

1-28-2015

Public Policy Implementation: Recreational Marijuana in Colorado

Sara Elena Shoemate

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/padm_etds

Recommended Citation

Shoemate, Sara Elena. "Public Policy Implementation: Recreational Marijuana in Colorado." (2015).
https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/padm_etds/6

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Public Administration ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Sara E. Shoemate

Candidate

School of Public Administration

Department

This thesis is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Thesis Committee:

Dr. Bruce J. Perlman , Chairperson

Dr. Michael Scicchitano

Dr. Nicholas Edwardson

**PUBLIC POLICY IMPLEMENTATION:
RECREATIONAL MARIJUANA IN COLORADO**

by

SARA E. SHOEMATE

BACHELOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND HISTORY, 2010

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Public Administration

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

December 2014

Public Policy Implementation: Recreational Marijuana in Colorado

by

Sara E. Shoemate

B.A., History and Political Science, 2010

Master of Public Administration, University of New Mexico, 2014

ABSTRACT

In 2012, voters in Colorado and Washington State voted to legalize marijuana for recreational use. These states have the challenging task of creating and implementing a policy framework with which to regulate the now legal cultivation, distribution, and use of marijuana. This is a considerable task due to the lack of precedent and information regarding the issue, and because of the intergovernmental issues involved. This thesis focuses on the issue in regard to local governments in Colorado.

The goal of this thesis is to gain a better understanding of the adoption of RME and barriers to the implementation processes of RME in local governments in Colorado. In order to gain this understanding, a survey of city and county managers and administrators across Colorado was conducted. The survey acted as a ‘status check’ of where localities are in the decision making process and sought to gain information about the policy adoption and implementation processes thus far. Existing public policy implementation literature was used as a foundation for the survey questions. The results of the survey indicated that most respondents have made a decision on the operation of RME and that a majority have banned them.

Further analysis indicated that those local governments that have smaller populations, and are classified as rural and Republican, are more likely to have banned RME. Those localities that do not allow the operation of medical marijuana establishments (MME) are

likely to have banned the operation of RME, and vice versa—those localities that do allow the operation of MME are more likely to allow the operation of RME. This indicates these local governments are working incrementally in changing their marijuana policies. In regards to the implementation process, it appears many different local government departments will be involved in planning and enforcement, but there is no great concern about fiscal issues. Additionally, with respect to potential intergovernmental conflict, there seems a fairly low degree of concern among local government respondents regarding potential federal government enforcement actions.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
Background	5
Economic considerations	5
Banking and investment issues	7
Implications for demand/use	8
Literature Review	11
Public policy and implementation	11
Intergovernmental Issues	17
Study goals	21
Methodology	22
Survey participants	22
Survey and data collection	23
Response rate	24
Analytical technique	25
Results	26
Testing the hypotheses	26
A lay of the land	28
Discussion	30
Contributing factors to policy implementation	31
Implications for future research	38
Limitations	39

Reference List	42
Tables.....	46
Appendix 1.....	52
Appendix 2.....	55

List of Tables

Table 1: Local government position on RME, by political party.....46

Table 2: Local government position on recreational marijuana based on locality population.....47

Table 3: Local government position on RME, by urban/rural classification.....48

Table 4: RME/MME Relationship49

Table 5: Concern about Federal Government Enforcement Action.....50

Table 6: Status of MME and RME51

Marijuana is the most widely used illicit drug in developed nations (“World Drug Report,” 2014). The question of how to regulate this drug is widely debated. As of 2012, no federal, state, or local government had legalized marijuana for any reason besides that of medicinal use. While some countries have “de facto” legalized marijuana (namely the Netherlands and Portugal), by decriminalizing it, it is still technically an illegal substance. As for the United States (US), marijuana is classified by the federal government as a Schedule I drug according to the Controlled Substances Act (CSA). Per the CSA, Schedule I drugs have a “high potential for abuse,” have “no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States,” and there exists a “lack of accepted safety for use of the drug...under medical supervision,” (Controlled Substances Act of 1970, 2013). Despite this classification by federal government, twenty-three US states have legalized marijuana for medicinal purposes and eighteen states have decriminalized the drug (“23 Legal Medical,” 2014) (“States that have,” 2014). Colorado and Washington voters legalized the production, distribution, and use of recreational marijuana (RM).

These states are taking monumental steps in the realm of drug policy. January 1, 2013 was the first day citizens, aged twenty-one and over, were legally allowed to use the drug in Colorado; and January 1st of this year (2014) was the first day recreational marijuana establishments (RME) were allowed to sell marijuana to the general public. Per Colorado’s Amendment 64 (passed by voters), each local government is free to decide whether or not to allow the operation of RME, just as they have been allowed to decide the same of medical marijuana establishments (MME) (CO Const. amend. LXIV). This local option has proven to be a useful source of insight in regards to policy and implementation.

The uniqueness of the policy shift makes it perfect for examination and analysis of implementation processes. Both states carry the heavy burden of successfully implementing and regulating this new policy in a way that mitigates the potentially negative consequences. One obstacle for successful outcomes, such as avoidance of federal government intervention, a thriving marijuana industry, and minimal impact on public health—is the lack of precedent and information on the issue. Little information about the economic and public health impacts of legalization exists. Additionally, implementors in Colorado and Washington have had limited access to similar legalization laws or policies by which to replicate their policies on. The case of Colorado and marijuana legalization should prove to be an interesting case study by which to observe the first implementation process for a marijuana policy. This paper examines policy adoption by and the implementation processes of local governments in Colorado dealing with the local option of permitting or banning RME.

Generally speaking, the theoretical framework of public policy implementation and research on public policy use three different approaches: 1.) a top-down approach, or the idea that all policy-related decisions are based on the central directive; 2.) a bottom-up approach, or emphasis of the role of the “street-level bureaucrat” as a main decision maker; or 3.) hybrid approaches, the incorporation of elements from both bottom-up and top-down approaches (Puelzl & Treib, 2007).

Regardless of the approach employed, a lot of implementation literature covers best practices, or resources necessary for successful implementation, as well as common reasons for unsuccessful implementation. This literature suggests three main elements for success: 1.) gaining political and constituent support; 2.) constructing streamlined

decision processes; and 3.) obtaining sufficient monetary and administrative resources. Also, while the change at the state-level in Colorado is considerable, existing literature suggests that policy changes most often occur incrementally—so this paper will address the concept of incrementalism, at the local level. This public policy literature is a resource that benefits scholars and administrators alike, as the task of implementing this new policy will be difficult. Despite the availability of public policy literature, scarce literature exists that addresses marijuana policy specifically. This paper seeks to provide information that will begin to bridge this gap in the literature.

One challenge for implementation of RME by local governments is the fact that the legalization of marijuana in Colorado and Washington is in direct conflict with the laws of the federal government. The United States (US) Department of Justice (DOJ) has indicated they will forgo involvement in the two states' decisions under the condition that the states address the concerns the DOJ has deemed most important (Cole, 2013). However, there still exists the precedence of federal law, and therefore, the right of the federal government to intervene. This intergovernmental conflict contributes to the prominence and complexity of the issue.

The aforementioned intergovernmental issues could potentially affect the implementation process, should the Federal Government decide to intervene in Colorado and Washington. The fact that Colorado and Washington are among the first governments to allow the legalization of marijuana could also potentially affect the implementation process. The lack of information on the behavioral and institutional impacts of legalization (e.g. drug use, the criminal justice system, banking, and the economy, public health) essentially makes these states' efforts experimental. While

implementation of public policy is inherently a difficult process, the implementation of such a divisive and complex issue is likely be much more challenging than normal.

The purpose of this thesis is to gain a better understanding of the adoption of RME and barriers to the implementation processes of RME in local governments in Colorado. The issue was examined in terms of the general policy cycle, which includes policy adoption, implementation, and evaluation (May & Wildavsky, 1978). While it may be too early to engage in the evaluation phase of the cycle, the policy adoption and implementation phases are well under way. These issues are examined within the context of existing policy implementation literature, as well as within the context of various independent variables that characterize respondents' local governments and may affect implementation.

For this study, a survey was utilized to help gain this understanding. Survey participants included Colorado municipal and county managers and administrators. Survey topics included the status of both medical marijuana establishments (MME) and RME in their communities, reasons contributing to this status, RME implementation questions, and demographic information.

Using univariate and descriptive statistical analysis, study hypotheses were tested. Political party, the urban/rural classification, and population do all appear to share a relationship with the allowance of RME. Results also show that localities that permit the operation of MME do permit the operation of RME at higher rates than those localities that do not permit the operation of MME. Additionally, despite the prominence of intergovernmental relations issues, both adopters and non-adopters of RME are less worried about potential federal government enforcement actions than they are worried.

Background

The following topics are the most prevalent issues discussed in the debate over marijuana policy. These topics served, in part, as a basis of the research study because of their prevalence in social discourse and the likelihood that they contributed to the local decision making process. As with many other policies, economic impacts, potential barriers to implementation (in this case, a lack of banking and investment options available to the marijuana industry), and potential consequences (a possible increase of marijuana use and demand) are all important considerations when discussing the adoption of a public policy that legalizes RME and its subsequent implementation.

