations that criminalization creates. We supported the referendum in 2016 that allowed for legal recreational cannabis in Maine. That support was based in part on the fact that criminalizing cannabis leads to the disproportionate arrest and incarceration of Black people, as well as concern over the myriad civil liberties violations that have accompanied drug interdiction efforts for the past half century.

Now, we submit these comments to the Marijuana Advisory Commission to identify two areas of concern regarding contacts between law enforcement and citizens involving adult use of cannabis. We are concerned that such contacts, first, disproportionately subject Black citizens to arrest; and second, demonstrate that law enforcement continues to use “smelling marijuana” as a pretext to search vehicles.

*Disproportionate arrests of Black people for possessing cannabis*

Black and white citizens report smoking cannabis at similar rates—this has been demonstrated through multiple nationwide surveys over the past twenty years.<sup>1</sup> Despite the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Results from the 2010 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Summary of National Findings*, U.S. Dep’t of Health and Human Services 21, 74 (Sept. 2011), <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUHresults2010/NSDUHresults2010.pdf>; *Report to the United Nations on Racial Disparities in the U.S. Criminal Justice System*, The Sentencing Project (Apr. 19, 2018), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/un-report-on-racial-disparities/>; *Facts about Marijuana Use*, PsychCentral (Jul. 28, 2020), <https://psychcentral.com/lib/facts-about-marijuana-use#1>;

similarities in usage, across the country Black people are at a significantly higher risk of being arrested for possession of cannabis.<sup>2</sup>

Maine is no exception to this general rule. As recently as 2018, Black people in Maine were four times as likely to be arrested for possession of cannabis than white people, an increase since 2017.<sup>3</sup> This incredibly disproportionate arrest rate, with no data to show that Black people are consuming or transporting cannabis at four times the rate of white people, demonstrates that law enforcement is still using cannabis possession as a tool to disproportionately search and arrest Black people.

This is particularly troubling because even arrests that do not result in prosecution can have a tremendously damaging impact on the arrestee. For example, an arrest (even with no resulting conviction) will appear in a person's criminal history record information, and therefore appear if a potential employer, landlord, or lender conducts a background check.<sup>4</sup> A wrongful arrest leaves a person with trauma and anger for having been targeted.<sup>5</sup> Arrests with no following conviction are also correlated with, and likely cause, lower incomes and an increased likelihood of dropping out of school.<sup>6</sup> Pre-trial detention (in the event that a person is unable to post bail) can also result in a loss of child custody.<sup>7</sup> Thus, every arrest is concerning and that Black people are disproportionately subject to arrest for cannabis possession means they are also disproportionately subject to myriad other difficulties.

#### *Maine law enforcement continues to use smelling cannabis to justify vehicle searches*

Despite legal cannabis consumption and transportation, Maine law enforcement at both the local and state level continues to use having smelled cannabis as justification to search vehicles, and to prolong traffic stops.<sup>8</sup> Notably, on one occasion where the person stopped

---

<sup>2</sup> *Every 25 Seconds*, Human Rights Watch (Oct. 12, 2016), [https://www.hrw.org/report/2016/10/12/every-25-seconds/human-toll-criminalizing-drug-use-united-states#\\_ftn2](https://www.hrw.org/report/2016/10/12/every-25-seconds/human-toll-criminalizing-drug-use-united-states#_ftn2); *Marijuana's racist history shows the need for comprehensive drug reform*, Brookings Inst. (June 23, 2020), <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/how-we-rise/2020/06/23/marijuanas-racist-history-shows-the-need-for-comprehensive-drug-reform/>.

<sup>3</sup> *A Tale of Two Countries: Racially Targeted Arrests in the Era of Marijuana Reform*, American Civil Liberties Union 32, 35 (2020), [https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/field\\_document/marijuanareport\\_03232021.pdf](https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/field_document/marijuanareport_03232021.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> *FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)*, Maine Criminal History Record & Juvenile Crime Information Request Service (2015), <https://apps1.web.maine.gov/online/pcr/faq.htm>; 16 M.R.S. § 703(3).

