APPENDIX 6
False Alarms:
Arrest Decisions for Participants with BAC <.10%

Q-F-V Category	BAC	Nystagmus Score	Total Test Score
Heavy	.096	0	32
	.095	16	57
	.092	20	52
	.088	10	39
	.084	0	18
	.080	8	19
	.071	4	39
	.049	0	25
	.047	7	27
	.008	5	23
	.004	1	16
	.000	0	31
	.000	0	19
	.000	0	27
Moderate	.099	4	24
	.098	10	20
	.095	9	33
	.093	2	14
	.091	8	27
	.088	17	42
	.088	4	22
	.088	4	25
	.087	4	21
	.086	6	34
	.085	2	27
	.085	10	40
	.081	0	28
	.077	0	13
	.077	8	30
	.074	8	15
	.070	2	26
	.056	4	18
	.051	4	36
	.050	5	18
	.048	4	14
	.046	0	9
	.045	0	6

Light	.075	13	49
	.069	2	14
	.060	3	20
	.058	4	33
	.057	6	28
	.056	10	19
	.055	0	13
	.052	8	25
	.052	0	18
	.000	1	19

APPENDIX 7
Years of Service and DWI Arrest Experience of Officers Who Participated in Evaluation Study

Law Enforcement Agency	Officer's Yrs. of Service	Current Rate of DWI Arrests/Mo.	Total DWI Arrests
Santa Monica Police Dept. 2 Officers	2-1/2	10	110
	5	10	200
Calif. Highway Patrol 4 Officers	7	10	600
	2	10	180
	2-1/2	10	200
	10-1/2	10	400
Los Angeles Police Dept. 2 Officers	8	15	500
	3	0	150
Los Angeles County Sheriff 2 Deputies	7	30	2000+
	15	10	1000

APPENDIX 8

Summary of Stepwise Discriminant Analyses, BMDP7M

Classify participants as above/below .10% BAC

F to Enter/Remove	Variables Entered	Classification Matrix			% Correct	Classification Variables	Canonical Correlation
1.0	All test scores (without total score)		Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Tracing Walk-Turn Finger Count Nystagmus, Left Eye One-Leg Stand (Walk-Turn Removed)	.62978
		Below	156	17	90.2		
		Above	19	43	69.4		
			175	60	84.7		
2.0	All test scores (without total score)		Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Tracing Walk-Turn	.62278
		Below	152	21	87.9		
		Above	20	42	67.7		
			172	63	82.6		
2.0	Single tests: One-Leg Stand		Below	Above		One-Leg Stand	.39932
		Below	133	34	79.6		
		Above	22	40	64.5		
			155	74	75.5		
	Finger-Nose		Below	Above		Finger-Nose	.34414
		Below	127	41	75.6		
		Above	27	35	56.5		
			154	76	70.4		

F to Enter/Remove	Variables Entered		Below	Above	% Correct	Classification Variables	Canonical Correlation
(2.0)	Finger		Below	Above		Finger Count	.25049
	Count	Below	119	49	70.8		
		Above	27	36	57.1		
			146	85	67.1		
	Walk-Turn		Below	Above		Walk-Turn	.44165
		Below	135	32	80.8		
		Above	25	37	59.7		
			160	69	75.1		
	Tracing		Below	Above		Tracing	.40988
		Below	141	26	84.4		
		Above	28	35	55.6		
			169	61	76.5		
	Nystagmus-Left		Below	Above		Nystagmus-Left	.57470
		Below	151	17	89.9		
		Above	29	34	54.0		
			180	51	80.1		
	Nystagmus-Right		Below	Above		Nystagmus-Right	.59986
		Below	147	21	87.5		
		Above	19	44	69.8		
			166	65	82.7		

F to Enter/Remove	Variables Entered	Classification Matrix		% Correct	Classification Variables	Canonical Correlation
(2.0)	Nystagmus-Total	Below	Above		Nystagmus-Total	.60618
		Below	146	22	86.9	
		Above	20	43	68.3	
			166	65	81.8	
2.0	Test Subsets:	Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Tracing One-Leg Stand	.62232
	-One-Leg Stand	Below	153	20	88.4	
	-Finger-Nose	Above	21	41	66.1	
	-Tracing		174	61	82.6	
	-Total Nystagmus					
	-Finger-Nose	Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Tracing Walk-Turn	.62278
	-Tracing	Below	152	21	87.9	
	-Total Nystagmus	Above	20	42	67.7	
	-Walk-Turn		172	63	82.6	
	-Tracing	Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Tracing Walk-Turn	.62278
	-Total Nystagmus	Below	152	21	87.9	
	-Walk-Turn	Above	20	42	67.7	
	-Finger Count		172	63	82.6	