Economic considerations

One of the most widely discussed issues in the debate on drug policy is that of the economic costs to taxpayers, and federal, state, and local governments. Those that lean towards legalization/liberalization generally believe that the costs of prohibition outweigh the benefits. It is argued that the “war on drugs” started by President Nixon in the early 1970s, has been an economic sinkhole—as it has been a large consumer of funds without producing the intended results of the eradication of drug use and drug-related violence (Chilea & Chilea, 2011). Legalization is, so far, the least utilized form of policy used to regulate marijuana. As of 2012, no U.S. States, aside from Colorado and Washington had legalized marijuana for recreational purposes. Many believe that the ‘war on drugs’ has only contributed to the strength of the narcotics dealers, by seizing massive amounts of products, thereby driving up the costs and profits of drugs (Chilea & Chilea, 2011). There are also many arguments for the legalization of marijuana, as it could potentially make for an industry that is better regulated and controlled. Many believe that it would

result in a decrease in crime, as legalization would take the profitability out of the illegal drug business; and many also believe that better health protection would result from legalization if a portion of enforcement costs would go towards harm reduction and addiction programs (Block, 1993).

Proponents of legalization believe that states and the federal government have much to gain from potential revenue if the drug were regulated and taxed. More specifically, legalization would eliminate arrests for trafficking as well as possession; save on prosecutorial, judicial, and incarceration expenses; and would allow for taxation. A look at the economic benefits by top economists shows that the federal government could decrease expenditures by up to \$7.7 billion annually with legalization. The industry could also potentially generate a tax revenue of \$2.4 billion if taxed like other goods, and up to \$6.2 billion annually if the drug were taxed at rates similar to drugs and alcohol (Egan & Miron, 2006). Not only would the federal government benefit, but state and local governments would see decreased expenditures for the same reasons. Colorado itself had brought in roughly \$7 million in tax and licensure fees by June of 2014 (Ingraham, September 11, 2014).

Additionally, a look at policing expenditures in the locality of Copenhagen found that between 0.1% and 2.2% of annual resources were used for policing cannabis in low-intensity years. That number jumped to between 0.25% and 5.7% in high-intensity years, while the percentage spikes to upwards of 10% of annual resources for crackdowns (Moeller, 2012). The reallocation of these resources elsewhere could potentially benefit state and local governments.

Banking and investment issues

A potential barrier to the successful implementation of RME at the local level is that banking services and investment opportunities are essentially non-existent in the marijuana industry. Federal laws aimed at preventing money laundering have thus far affected the way RME are forced to do business (Clough, 2013, May 23). RME are businesses that operate legally under state law (by cultivating and/or selling marijuana), but under federal law are illegal. RME are not afforded the same financial and tax benefits, such as payroll deductions, that traditional businesses are. It is also difficult for these businesses to find and keep relationships with banks for loan and business account purposes. Banks that do business with RME are at risk of repercussions from the federal government, including loss of federal insurance, business charter, or prosecution of individual bankers. Everyday tasks become markedly more complicated for RME—buying office supplies requires cashier's checks, and many cannot accept credit and debit cards as customer payment (Clough, 2013). They are, therefore, forced to run as cash-only businesses. This business model comes with security concerns, as well as record-keeping concerns, thereby making them more difficult to audit (Vekshin, 2013).

The same problems apply to investors, and are hindrances to the growth of the industry. Similar to banks, investors are wary of dealing with companies that deal with marijuana-related products. Investors do not want to run the risk of investing in a company that is high-risk. For those trying to break into the marijuana industry, this lack of investors makes getting off the ground even more difficult. To Brendan Kennedy, this lack of access to banking services poses a real problem for industry growth. Kennedy is one of the founders of Privateer Holdings, the first private-equity firm to risk capital in

the marijuana industry. However, even Privateer Holdings refuses to invest in businesses that deal with marijuana products, and instead invest in ancillary products such as inventory-tracking software, lighting for grow operations, and security services (Barcott, 2013).

Addressing these problems has proven to be tricky, as it is the response of the federal government that dictates what banks and investors will, or will not, do. Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper did sign a bill earlier this year that set up a makeshift framework for marijuana business owners to gain access to financial services (Altman, June 6, 2014). The federal government has also issued guidelines for Colorado and Washington to follow with the assurance that, if followed, the federal government will allow banks to do business with marijuana-related businesses (Grossman, February 14, 2014). However, there are signs that despite these efforts, banks are still reluctant to engage with these businesses (Sullum, September 18, 2014). The importance of establishing a functional network of banking services, and the encouragement of a thriving industry, are important to the overall success of RME in Colorado and Washington.

Implications for increased demand/use

Increased marijuana use, especially by youth, is a major concern to many local communities. While many agree that there will be an increase, it is difficult to predict how much of an increase will actually occur. There is little to no data concerning usage rates as a result of legalization, though there is some information that could be of help—including the effects on use after the implementation of decriminalization and medical marijuana, as well as the de facto legalization in the Netherlands.

The decriminalization of marijuana is a type of policy used in order to regulate the drug. With decriminalization, there is generally reduction of penalty (e.g. no prison time, or the offense does not go on a criminal record) for first time offenses of small amounts for personal consumption. A number of U.S. states have taken decriminalized marijuana, as has Western Australia (“States that have,” 2014) (Damrongplisit, Cheng, & Xueyab, 2010). While Colorado law now finds marijuana legal, looking at effects caused by liberalization of marijuana law could give rough estimations of the future effects of legalization.

Studies regarding the effects decriminalization has on demand in Western Australia have been mixed. One study shows that living in a decriminalized state in Western Australia increased the probability of smoking marijuana by 16.2% (Damrongplisit, et.al., 2010). However, other studies of Western Australia have shown that while the effect of the legal status of marijuana differs across different age-groups and genders, there is no evidence to show that decriminalization has affected use by young people (a cohort often at the center of concern in drug policy debates), nor has it increased the frequency of use among previous users (Williams, 2004). Another study shows that past experience with decriminalization indicates that increase in demand is not considerable for youth, and that the demand shifts from that of alcohol, and ultimately does not lead to an increase in overall demand between the two substances (Thies, 2012).

A look at usage rates in the Netherlands might provide the best indication as to what might happen to usage rates in Colorado. Despite arguments to the contrary, de facto legalization of marijuana in the Netherlands in the 1970s was actually followed by stable usage rates in the years following the policy change. Additionally, a look cross-

nationally shows usage rates between Dutch youth and German youth to be similar, despite differences in policy—Dutch policy being quite liberal, and German drug policy being much more restrictive (Reuband, 1998). Studies from the 1980s and 1990s comparing highly liberal and highly repressive countries, in terms of drug policy, have roughly identical average usage rates per capital (Reuband, 1998). Another study looked at drug use rates in two similar cities with opposing policies, Amsterdam and San Francisco. This study found that the mean age for onset of use, mean age for regular use, and mean age for maximum use for both cities were nearly identical (Yacoubian, 2007). Essentially, the study found no evidence to support the idea that decriminalization or legalization increases use, or that criminalization decreases use.

The cost of marijuana also seems to have an effect on demand. Currently, commercial grade marijuana is sold for \$500-\$1500 per pound. One study has found that with legalization and regulation, prices could dip down to below twenty dollars per pound. This decrease in price will most likely result in an increase in demand, though it is hard to determine elasticity of demand in this case, as it could depend on a multitude of factors including pre-legalization culture of a state or locality (Caulkins, Kilmer, MacCoun, Pacula, & Reuter, 2012). Cost issues will likely be an important part of the overall usage and tax revenue in Colorado. These costs issues may only bear relevance to recreational marijuana in Colorado if or when prices become competitive with medical marijuana and black market marijuana, both of which are cheaper than recreational marijuana (Ingraham, September 11, 2014).

Literature Review

In order to provide a basis for better understanding of implementation of RME by local governments in Colorado, existing literature was consulted. Public policy literature is addressed, with a focus on implementation, including incrementalism, components of successful implementation, and the role of implementation in the policy cycle. As stated previously, the approaches of top-down, bottom-up, and hybrid are most often utilized. Aspects and ideas from all three approaches are addressed. Additionally, IGR related literature is addressed here, including issues associated with the U.S. Federalist system, decision-making within the IGR context, and the role of politics.

Public policy and implementation

In considering a policy's chance for success it is necessary to consider the role the implementation aspect plays, and it is wise to refer to implementation literature. While there is little policy and implementation literature regarding marijuana legalization specifically, some conclusions about marijuana policy can be gathered from policy literature in general. Since the 1970s, public policy implementation literature has focused on the implementation and analysis of various public policies, as well as the general best practices of successful policy implementation (Puelzl & Treib, 2007). The implementation of public policy within the context of significant intergovernmental differences adds another layer of complexity.

Successful public policy implementation, "the process by which policies are transformed into public services" (Van Horn, Jones, Van Meter, & Thomas, 1976, p. 40), is critically important to successful public policy. Even the best-constructed public policies will fail if implemented poorly (Ewalt & Jennings, 2004). When implementing

new policy it is important to understand that policy implementation is not independent of policy design. Rather, the two share a co-dependent connection (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1979). It is fairly obvious that implementation is dictated by the policy at hand and its objectives. However, the reverse is also true; implementation shapes policy. Change is inherent in the lifespan of successful policy, as new policies are almost never perfect the first go around. The need to adjust policy and implementation tactics often occurs after implementation has begun and problems have arisen. The inevitability of change demonstrates that implementation is an evolutionary process, rather than a static one (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1979). It is important for administrators to acknowledge the relationship between policy and its implementation, and the evolution that takes place over time. This could be especially important for administrators in Colorado to keep in mind, as there is nearly no precedent concerning implementing recreational marijuana policies.