<sup>5</sup> Human Rights Watch, note 2 *supra*.

<sup>6</sup> *The Impacts of Arrest*, IACP/UC Center for Policy and Research (2020), [https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/Research%20Center/Impacts%20of%20Arrest%20\(infographic\).pdf](https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/Research%20Center/Impacts%20of%20Arrest%20(infographic).pdf);

<sup>7</sup> Megan Stevenson & Sandra G. Mayson, *Pretrial Detention and Bail*, U of Penn. Law School Public Law Research Paper No. 17-18 (2013), [https://law.asu.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academy\\_for\\_justice/2\\_Reforming-Criminal-Justice\\_Vol\\_3\\_Pretrial-Detention-and-Bail.pdf](https://law.asu.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/academy_for_justice/2_Reforming-Criminal-Justice_Vol_3_Pretrial-Detention-and-Bail.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> *Maine State Police Troop F Report*, Fiddlehead Focus, Sept. 6, 2021, [https://fiddleheadfocus.com/2021/09/06/news/police\\_fire/maine-state-police-troop-f-report-aug-2-8-2021/](https://fiddleheadfocus.com/2021/09/06/news/police_fire/maine-state-police-troop-f-report-aug-2-8-2021/); Lynn Storen, *October 2019*, Dep't of Pub. Safety Maine State Police, Oct. 7, 2019, <https://www.maine.gov/dps/msp/archive/201910>; Michael Rubinkam, *In era of legal pot, can police still search cars based on odor?*, PBS, Sept. 13, 2019, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/in-era-of-legal-pot-can-police-still-search-cars-based-on-odor> (detailing stop experienced by David Boyer).

was highly knowledgeable about cannabis laws in Maine and able to self-advocate, no search resulted—this does not appear to have been the case when the person stopped was less aware.<sup>9</sup>

Of the nineteen states that have legalized recreational cannabis, courts in seven of them (California,<sup>10</sup> Colorado,<sup>11</sup> Delaware,<sup>12</sup> Massachusetts,<sup>13</sup> Oregon,<sup>14</sup> Vermont,<sup>15</sup> and Virginia<sup>16</sup>) have found that the smell of cannabis no longer justifies a finding of probable cause to search a vehicle. In Connecticut, the recently passed bill allowing for recreational cannabis explicitly disallowed “evidence collected” in violation of the bill to be admitted in court, and law enforcement there has already enacted a policy of not using the odor of cannabis to create probable cause or reasonable suspicion to support any stop or search of a vehicle.<sup>17</sup> New Jersey and New York have taken similar approaches.<sup>18 19</sup>

Notably, in the remaining states that have allowed for recreational cannabis (Arizona, Alaska, Montana, Nevada, South Dakota, and Maine), we are unable to find any record that those state courts or legislatures have explicitly *allowed* the smell of cannabis to create probable cause post-legalization. In other words, all states actually faced with the question have determined that legal recreational cannabis means the smell of cannabis does not create probable cause.

These legislative and judicial findings serve to enforce the major demonstrable benefit of legalizing recreational cannabis—namely that it increases state revenue by lowering law enforcement expenditures and increasing state tax revenue.<sup>20</sup> When law enforcement remains able to search a vehicle based on the smell of cannabis, those searches and traffic stops create expenses that undercut the law enforcement savings of legalized recreational

---

<sup>9</sup> Rubinkam, note 8 *supra*.

<sup>10</sup> *U.S. v. Martinez*, 811 Fed. App'x. 396 (9th Cir. 2020); *U.S. v. Maffei*, 827 Fed. App'x. 760 (9th Cir. 2020).

<sup>11</sup> *People v. McKnight*, 2019 CO 36 (Colo. 2019).

<sup>12</sup> *Juliano v. Delaware*, Case No. 320, 2019 (Del. 2021).