Incremental implementation. Parallel to looking at policy and implementation as evolutionary processes is the often incremental nature of those processes. The method of making smaller or minor changes, as opposed to major changes, is a highly utilized form of decision making. With incremental policy making, “basic policy orientation often remains fairly constant with change coming incrementally,” (Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1979, p. 482). Policy making in the public sector is no exception.

Due to the complex nature of issues dealt with in the public sector, using an incremental approach to decision and policy making has largely been the method of choice (Lindblom, 1959). The complex nature of changing public policy is due in large part to the number of different ‘actors’ involved. Administrators have pressure coming

from a multitude of sources, and therefore, are left to deal with ‘competing values.’ For administrators to rank these values by importance is often fruitless and counterproductive, and is one reason why incrementalism is often the preferred method of decision making in the public sector (Lindblom, 1959). Small policy changes are made as to not offend any one constituency group. Not only must administrators and policy makers consider the wants of constituents, but also must consider the effects of partisanship and political parties. Incremental changes are often easier for administrators to control, versus radical changes that are more likely to produce unpredictable results (Lindblom, 1959). It is for this reason also that policy changes occur incrementally—the compromise needed to make policy changes is significant. It is the nature of politics in the public sector that has fostered the want for risk-aversion, and thereby the use of incrementalism, in public policy making.

Incrementalism is also favored by authors Carl E. Van Horn and Donald S. Van Meter, who discussed implementation theory in their article, “The Policy Implementation Process,” (1975). Van Horn and Van Meter wrote that successful policy implementation is heavily influenced by two distinguishing characteristics, one of which being the amount of organizational change involved (1975). Essentially, drastic organizational changes in implementing agencies results in a policy more difficult to implement than a scenario in which there is incremental change—the more drastic the change, the less positive the outcome.

Components of successful implementation. Considering the controversial nature and “newness” of the issue at hand, it is important to consider the contributing factors of successful policy; as well factors to avoid that contribute to unsuccessful policy

implementation. Policy and implementation literature discusses both of these ideas. Authors of “The conditions of effective implementation: a guide to accomplishing policy objectives,” Sabatier and Mazmanian discuss conditions that they believe will lead to the successful completion of policy objectives. One of these conditions provides that statutes and/or other official policy directives “structure the implementation process to maximize the likelihood target groups will perform as desired” (484). A number of factors are involved in this condition. These factors include: obtaining sufficient resources, having clearly ranked policy objectives, and the assignment of policy directives to supportive agencies. Something implementing officials should avoid is the issue turning into a ‘capability problem,’ as defined in other implementation literature. In line with Sabatier and Mazmanian’s ideas, implementing agencies cannot be expected to successfully implement policy if they have capabilities problems, such as: overworked and/or incompetent staff, insufficient information, insufficient political support and financial resources, and unmanageable time constraints (Van Horn et al., 1976). While explicit policy directives will help implementors truly understand what it is their roles are, structuring the implementation process for success will ensure that implementors and their agencies will have the sufficient resources in order to do so.

Additionally, under Sabatier and Mazmanian’s condition, it is important to consider the collaboration and integration of the various agencies involved. The higher the number of agencies and individuals involved in implementation, the greater the chance of the ‘veto points’ will manifest. Sabatier and Mazmanian describe veto points as, “occasions in which an actor has the capacity...to impede the achievement of statutory objectives” (Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1979, p. 490). Commonly this can include

the delayed approval of decisions as well as the outright denial of decisions, resulting in a “back to the drawing board” scenario. However, it is possible to try to reign in these impediments. Efforts in minimizing the effects of veto points generally results in delayed progress, rather than outright termination of a program. Essentially, adopting the most direct route (with the minimum amount of people and departments involved possible) to achieving policy objectives is the most preferable (Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1979).

The concept of trade-offs is also necessary for policy success. Achieving good implementation is difficult and administrators must “balance the benefits” in order to achieve intended goals and policy (Browning, Rogers Marshall, & Tabb, 1980). Collaboration and negotiation are important aspects of the balancing act. In order to construct and implement policy differing viewpoints must be considered, as to avoid conflict and tension (Emad & Roth, 2009). Generally speaking, without collaboration and negotiation a policy will not have the necessary support to be neither approved, nor successfully implemented.

This sort of ‘goal consensus’ is another aspect attributed to success or failure of policy implementation (Van Horn & Van Meter, 1975)—the more consensus, the better chance of successful policy implementation. While the inclusion of multiple interests might slow down implementation, it might be considered positive when considering policy. The more voices that are heard during policy formation, the more likely a policy is to be seen as legitimate by constituents. Public officials in Colorado have been and still continue to consider the pros and cons of marijuana legalization on their communities. Given the far-reaching nature of the issue these officials have much to consider, including issues like public health, economics, and public safety. The adoption

of RME has been and will continue to be partially dependent on how local communities decide to evaluate the costs and benefits of the new law within the context of their communities and values.

Similarly, the idea of innovation implementation could explain some aspects of the adoption and implementation processes. Innovation implementation addresses the process behind the adoption of ‘innovations,’ or, new technologies and/or new concepts (Klein & Sorra, 1996). In the case of RME and local governments in Colorado, the adoption of RME could be considered the ‘innovation’ at hand. Innovations-fit values, essentially the “fit of the innovation to a targeted users’ values” can help predict how receptive users or groups will be to implementing innovations (Klein & Sorra, 1996, p. 1061). Looking at local communities in Colorado in this light could perhaps help predict which communities will adopt/have adopted the operation of RME. In order for adoption to occur, communities’ values will likely have to be largely homogeneous (i.e. little intra-group differences) in support for RME adoption. For example, those communities that tend to be more liberal (or, have a majority of voters registered Democrat), and live in larger populations that are considered urban might find their values are more in line with the innovation of RME adoption.

The Policy Cycle. When lucky, policy makers have time to work through the cycle of a good implementation plan. Ideally, public policy is constructed, implemented, and subsequently evaluated for efficiency and effectiveness. Whether the policy was implemented well or poorly can be verified by observing the difference between the actual consequences and the intended consequences. This is completed during the evaluation portion of the cycle. The evaluation portion can be a crucial component in

strengthening or fixing flawed implementation (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1979). The evaluation component will be notably important for local governments in Colorado.

While policy, implementation, and evaluation are all necessary working components, results are often unpredictable. Pressman and Wildavsky make this point well, in stating: “Faithful implementation is not a vacuous notion... There is no need to feel guilty about failing to carry out a mandate inherent in a policy in a literal way, because literal implementation is literally impossible. Unless a policy matter is narrow... the policy will never be able to contain its own consequences,” (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1979, p. 179). Despite the best planning of Colorado administrators, unintended consequences will assuredly occur.

Intergovernmental Issues

As mentioned previously, intergovernmental issues are inherent in the topic of marijuana legalization and the adoption of RME at the local level. IGR is a contextually important factor in the issue of marijuana legalization. The divide between the US Federal Government and many state governments regarding drug policy grows larger every year, as more and more states legalize and decriminalize marijuana to varying degrees. The US’ system of federalism and its complexities make the implementation processes even more difficult, as decision making under these circumstances can be challenging.

The challenges of the US federalist system. The United States works as a federalist system under which both the federal and state governments are independent but equal partners who share power (Smith, Greenblatt, & Mariani Vaughn, 2001). Authors Smith, Greenblatt, and Vaughn cite both advantages and disadvantages to federalism in

their book *Governing States and Localities*. The disadvantages listed most certainly apply to issue of marijuana legalization in the United States. These stated disadvantages assert that federalism, “increases complexity and confusion,” “increases conflict when jurisdictional lines are unclear,” and “creates inequality in services and policy” (29). This confusion often arises due to the evolving nature of federalism and differing interpretations.

Issues of legality heighten the complexity of federalism and intergovernmental relations. Regarding the issue of marijuana, the federal government has the power to control the issue, despite the fact that the regulation of marijuana is not an enumerated power given to the federal government in the Constitution. It has been ruled that regulation falls under the Interstate Commerce Clause because the production and distribution of the substance often occurs across state lines (Young, 2005). The 2005 Supreme Court decision, *Gonzalez V. Raich*, held that under the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution the federal government could prohibit the production, distribution, and use of marijuana (including for medicinal purposes), even if it is legal under individual state law (Bostwick, 2012). Furthermore, the Supremacy Clause in the U.S. Constitution holds that the U.S. Constitution, Federal Statutes, and U.S. Treaties are the “supreme law of the land,” meaning that federal law reigns supreme when a conflict between federal and state law arises. The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, however, holds that powers that are not specifically granted to the federal government and not specifically prohibited to the States are reserved to the States and the people. Nevertheless, because of aforementioned legal reasoning, it is an issue that ultimately lies in the hands of the Federal Government.

It would be remiss, however, to ignore other factors that influence intergovernmental relations. The most influential of these factors being that of politics. Author Robert Agranoff described the involvement of politics aptly in stating that there is “no way to avoid politics when the issues and decisions involve mayors, council persons, county commissioners, special district boards, and representatives of significant private interests” (Agranoff & Lindsay, 1983, p. 231). These types of elected officials are born of politics, and often will end because of politics. The balancing act officials struggle with in implementation and policy making, as discussed previously, applies also to those dealing with broader IGR decisions.

The trade-offs in dealing with IGR issues are often just as important, if not more, in influencing the success of certain policies. For example, it has widely been considered a wise move for the federal government to avoid intervention in Colorado, as polls have shown it would be unpopular and politically unsound to do so (Newport, December 10, 2012). While the federal government could legally intervene in the proceedings, the trade-off of becoming politically unpopular has not shown to be worth the perpetuation of the War on Drugs in Colorado. The issue of marijuana legalization is political in nature, and this partisanship will likely crop up in other aspects of the policy and implementation processes.

Decision making in the IGR context. Another aspect of the implementation process that, in this case, affects intergovernmental relations is the power and discretion of the “street-level bureaucrat.” Street-level bureaucrats often make decisions just as much top-level administrators (though they may be administrative in nature, rather than policy driven), making them an integral part of the implementation process. Also known

as “front-line bureaucrats,” these public servants have the latitude in deciding “how to apply or enforce rules and the type and quality of services to be delivered” (Trusty & Cerveny, 2012, p. 115). These public servants are essential to policy success, as most policies simply cannot be implemented without them.

The integration of personal values into decision-making provides additional complexity regarding the discretion of street-level bureaucrats—some view the influence of personal values and use of discretion as perfectly natural and unavoidable, while others believe that personal values can negatively influence policy implementation (Trusty & Cerveny, 2012). The use of discretion has affected those states with medical marijuana laws. In the past, despite instruction from Deputy Attorney General David Ogden to federal prosecutors to not focus on individuals complying with state medical marijuana laws, many medical marijuana dispensaries were raided (Ogden, 2009, October 19). While federal prosecutors may not be considered street-level bureaucrats in the traditional sense, it is this type of discretion that can, and does, affect policy implementation.

It is the undefined power relations inherent in IGR issues that could lead to disconnect in Colorado. It is possible that previously mentioned dispositional conflicts or policy-professional conflicts could undermine implementation at the local level. On the other hand, implementers could view the will of Colorado voters as their directive. Regardless, while federal law supersedes state law in this case, the federal government recently announced they will give Colorado and Washington state latitude to implement their new laws, given the states strictly regulate the process (Brady, 2013). However, a 2009 memo from Department of Justice lead many states to believe that medical

marijuana facilities would be a low priority to law enforcement and prosecution. This was not the case in many states, which saw an influx in dispensary raids (Yardley, 2011). It is these sorts of complexities that could make implementors at the local level weary of actions at the federal level.

Study goals

The purpose of this thesis is to gain a better understanding of the adoption of RME and barriers to the implementation processes of RME in local governments in Colorado. In order to achieve the desired level of understanding, a survey was sent to local public officials across Colorado to gather quantitative data. The survey was structured in order to obtain a ‘status check’ of, and reasoning behind, the adoption process in localities across Colorado, as well as to address topics found in relevant implementation literature. These topics mainly include: incrementalism in policy, implementation and involvement of local departments, implementation and budget issues, and intergovernmental concerns. Given the issues previously discussed, study hypotheses were based on: the political nature of the issue and the innovation-values fit of those localities that would presumably not permit RME; the idea that governments make policy changes incrementally; and likelihood that intergovernmental issues would play an important role in the local decision-making process. The study hypotheses are as follows:

H1: Localities that are classified as Republican, rural, and have small populations are least likely to permit the operation of RME.

H2: Localities that permit the operation of MME will permit the operation of RME at higher rates than those localities that do not permit the operation of MME.

H3: Localities that have permitted the operation of RME will be less concerned with possible federal government enforcement actions than those localities that have banned the operation of RME.

Methodology

This thesis is a study of attitudes of local government officials, RME adoption and implementation, and marijuana legalization in Colorado. The purpose of the study was to explore in depth the attitudes of Colorado public officials at the local level regarding RME adoption and implementation. As discussed previously, marijuana legalization is one of the most complicated and prominent intergovernmental issues in recent history. It is safe to say, then, that the intergovernmental problems involved are likely to have an impact on the implementation of marijuana legalization and RME in a way that does not occur during the implementation of most other public policies. Also it is not clear what part is played by factors like the costs and barriers to the policy's implementation, the pre-existing adoption of MME, or the location and political affiliation of respondents' communities. To understand the roles of these factors, local officials were surveyed on their views.

Survey participants

As stated previously, Colorado public officials were the target group of the survey. Specifically, at the city/town level, managers and administrators (and city and town clerks, in the absence of a manager) were targeted. At the county level, managers and administrators were also targeted. These positions were chosen with the assumption that these individuals would not only have up-to-date knowledge regarding the policy,

but would also be able to speak to the policy and implementation process, as well as the concerns of their colleagues and communities.

Participants within local governments were found either using the Colorado Municipal League (CML) website, or online searches. The CML website contains contact information for municipalities, and municipal officials are listed on the CML website. The necessary piece of contact information was e-mail addresses, as this was the means of sending out the survey. In the event that e-mail addresses were not made available on the CML website, phone calls were made in order to obtain this information. County contact information was found similarly, but by using online searches, as the CML website contains only information for municipalities. Because contact could not be made with all local governments, contact information was not obtained for all 335 municipalities and counties. In the end, e-mail addresses were obtained for, and the survey was sent to 300 potential respondents.

Survey and data collection

While a number of methods exist for data collection, ultimately a survey was used to gather data. While the initial cost of time was high (i.e. collecting all necessary contact information), the ongoing cost of conducting a survey via email was relatively low. The survey was able to reach a target audience of more than would have been possible through other methods, such as interviews. Another advantage of using the survey method was that respondents were able to maintain anonymity while being able to answer potentially sensitive questions in private.

The survey was administered by the Florida Survey Research Center (FSRC) at the University of Florida. The survey consisted of fifteen questions, and included

branching and multiple choice questions. Survey topics included questions regarding the status of medical marijuana in their local governments, the status of recreational marijuana in their local governments, reasons contributing to said status, policy implementation pertaining to recreational marijuana, and demographic information. Survey questions were based on two main factors: 1.) existing public policy implementation literature, in order to better understand what is taking place at the local level with respect to implementation processes (e.g. incrementalism, capability problems); and 2.) the desire to understand where local governments are in the decision-making process and to better understand the thought process behind those decisions, in order to support the idea and hypotheses related to the implementation literature. See Appendix 2 for the full survey.

Response rate

The survey was sent out to 300 municipal and county managers, administrators, and clerks. Only fully completed surveys were used for data analysis. Ultimately, 133 fully completed surveys were returned, making for a 44.3% response rate (133/300). Out of 271 incorporated municipalities, 110 responded to the survey. Out of 64 Colorado counties, 23 responded to the survey. Responses represented 56 of 64 Colorado counties, either from the counties themselves, or cities/towns within those counties. Cities with populations ranging from 132 to 600,158 residents were represented in the completed surveys.

Analytical technique

In order to analyze the collected data, both univariate and descriptive statistics were used. Using the data analysis and statistical software Stata, univariate analysis across key variables was conducted. This univariate analysis was utilized in order to test the previously stated hypotheses and because the data and response rate are well suited for the analysis. Descriptive statistics were used in order to get broader picture of the data, especially the aspects of the data not well suited for inferential statistics.

In analyzing possible variables contributing to local government decisions regarding the approval of RME, a number of independent variables were chosen. These independent variables were political party, local government population, and an urban/rural classification.

Population numbers and the urban/rural classifications relied upon the 2010 U.S. Census. For the urban/rural variation three classifications were used: rural, urban cluster, and urban area. For voter registration/political party, voter registration records from the Colorado Secretary of State's office were used. Because this information was only available at the county level and not available per municipality, the political party for each municipality was assigned based on the county in which they reside. If one party had a majority of registered voters, then the municipality/county was classified accordingly. The registration of voters in some counties was rather close. In those cases, the municipality/county was classified as 'swing.' Additionally, some municipalities are located in multiple counties. If the counties differed in classification (i.e. one county was classified as 'Republican' and one as 'Democrat') then the municipality was classified as 'swing.'

Results

Testing the hypotheses

All chosen key variables in relation to whether or not a local government has permitted recreational marijuana appear to have statistically significant relationships. There is a statistically significant relationship between political affiliation of a locality and whether or not they have permitted the operation of RME ($\chi^2=10.2601$, $df=2$, $p<0.05$) (see Table 1). In this case, areas that are classified as ‘Democrat’ are more likely to allow RME than ‘swing’, and ‘Republican’ classified areas. A statistically significant relationship exists between population and the RME decision (fisher’s exact=0.017, $p<0.05$) (see Table 2), as well as between the urban/rural classification and the allowance of RME ($\chi^2=8.91$, $df=2$, $p<0.05$) (see Table 3). This means that rural areas are the least likely areas to allow the operation of RME, followed by urban clusters, and urban areas. Population wise, the smaller the locality, the less likely they are to allow MME. Hypothesis 1 postulates that localities that are smaller in population, and classified as Republican and rural, will be less likely to allow the operation of RME. The above findings support this hypothesis.