<sup>13</sup> *Commonwealth v. Overmyer*, 496 Mass. 16 (Mass. 2014).

<sup>14</sup> *Oregon v. Bowen*, No. 14 2021 505 (Ore. 2021).

<sup>15</sup> *Zullo v. Vermont*, 2019 VT 1 (Vt. 2019).

<sup>16</sup> Virginia HB 5058; <https://lis.virginia.gov/cgi-bin/legp604.exe?202+sum+HB5058>.

<sup>17</sup> Christopher Keating, *Connecticut state and local police prepare to enforce new law on legal weed on July 1.*, The Hartford Courant, Jun. 29, 2021, <https://www.courant.com/politics/hc-pol-cops-enforcing-new-pot-law-20210629-z6w5xojgijevjniquflgouwy5u-story.html>.

<sup>18</sup> *Frequently Asked Questions Marijuana Decriminalization and Legalized Cannabis*, N.J. Office of the Att'y General, Mar. 8, 2021, [https://www.nj.gov/oag/marijuana/docs/FAQs\\_Updated\\_3.8.21.pdf](https://www.nj.gov/oag/marijuana/docs/FAQs_Updated_3.8.21.pdf).

<sup>19</sup> Thomas Tracy & John Annese, *Now that pot is legal, NYPD tells its cops the smell of weed alone is no longer enough to justify a car search*, NY Daily News, Apr. 1, 2021, <https://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/nyc-crime/ny-nypd-new-rules-legal-marijuana-20210401-xr4kdxxffzg6nmxbvomioe2te-story.html>; Eric Tichy, *Law will prevent searches based on marijuana smell*, Observer, Apr. 6, 2021, <https://www.observertoday.com/news/page-one/2021/04/law-will-prevent-searches-based-on-marijuana-smell/>; S854A § 2205(3)(A), (B).

<sup>20</sup> Cato Inst., *The Effect of State Marijuana Legalizations: A 2021 Update*, Feb. 2, 2021, <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/effect-state-marijuana-legalizations-2021-update> (assessing impacts of legalization in eight states with regards to crime and economy and finding a significant impact only as to economy).

cannabis.<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, because Black people are disproportionately targeted for traffic stops and vehicle searches, disallowing searches based on the smell of cannabis can address that form of harassment.<sup>22</sup> That Maine continues to permit the smell of cannabis to justify a finding of probable cause has a disproportionate impact on Black citizens and undercuts the benefits of legalizing recreational cannabis. The Commission should, therefore, recommend to the legislature that the legislature adopt a law stating that the smell of cannabis does not create probable cause.

Sincerely,

Anahita Sotoohi  
Legal Fellow

---

<sup>21</sup> Frank Mazo IV et al, *The Financial Impact of Legalizing Marijuana in Illinois*, Ill. Econ. Pol’y. Inst. Nov. 9, 2018, <https://illinoiseipi.files.wordpress.com/2018/11/ilepi-pmcr-financial-impact-of-legalizing-marijuana-in-illinois-final.pdf> (noting significant savings associated with reducing police spending in relation to marijuana)

<sup>22</sup> Andrew Ringle, *Bill to end police stops for marijuana smell passes Va. Senate*, WHSV3, Aug. 28, 2020, <https://www.wHSV.com/2020/08/28/bill-to-end-police-stops-for-marijuana-smell-passes-va-senate/>; Shane Sanderson, *Black drivers’ cars searched more frequently on basis of drug, alcohol odor*, Columbia Missourian, Dec. 6, 2016, [https://www.columbiamissourian.com/news/local/black-drivers-cars-searched-more-frequently-on-basis-of-drug-alcohol-odor/article\\_76c6279a-b63f-11e6-9c89-0ff7ad37d769.html](https://www.columbiamissourian.com/news/local/black-drivers-cars-searched-more-frequently-on-basis-of-drug-alcohol-odor/article_76c6279a-b63f-11e6-9c89-0ff7ad37d769.html).