In testing the significance of the independent variables against the question of whether or not localities allow MME, two tests showed significance. Both the rural/urban classification ($\chi^2=8.34$, $df=2$, $p<0.05$) and population (fisher’s exact=0.008) variables have a statistically significant relationship with the allowance of MME. Urban areas are more likely than urban clusters to allow MME, and urban clusters are more likely than rural areas to allow MME. Population wise, the larger the locality, the more likely they are to allow MME. Political affiliation did not show statistical significance in

relation to the allowance of MME. While testing key variables against the allowance of MME does not directly address a stated hypothesis, statistical testing was conducted as a point of reference for future discussion.

Table 4 shows the relationship between having permitted MME and the allowance of RME. Of the forty respondents who do already allow the operation of MME, 70% have permitted the operation of RME, and 10% have banned the operation of RME. This is in stark contrast to those respondents who do not permit the operation of RME. Of those 93 respondents, 71% have banned the operation of RME, only 2.1% have approved the operation of RME, and 10.8% have placed a moratorium on the issue. A fisher's exact test shows this relationship to be statistically significant (fisher's exact=0.000). This finding supports Hypothesis 2, which postulates that localities that permit the operation of MME will permit the operation of RME at higher rates than those localities that do not permit the operation of MME.

Table 5 shows the differences in level of concern (between adopters and non-adopters) for potential federal government enforcement actions. In regards to intergovernmental relations, survey participants were asked whether or not their local governments had concerns about possible enforcement actions by federal government agencies. Of the thirty respondents who have permitted the operation of RME, 32.3% of respondents are concerned, while 48.4% of respondents are not concerned with federal government interaction. Of the eighty respondents who have banned the operation of RME, 37.5% of respondents are concerned, and 38.8% of respondents are not concerned. Of those same eighty respondents, 47.5% cited conflict with federal government laws as a contributing reason for banning RME in their local governments. However, the

relationship between the two groups' answers did not prove to be statistically significant. This finding does not support Hypothesis 3, which postulates that localities that permit the operation of MME will permit the operation of RME at higher rates than those localities that do not permit the operation of MME.

A lay of the land

Table 6 shows the breakdown of responses regarding the status of both MME and RME. Of the 133 respondents, 30.1% currently allow MME to operate in their local governments, while 69.9% do not allow MME. 124 respondents have made an official decision regarding the operation of RME. Of those 124 respondents, 24.8% have approved the operation of recreational marijuana establishments 57.9% have banned, and 16.5% have placed a moratorium on the issue.

Respondents were also asked for reasons why their localities banned or approved the operation of RME. Those localities that have banned the operation of RME cited issues of morality (62.8%), public opinion (50%), public safety issues (47.1%), and conflict with federal government law regarding the issue (45.7%) as the top reasons for the ban (see Appendix 1, Table A1). Those localities that have placed a moratorium on the issue cited generally similar reasons (though not the entire 'moratorium' population was branched to this question). Issues of morality (60%), conflict of federal government law (60%), and the lack of data on the issue (60%) surfaced the top of the list—though the most common reason was that these localities would like to wait and see what happens in the rest of the state (80%) (see Appendix 1, Table A2). Of those localities that have approved the operation of RME, public opinion (93.3%) and the feeling that the

allowance of RME is generally ‘not a big deal’ (50%) were the top reasons cited for approval (see Appendix 1, Table A3).

Survey participants who reported that their local government has permitted the operation of RME were also asked about the involvement of other local and state departments in regards to both the planning process and enforcement of the new regulations. Of those thirty respondents, the departments that were cited most often as having been, or will be, involved in the planning process are: law enforcement at 87.1%, zoning and planning at 87.1%, community development at 61.3%, and licensing at 61.3%. Similarly, officials cited law enforcement at 80.6%, zoning and planning at 67.7%, and code enforcement at 64.5%, as the departments that have most often been, or will be, involved in the enforcement of RME operation (See Appendix 1, Table A4).

Of the thirty respondents who reported that their local government has permitted the operation of RME, seven reported that one or more departments in their local governments have requested additional funds or staffing to help facilitate the implementation of recreational marijuana regulations. The departments that were cited with most frequency by those seven respondents were law enforcement at 85.7%, licensing at 57.1%, and code enforcement at 42.9%. (See Appendix 1, Table A4).

Additionally, respondents were asked whether or not they have issued a local tax on the sale of marijuana. 20% (6) of respondents have issued a local tax, ranging anywhere from 1% to 8%. 26.7% of respondents have not issued a local tax, but have plans to do so. 43.3% of respondents have not issued a local tax and have no intentions of doing so (See Appendix 1, Table A5).

As for the survey respondents themselves, 50.4% were male, and 41.4% were female. For 48.9% of respondents the highest level of education achieved is master's degree, while 15.8% have obtained a bachelor's degree. 54% of respondents were city/town managers or administrators, while 19.5% of respondents were city/town clerks, and 12.8% are county managers or administrators. 48.9% of respondents have been in their current position for anywhere from zero to four years, and 22.5% have been in their current position for anywhere from five to nine years. However in terms of respondents' total government work experience, 37.8% have 25 plus years of experience, 16.5% have anywhere from 20 to 24 years of experience, and 10.2% have anywhere from 15 to 19 years of experience.

Discussion

The purpose of this thesis is to gain a better understanding of the adoption of RME and barriers to the implementation processes of RME in local governments in Colorado. In order to gain this understanding, the adoption of RME by local governments was examined within the context of the policy implementation cycle, existing policy implementation literature, and various independent variables that characterize respondents' local governments.

A survey was sent to local public officials across Colorado to gather quantitative data. The survey was structured in order to obtain a 'status check' of, and reasoning behind, the adoption process in localities across Colorado, as well as to address topics found in relevant implementation literature. These topics mainly include: incrementalism in policy, implementation and involvement of local departments, implementation and

budget issues, and intergovernmental concerns. To conduct the data analysis, descriptive and quantitative statistics were employed.

The research findings showed that the concept of incrementalism in policy adoption is relevant; and both adopters and non-adopters of RME are concerned with potential federal government enforcement actions at similar rates (adopters at 32.3%, and non-adopters at 37.5%). Results also show that political classification is a factor in whether or not a locality permitted the operation of recreational marijuana establishments, as are city population and whether or not a city is classified as urban or rural.

Contributing factors in implementation of RME

The following factors appear to have had some impact on the implementation of RME in local governments in Colorado, and have provided insight from which to both describe how the implementation process is going, and to form educated questions about the process. These factors include: the impact of key variables (political affiliation, the urban/rural classification, and population) on MME and RME adoption, incrementalism as a part of the implementation process, the impact of IGR issues on decision-making, and other implementation issues (e.g. budgeting and department involvement).

The impact of key variables on MME and RME adoption. Of the three independent variables tested (political affiliation, population, and the urban/rural classification), two proved to show a statistically significant relationship with MME. Political affiliation has no effect on whether or not a local government has permitted

medical marijuana. The rural/urban classification and population, however, did prove to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

In regards to RME, political affiliation, population, and the rural/urban classification all proved to be statistically significant. This means that: areas classified as ‘Democrat’ are more likely to permit RME; urban areas are the most likely to permit RME, as opposed to urban clusters and rural areas; and, by and large, the larger the population, the more likely the locality is to permit RME. These findings do support Hypothesis 1. This hypothesis states that non-adopters will be classified as Republican, will have smaller populations, and be classified as rural areas. These results can likely be explained by both the political nature of the issue and the innovation-values fit concept described earlier. Those localities that allowed the operation of RME likely have the values and characteristics most agreeable with implementing such an innovation.

The findings involving the chosen key variables could potentially be a basis for future research. While the relationship between permitting MME and RME showed to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), the two policies did not share the same correlations with the chosen key variables. Though it is apparent the issue of marijuana legalization is political in nature, the fact that political party was not found to show a statistically significant relationship with both the allowance of MME and RME (only with RME), is curious. One conceivable reason is the fact that medical marijuana is a much more established industry at this point. It is possible that partisanship has become less of an issue in MME adoption over time, and that perhaps the same will happen with recreational marijuana. Regardless, further investigation could be conducted in order to find the similarities and differences in these policies.

Incrementalism in RME adoption. In considering the applicability of the concept of incrementalism to RME implementation, results found a strong connection. In this case, incrementalism appears to come in two distinct instances: those localities that allow the operation of MME (and are allowing the operation of RME at high rates), and those localities that have banned the operation of MME (that are banning the operation of RME at high rates). A significant determinant of whether or not local governments have decided to allow RME was their status on MME ($p < 0.05$).

Those localities that do allow the operation of MME have approved the operation of RME at rates considerably higher than those localities that have banned the operation of MME. In fact, of the ninety-three localities that have banned the operation of RME, 71% (66 respondents) have banned the operation of MME as well. Conversely, of the forty localities that allow the operation of MME, 70% (28) have permitted the operation of RME within their jurisdiction. As stated previously, the correlation between the adoption of MME and the decision to allow the operation of RME is statistically significant. This supports Hypothesis 2, which states that those localities that allow the operation of MME are more likely to permit the operation of RME than those localities that do not allow MME.

The finding that the allowance of MME and RME share a statistically significant relationship supports the idea that local governments in Colorado are working incrementally in regards to recreational marijuana. For those localities that do not permit MME, the allowance of RME would be a fairly radical policy shift. On the other hand, the policy shift dealt with by those localities that do allow MME is certainly of a lesser degree. The fact that fifty percent of RME permitting respondents cite ‘culture’ (e.g. the

policy won't change much; not a big deal to anyone) as a reason for allowance is certainly telling of the more relaxed attitude toward RME that that group possesses.

In considering the possible contributing factors and reasons for this incrementalism, relevant policy literature can be consulted. Administrators and decision makers often rely on incrementalism because incremental changes help administrators better monitor results and manage unpredictable outcomes (Lindblom, 1959).

Considering the unprecedented nature of marijuana legalization, it is no surprise that many localities in Colorado have taken a slower approach to changing their policies, with many opting to decline completely. For example, of those localities that have placed a moratorium on the issue (and answered this particular question), 80% cited wanting to take a 'wait and see' approach as a reason for their decision (see Appendix 1, Table A2).

The amount of organizational change is also considered to be a factor in successful implementation, and a factor in incrementalism (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975). Of the 70% respondents that reported having banned RME, 42.9% cited excessive enforcement costs and 21.4% cited excessive planning and implementation costs as reasons for having banned RME. While these numbers are not particularly high and do not appear to be heavily influential on the decision making process, they are legitimate concerns. For these localities, the organizational change needed to implement could be too radical, while localities that do permit MME are likely to have the resources and administrative infrastructure necessary to better accommodate the policy change.

The impact of IGR issues. IGR issues are some of the most discussed issues in reference to marijuana legalization in the U.S. The difference in federal stance and Colorado's stance on the legality of the drug have been at odds since the late 1990s, when

Colorado and a handful of other states legalized the use, sale, and distribution of medicinal marijuana for its citizens. While the medical marijuana industry has thrived in Colorado, raids on medical marijuana dispensaries have been a somewhat routine occurrence despite assurances from the federal government that their resources would be directed at other concerns (Yardley, 2011, May 7). Because these intergovernmental complications exist, inquiry into IGR and its influence in local RME decisions is natural.

Findings show that those localities that have permitted the operation of RME, and those that have banned the operation of RME, are concerned about possible enforcement actions by the federal government at fairly similar rates. Of the thirty-one localities that have permitted RME, 32.3% are concerned; though nearly half reported their local government had no concerns (48.4%). Of the eighty localities that have banned RME, 37.5% reported concern, and 38.8% reported no concern. As stated in the results section, this relationship was not found to be statistically significant.

This finding regarding concern rates of potential federal government intervention does not support Hypothesis 3, which postulated that those localities that have permitted RME are less concerned about potential federal government enforcement actions than those localities that have not permitted RME. This non-statistically significant finding is, however, interesting. Of both adopters and non-adopters, more respondents alleged they were not concerned about possible federal government enforcement than respondents that said they were concerned about this enforcement. Results indicate that adopters are concerned with possible enforcement but are allowing the operation of RME despite these concerns. Additionally, considering so many RME adopters are also MME adopters, it is not surprising that some of these localities would be concerned; as the

Federal Government has a history of intervening in the medical marijuana industry (Yardley, 2011).

However, considering the significance and prevalence of discussions about intergovernmental issues, it would be useful to further examine why more local governments are not concerned about potential federal government interaction. An additional angle for study would be to question whether those implementors at the state level are concerned at higher rates than those at the local level. While these issues can affect local governments, this IGR issue is generally seen as a conflict between the Federal Government and state governments, rather than a conflict between the Federal Government and local governments.

Implementing RME. As stated previously, of the 133 survey respondents, only 30 reported having permitted the operation of RME. In examining the implementation aspects, relevant questions were posed to localities that have permitted the operation of RME. Respondents were asked about the departments that have been/will be involved in the planning process. All of the eleven departments listed in the survey were chosen by at least one respondent. Similarly, respondents were asked about the departments that have been/will be involved in the enforcement process. Here, ten of the eleven listed departments were chosen by at least one respondent. This shows the range of possible involvement by different local government departments. As discussed previously in the literature review, this level of involvement could be considered either a benefit or a hindrance. On the one hand, the participation of various departments means more experts in their respective fields are involved, and more compromise is undoubtedly involved

(Browning et al., 1980). However, implementation of new policies can be hindered by an increasing number of involved parties (Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1979).

Another aspect of the implementation process that is worth noting is the economic considerations. Of the thirty respondents who answered the implementation questions, only 23.3% ended up answering questions regarding their budget. When asked if any local departments had requested additional funds or staffing in order to accommodate the changing policy, only seven respondents answered favorably. Considering the degree of involvement of local departments, the request of additional resources seems somewhat low. However, nearly half of localities (46.7%) either have issued a local tax, or plan to issue local tax on the sale of marijuana. It is possible that these localities plan on using tax income in order to support any additional workload, and that other localities plan on simply re-allocating funds in order to suit their needs.

42.9% of respondents who have banned RME cited enforcement costs as reasons for having banned RME. The percentage that cited excessive regulatory burdens and ‘planning and implementation’ costs were somewhat low at 21.6% and 18.4%, respectively. The lack of concern regarding economic issues appears to apply in many cases. Those localities that have banned the operation of RME did not cite economic issues as high on their list of reasons, and so far those localities that have permitted RME have not required economic reinforcements for planning and enforcement. These observations are surprising, considering economic impact has been a major argument for legalizing marijuana. Results regarding the fiscal impacts indicate that the economic costs are not necessarily a determinant in banning, but rather an added benefit of permitting the operation of RME.

Implications for future research

Firstly, while this study did provide a good baseline for understanding the processes involved in adopting and implementing RME in Colorado, the scope of the study was limited. Looking at the issue from a case study perspective could be thoroughly beneficial for future research, and could provide much needed detail and insight that more focused studies cannot provide. The potential for further insight into the issue is improved should both Colorado and Washington be studied from case study perspectives. As the states' policies have taken different paths, it would be informative to study the efficacy of the different approaches.

Secondly, future research should focus on a broader array of contributing factors. Just as policy implementation should not be viewed in isolation from the overall policy cycle, the policy cycle should not be viewed in isolation from external influences, such as “other policy fields [and] external economic developments” (Puelzl & Treib, 2007, p. 97). A state or local government's culture and economic climate will influence the success of any policy. Research that accounts for these kinds of external influences could help explain individualized contributing factors and reinforce the idea that, despite any amount of planning, unexpected results will occur (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1979). While any research done on Colorado and Washington will be beneficial to gaining insight on the issue as a whole, it is important to recognize the cultural and economic differences between different states and different local governments—and what works in one place, may not work in another.

Ultimately, while this study provides a good idea of the adoption and implementation of RME by Colorado local governments at this point in time, the issue is

still rather new and is still evolving. In order to get a better refined grasp of the situation, it will be necessary to conduct research at a later date. The benefit of added time is three-fold: we can learn more about the decision making process as more and more localities address the issue; we can gain more knowledge about the implementation process as localities continue to carry out their chosen policy directives; and we will be able to see and potentially assess the effects of the policy.

Limitations

While there are many benefits to using close-ended questions in a survey, limitations exist regardless of how well the survey is constructed. Three drawbacks to using close-ended questions are: they may be frustrating to survey participants if their desired answer is not a choice, poor question wording can influence participants' answer choice, and the chance of participants choosing an unintended response is higher. Researchers also lack the ability to reason the decision-making of the participants when using close-ended questions, making it impossible to distinguish between respondent answers (i.e. the same answer may mean different things to different people). Perhaps most relevant to this particular study is the fact that close-ended questions may make participants give rather simplistic answers to questions about such a complex issue. However, while conducting in-person or phone interviews may have allowed for a deeper and clearer insight into respondents' opinions, the number of respondents would have been significantly lower and less diverse than using the survey method.

Limitations also exist in some classification methods of the key variables (political party, urban/rural, and population). For example, information for the 'political party' classification was limited. As stated previously, this classification was based off

voter registration information provided by the Colorado Secretary of State's office. The information provided, however, covered only voter registration by county. It is entirely possible that respondents' voter registration does not align with their county's overall numbers.

Despite these limitations, respondent information was classified and handled as accurately as possible, and still provides useful and relevant information. This data still serves as a useful baseline for describing how the adoption and implementation processes have evolved, and the contributing factors behind them.

Conclusion

The legalization of marijuana in Colorado and Washington was a radical shift in drug policy in the US. These states have the opportunity to create political precedence by creating and implementing a policy framework with which to regulate the now legal cultivation, distribution, and use of marijuana. If creating these frameworks and policies without similar models to duplicate was not enough, the existence of intergovernmental issues adds another layer of complexity. While local governments cannot prevent their citizens from using the drug, they can decide whether or not they will allow the operation of RME within their jurisdiction.

This local option has given, and will continue to give, insight into the policy adoption and implementation processes. This thesis attempted to gain a deeper understanding of the adoption of RME at the local level, and the associated barriers to implementation. In order to do so, a survey of city and county managers and administrators across Colorado was conducted. The survey acted as a 'status check' of where localities are in the decision making process and sought to gain information about

the implementation process thus far. Existing public policy implementation literature was used as a foundation for the survey questions.

The results of the survey indicated that while most respondents have made a decision regarding the operation of RME, a majority have placed a ban. Further analysis indicated that those local governments that have smaller populations and are classified as rural and Republican are more likely to have banned RME. Those localities that do not allow the operation of MME are likely to have banned the operation of RME, and vice versa—those localities that do allow the operation of MME are more likely to allow the operation of RME. This indicates that these local governments are working incrementally in changing their marijuana policies, as localities that already allow the operation of MME have permitted the allowance of the operation of RME at significantly higher rates than those localities that do not allow the operation of MME. In regards to the implementation process, it appears many different departments will be involved in the planning and enforcement processes, and a general lack of concern regarding fiscal issues exists. Additionally, there seems to be a fairly low degree of concern regarding potential federal government enforcement actions among local governments.

In an attempt to gain a deeper understanding of the adoption and implementation processes of RME at the local level in Colorado, this study used existing public policy literature and a survey of Colorado public officials. It is hoped that this analysis will provide a basis for further examination and investigation of the implementation processes of marijuana legalization and RME adoption in Colorado.

Reference List

- Agranoff, R., & Lindsay, V. A. (1983). Intergovernmental management: Perspectives from human services problem solving at the local level. *Public Administration Review*, 43(3), 227-237.
- Altman, A. (2014, June 6). Colorado's new pot banking law won't solve cash problems. *Time Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/2839059/colorados-new-pot-banking-law-wont-solve-cash-problems/>
- Barcott, B. (2013, June 25). How to invest in dope. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/30/magazine/how-to-succeed-in-the-legal-pot-business.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Block, W. (1993). Drug prohibition: A legal and economic analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12(9), 689-700.
- Bostwick, J. M. (2012). Blurred boundaries: The therapeutics and politics of medical marijuana. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 87(2), 172-186.
- Brady, D. (2013, August 29). Obama administration will not block state marijuana laws, if distribution is regulated. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/obama-administration-will-not-preempt-state-marijuana-laws--for-now/2013/08/29/b725bfd8-10bd-11e3-8cdd-bcdc09410972_story.html?wpisrc=al_comboPN
- Browning, R. P., Rogers Marshall, D., & Tabb, D. H. (1980). Implementation and political change: Sources of local variations in federal social programs. *Policy Studies Journal*, 8(4), 616-632.
- Caulkins, J. P., Kilmer, B., MacCoun, R. J., Pacula, R. L., & Reuter, P. (2012). Design considerations for legalizing cannabis: lessons inspired by analysis of California's Proposition 19. *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*, 107(5), 865-871. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2011.03561.x
- Chilea, D., & Chilea, A. A. (2011). A brief overview of drug control policy in the United States and its current challenges. *Juridical Current*, 14(3), 13-22.
- Clough, R. (2013, May 23). Pot dispensary economy forced into shadows as more banks refused to do business. *Huffington Post*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/24/pot-dispensary-economy_n_3326412.html

CO Const. Amend. LXIV

- Cole, J.M. (2013, August 29). *Memorandum for all United States attorneys* [Memorandum]. Washington DC: Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov/iso/opa/resources/3052013829132756857467.pdf>
- Controlled Substances Act of 1970, 21 U.S.C. § 812 (2013).
- Damrongplisit, K., Cheng, H., & Xueyab, Z. (2010). Decriminalization and marijuana smoking prevalence: Evidence from Australia. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 28(3), 344-356. doi: 10.1198/jbes.2009.06129
- Egan, D., & Miron, J. A. (2006). *The budgetary implications of marijuana prohibition*: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.prohibitioncosts.org/mironreport/>
- Emad, G., & Roth, W. M. (2009). Policy as boundary object: A new way to look at educational policy design and implementation. *Vocations and Learning*, 2(1), 19-35. doi: 10.1007/s12186-008-9015-0
- Ewalt, J. A. G., & Jennings, E. T., Jr. (2004). Administration, governance, and policy tools in welfare policy implementation. *Public Administration Review*, 64(4), 449-462.
- Grossman, A. (2014, February 14). Banks to be allowed to do business with marijuana dispensaries. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304434104579383150782034282>
- Ingraham, C. (2014, September 11). Colorado marijuana tax revenues surge as recreational sales surpass medical. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2014/09/11/colorado-marijuana-tax-revenues-surge-as-recreational-sales-surpass-medical-for-the-first-time/>
- Klein, K. J., & Sorra, J. S. (1996). The challenge of innovation implementation. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 1055-1080. doi: 10.2307/259164
- Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of muddling through. *Public Administration Review*, 19(2), 79-88. doi: 10.2307/973677
- May, J. V., & Wildavsky, A. B. (1978). *The policy cycle*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Moeller, K. (2012). Estimating drug policy expenditures: Direct costs of policing cannabis in Copenhagen 2000–2009. *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy*, 19(5), 379-386. doi: 10.3109/09687637.2012.658888

- Newport, F. (2012, December 10). Americans want federal gov't out of state marijuana laws. *Gallup*. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/159152/americans-federal-gov-state-marijuana-laws.aspx>
- NORML. (n.d.). States that have decriminalized. Retrieved from <http://norml.org/aboutmarijuana/item/states-that-have-decriminalized>
- Ogden, D.W. (2009, October 19). *Memorandum for selected United States attorneys* [Memorandum]. Washington DC: Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov/usao/az/reports/medical-marijuana.pdf>
- Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. B. (1979). *Implementation : How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland : Or, why it's amazing that federal programs work at all, this being a saga of the Economic Development Administration as told by two sympathetic observers who seek to build morals on a foundation of ruined hopes*. Berkeley : University of California Press.
- ProCon.Org. (2014). 23 legal medical marijuana states and DC: Laws, fees, and possession limits. Retrieved from <http://medicalmarijuana.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=000881>
- Puelzl, H., & Treib, O. (2007). Implementing public policy. Fischer, F., Miller, G., Sidney, M.S. *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods* (pp. 89-107). Boca Raton: CRC/Taylor & Francis.
- Reuband, K.-H. (1998). Drug policies and drug prevalence: The role of demand and supply. *European Journal on Criminal Policy & Research*, 6(3), 321-336.
- Sabatier, P., & Mazmanian, D. (1979). The conditions of effective implementation: A guide to accomplishing policy objectives. *Policy Analysis*, 5(4), 481-504.
- Smith, K. B., Greenblatt, A., & Mariani Vaughn, M. (2001). *Governing States and Localities*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Sullum, J. (2014, September 18). Marijuana money is still a pot of trouble for banks. *Forbes Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jacobsullum/2014/09/18/local-banks-terrified-by-friendly-neighborhood-marijuana-merchants/>
- Thies, C. F. (2012). The relationship between enforcement and the price of marijuana. *Journal of Private Enterprise*, 28(1), 79-90.
- Trusty, T., & Cerveny, L. K. (2012). The role of discretion in recreation decision-making by resource professionals in the USDA Forest Service. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 107, 114-123. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.04.021

- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2014). *World Drug Report 2014*. Vienna: United Nations publications. Retrieved from http://www.unodc.org/documents/wdr2014/World_Drug_Report_2014_web.pdf
- Van Horn, C. E., Jones, C. O., Van Meter, D. S., & Thomas, R. D. (1976). The implementation of intergovernmental policy. Jones, C.O., Thomas, R.D. *Public policy making in a Federal system* (pp.39-62). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445-448.
- Vekshin, A. (2013, June 10). Banks dread contact high from pot stores. *Bloomberg Businessweek*. Retrieved from <http://magsreview.com/bloomberg-businessweek-june-10-2013/5566-banks-dread-contact-high-from-pot-stores.html>.
- Williams, J. (2004). The effects of price and policy on marijuana use: What can be learned from the Australian experience? *Health Economics*, 13(2), 123-137.
- Yacoubian, G. S. (2007). Assessing the relationship between marijuana availability and marijuana use: a legal and sociological comparison between the United States and the Netherlands. *Journal of Alcohol & Drug Education*, 51(4), 17-34.
- Yardley, W. (2011, May 7). Medical marijuana crackdown confounds states that allow medical marijuana. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/08/us/08marijuana.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Young, Ernest A. (2005). Just blowing smoke? Politics, doctrine, and the federalist revival after Gonzales v Raich. *The Supreme Court Review*, 1(1), 1-50. doi: 10.1086/655193

Tables

Table 1

Local government position on RME, by political party

	<u>Democrat</u>	<u>Republican</u>	<u>Swing</u>	<u>Total</u>
Not permitted (Frequency)	12	51	17	80
Response Percentage	54.55	85	60.71	72.73
Permitted (Frequency)	10	9	11	30
Response Percentage	45.45	15	39.29	27.27
Total (Frequency)	22	60	28	110

chi2=10.2601, df=2, p<0.05

Table 2

Local government position on recreational marijuana based on locality population

	<u>Locality Population</u>						<u>Total</u>
	<u>Fewer than 1,000</u>	<u>1k-5k</u>	<u>5k-10k</u>	<u>10k-25k</u>	<u>25k-100k</u>	<u>More than 100k</u>	
Not permitted (Frequency)	30	20	9	13	5	3	80
Response Percentage	90.91	66.67	60	81.25	55.56	42.86	72.73
Permitted (Frequency)	3	10	6	3	4	4	30
Response Percentage	9.09	33.33	40	18.75	44.44	57.14	27.27
Total (Frequency)	33	30	15	16	9	7	110

fisher's exact=0.017, p<0.05

Table 3

Local government position on RME, by urban/rural classification

	<u>Rural</u>	<u>Urban Cluster</u>	<u>Urban Area</u>	<u>Total</u>
Not permitted (Frequency)	44	31	5	80
Response Percentage	84.62	65.96	45.45	72.73
Permitted (Frequency)	8	16	6	30
Response Percentage	15.38	34.04	54.55	27.27
Total (Frequency)	52	47	11	110

chi2=8.91, df=2, p<0.05

Table 4

Relationship between MME and RME

	<u>MME not permitted</u>	<u>MME permitted</u>	<u>Total</u>
RME not permitted (frequency)	76	4	80
Response Percentage	97.44	12.5	72.73
RME permitted (frequency)	2	28	30
Response Percentage	2.56	87.5	27.27
Total (frequency)	78	32	110

Fisher's exact=0.000

Table 5

Concern about federal government enforcement actions,
in localities that have permitted and banned RME

	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Total</u>
Banned	31	30	61
Permitted	15	9	24
Total	46	39	85

Chi2=0.943, df=1, pr=0.331

Table 6

Adoption status of MME and RME

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
<u>MME</u>	<u>(133)</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Permitted	40	30.1
Not permitted	93	69.9
<u>RME</u>		
Permitted	30	22.6
Not permitted	70	52.6
Moratorium placed	24	18
Haven't decided	9	6.8

Appendix 1

Table A1

Local government reasons for banning RME

	<u>Frequency (70)</u>	<u>Response Percentage</u>
Conflict with federal government laws	32	45.7
Economically detrimental	13	18.6
Enforcement costs too high	30	42.9
IGR Issues	8	11.4
Morality/Not good for community	44	62.8
Not enough data on issue	13	18.6
Planning and implementation costs too high	15	21.4
Public health issues	22	31.4
Public opinion	35	50
Public safety issues	33	47.1
Regulatory burdens excessive	13	18.6
Wait and see	14	20
Other	6	8.6
Not sure	2	2.9
Prefer not to answer	4	5.7

Table A2

Local government reasons for placing moratorium on RME

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u> <u>(10)</u>	<u>Response</u> <u>Percentage</u>
Conflict with federal government laws	6	60
Economically detrimental	0	0
Enforcement costs too high	4	40
IGR Issues	2	20
Morality/Not good for community	6	60

Table A3

Local government reasons for permitting RME

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u> <u>(30)</u>	<u>Response</u> <u>Percentage</u>
Culture (won't change much/not big deal)	15	50
Good for society/Progress	5	16.7
Public Opinion	28	93.3
Revenue generated by applications	7	23.3
Revenue generated by taxes	12	40
Revenue generate by other related	5	16.7

Table A4

Departments involved in the planning and enforcement of RME

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
<u>Planning</u>	<u>(31)</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Code Enforcement	16	51.6
Community Development	19	61.3
Finance	16	51.6
HR & RM	7	22.6
Labor & Employment	1	3.2
Law Enforcement	27	87.1
Licensing	19	61.3
MJ Enforcement Division	5	16.1
Public Health	6	19.3
Social Services	3	9.7
Zoning & Planning	27	87.1
Other	9	29
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
<u>Enforcement</u>	<u>(31)</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Code Enforcement	20	64.5
Community Development	5	16.1
Finance	5	16.1
HR & RM	1	3.2
Labor & Employment	0	0
Law Enforcement	25	80.6
Licensing	15	48.3
MJ Enforcement Division	7	22.6
Public Health	2	6.5
Social Services	0	0
Zoning & Planning	21	67.7

Table A5

Local government tax plans

<u>Tax plan</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Response</u>
	<u>(30)</u>	<u>percentage</u>
Have issued a local tax	6	20
Have not issued a local tax, but have plans to do so	8	26.7
Have not issued a local tax, no plans to do so	13	43.3
Not sure/Did not answer	3	10

Appendix 2

1. Does your local government currently permit any medical marijuana establishments?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Prefer not to answer

1A. Will these medical marijuana establishments automatically be permitted to sell recreational marijuana?

[radio

Yes=1

No=2

Not Sure=8

Prefer not to answer=9

2. Has your local government formally decided whether or not to approve the operation of recreational retail marijuana establishments?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Prefer not to answer

2A. Which of the following describe your local government's current status regarding recreational marijuana establishments? [Please mark all that apply.]

Have not yet discussed the issue

Ordinance has been introduced and is awaiting future readings

Ordinance has been introduced and rejected

Pending a citizen vote

Pending a council vote

Placed a moratorium on recreational marijuana establishments

Public hearings are planned, but have not been held

Public hearings have been held

Some work sessions/study sessions have been conducted

Other (please describe)

Not sure

Prefer not to answer

2A1. Describe other:

2B. Which of the following best describes your local government's current status regarding recreational marijuana establishments?

Permitted recreational marijuana establishments based on Council vote

Permitted recreational marijuana establishments based on citizen vote
Banned recreational marijuana establishments based on Council vote
Banned recreational marijuana establishments based on citizen vote
Placed a moratorium on recreational marijuana establishments
Not sure
Prefer not to answer

2C. Which of the following do you believe are reasons why recreational marijuana establishments were prohibited by your local government? [Please mark all that apply.]

Conflict with federal government laws
Economically detrimental
Enforcement costs are too high
Intergovernmental issues
Morality / Not good for community
Not enough data on the issue
Planning and implementation costs are too high
Public health issues
Public opinion
Public safety issues
Regulatory burdens are excessive
Want to wait and see what happens in the rest of the state
Other (please describe)
Not sure
Prefer not to answer

2C1. Describe other:

2D. Did your local government have specific concerns about possible enforcement actions by federal government agencies?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

2E. Which of the following are reasons why recreational marijuana establishments were permitted by your local government? [Please mark all that apply.]

Culture (e.g. the policy won't change much; not a big deal to anyone)
Good for society / progress
Public opinion
Revenues generated by applications for establishments
Revenues generated by taxes
Revenues generated by other related businesses (e.g. tourism)
Not sure

Prefer not to answer

3. Which of the following government departments and organizations have been or will be involved in the planning process related to recreational marijuana regulations in your local government? [Please mark all that apply.]

Code Enforcement
Community Development
Finance
Human Resources & Risk Management
Labor & Employment
Law Enforcement
Licensing
Marijuana Enforcement Division
Public Health
Social Services
Zoning & Planning
Other (please describe)
Not sure
Prefer not to answer

3A. Please describe:

4. Will any state-level government departments or organizations (i.e. Marijuana Enforcement Division) be involved in your local government's planning process related to recreational marijuana regulations?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

5. Which of the following government departments and organizations have been or will be involved in the enforcement of recreational marijuana regulations in your community? [Please mark all that apply.]

Code Enforcement
Community Development
Finance
Human Resources & Risk Management
Labor & Employment
Law Enforcement
Licensing
Marijuana Enforcement Division
Public Health
Social Services

Zoning & Planning
Other (please describe)
Not sure
Prefer not to answer

5A. Please describe:

6. Will any state-level government departments or organizations (i.e. Marijuana Enforcement Division) be involved in your local government's <u>enforcement</u> of recreational marijuana regulations?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7. Have one or more departments in your local government requested additional funds or staffing to facilitate the implementation of recreational marijuana regulations?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7A. Which of the following local government departments have requested additional funds or staffing to facilitate the implementation of recreational marijuana regulations? [Please mark all that apply.]

Code Enforcement
Community Development
Finance
Human Resources & Risk Management
Labor & Employment
Law Enforcement
Licensing
Marijuana Enforcement Division
Public Health
Social Services
Zoning & Planning
Other (please describe)
Not sure
Prefer not to answer

7A1. Please describe:

7B1. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Code Enforcement?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B2. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Code Community Development?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B3. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Finance?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B4. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Human Resources & Risk Management?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B5. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Labor & Employment?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B6. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Law Enforcement?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B7. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Licensing?

Yes
No

Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B8. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Marijuana Enforcement Division?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B9. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Public Health?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B10. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Social Services?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B11. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for Zoning & Planning?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

7B12. Were the additional funds or staffing budgeted for the "other" local government department?

Yes
No
Not Sure
Prefer not to answer

8. Does your local government have concerns about possible enforcement actions by federal government agencies?

Yes
No
Not Sure

Prefer not to answer

9. Has your local government issued a local tax on the sale of marijuana in addition to the 15% excise tax and 10% sales tax issued by the state?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Prefer not to answer

9A. Are there currently any plans/discussions to do so?

Yes

No

Not Sure

Prefer not to answer

9B. How much is that?

10. What is your gender?

Female

Male

Prefer not to answer

11. In what year were you born?

12. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

[

High school graduate/GED

Associate's Degree (2-year degree, community college)

Bachelor's Degree (4-year degree)

Master's Degree and/or Professional Degree (e.g. MBA)

Doctorate (PhD, EdD, JD)

Prefer not to answer

13. How many years have you served in government in any capacity (including your current position)? [If you have worked in government for less than one year, please enter zero.]

14. Which of the following best describes your current position?

City/Town Manager or Administrator

City/Town Mayor

City/Town Councilor

City/Town Clerk

County Manager or Administrator
County Commissioner
Other
Prefer not to answer

15. And, how many years have you been in your current position? [If you have been in your current position for less than one year, please enter zero.]