F to Enter/Remove	Variables Entered	Classification Matrix			% Correct	Classification Variables	Canonical Correlation
(2.0)	-Tracing		Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Tracing One-Leg Stand	.62232
	-Total Nystagmus	Below	153	20	88.4		
	-Finger Count	Above	21	41	66.1		
	-One-Leg Stand		174	61	82.6		
	-Tracing		Below	Above		Walk-Turn Tracing One-Leg Stand	.50848
	-Finger Count	Below	138	35	79.8		
	-One-Leg Stand	Above	19	43	69.4		
	-Finger-Nose		157	78	77.0		
	-Walk-Turn						
	-Walk-Turn		Below	Above		Total Score Tracing Walk-Turn	.50559
	-Finger-Nose	Below	140	33	80.9		
	-Finger Count	Above	19	43	69.4		
	-Tracing		159	76	77.9		
	-One-Leg Stand						
	-5-Score Total						
	-Walk-Turn		Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Total Score	.62394
	-Finger Count	Below	153	20	88.4		
	-Tracing	Above	20	42	67.7		
	-Total Nystagmus		173	62	83.0		
	-4-Score Total						

F to Enter/Remove	Variables Entered	Classification Matrix		% Correct	Classification Variables	Canonical Correlation
(2.0)	-Finger Count	Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Total Score	.62325
	-Tracing	Below	154	19	89.0		
	-Total Nystagmus	Above	18	44	71.0		
	-One-Leg Stand		172	63	84.3		
	-4-Score Total						
	-Tracing		Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Total Score	.61903
	-Total Nystagmus	Below	152	21	87.9		
	-Finger-Nose	Above	17	45	72.6		
	-Walk-Turn		169	66	83.8		
	-4-Score Total						
	-Tracing		Below	Above		Total Score Total Nystagmus	.61877
	-Total Nystagmus	Below	151	22	87.3		
	-Finger-Nose	Above	19	43	69.4		
	-One-Leg Stand		170	65	82.6		
	-4-Score Total						
	-One-Leg Stand		Below	Above		Total Nystagmus Total Score	.61722
	-Walk-Turn	Below	152	22	87.4		
	-Nystagmus	Above	18	44	71.0		
	-3-Score Total		170	66	83.0		

F to Enter/Remove	Variables Entered	Classification Matrix			% Correct	Classification Variables	Canonical Correlation
(2.0)	-Walk-Turn		Below	Above		Total Score Total Nystagmus	.61340
	-Total Nystagmus	Below	152	22	87.4		
	-2-Score	Above	17	45	72.6		
	Total		169	67	83.5		
	-One-Leg Stand		Below	Above		Total Score Total Nystagmus	.61236
	-Total Nystagmus	Below	152	22	87.4		
	-2-Score	Above	22	40	64.5		
	Total		174	62	81.4		
	Total Score (only) of:		Below	Above		Total Score	.60535
	-One-Leg Stand	Below	146	21	87.4		
	-Walk-Turn	Above	17	45	72.6		
	-Total Nystagmus		163	66	83.4		

Note N ≠ 238 because computer program excludes cases with extreme or missing values.

APPENDIX 9

STIMULUS PROGRAMMING SYSTEM (SPS)

<u>System Description</u>

The SPS is a versatile system for studying human control and information processing functions. It consists of four major subsystems:

(1) A control unit, including a punched paper tape reader and printer,

(2) A display unit,

(3) Subject response controls, and

(4) A tracking task generator.

The <u>control unit</u> is the heart of the system. It contains a microprocessor which is programmed to read experimental sequence instructions from a paper tape, execute the instructions, record response data, and print output data such as trial number, response accuracy, and response time.

The <u>display unit</u> presently contains three display systems:

(1) A tracking display located in the subject's central field of vision,

(2) Forty peripheral lamps located at the subject's eye level, and spaced every 5° from 15° to 100° visual angle, right and left, and

(3) Forty single-light numerical readouts which can be located in various arrangements in the visual field, typically 10 in each of four quadrants.

The <u>response controls</u> include:

(1) A tracking control lever which can either be a force stick or a displacement stick,

(2) A four-way switch to indicate the quadrant in which a target digit appears, and/or

(3) A push-button switch which can be used to indicate the occurrence of a target digit or a peripheral lamp signal.

The tracking task generator allows selection of a variety of tracking task configurations, including a choice of:

(1)   Pursuit or compensatory tracking display,

(2)   Position or rate control,

(3)   Forcing function bandwidth, and

(4)   Forcing function and display gains.

Two types of scores are displayed on digital readouts: (1) absolute error, and (2) absolute error squared. The tracking generator can be manually operated as a completely separate unit or can be controlled via the SPS control unit from punched tape commands. In the latter case, tracking error scores are also printed on the printer in addition to the discrete response data.

The experimental sequence instructions, which are punched in the paper tape, allow extremely flexible control over stimulus presentation. Typical applications of this system are described below.

Applications

The primary application of this system is to the study of division of attention, as related to task and stress variables. Task variables include central and peripheral task difficulty levels and the type of central and peripheral tasks (e.g., pursuit versus compensatory tracking; peripheral signal detection versus visual search and recognition).

A typical experimental configuration is the combination of a tracking task with a search and recognition task. While tracking, the subject must search a field of digits for a target digit. The digit field changes intermittently, i.e., one or more digits may change every few seconds. A target digit is presented at given intervals within the changing background field - the subject must search for and recognize the target digit and respond with the four-way switch to indicate the quadrant in which the target digit occurred. During the test session, cumulative tracking error scores are printed out at regular intervals and the time and accuracy of all responses, including false alarms and incorrect responses, are also printed out along with identification data.

Each type of task can be presented separately as well as in combination with the others to examine the effects of task loading and configuration on performance. If desired, the tracking task generator allows recording of appropriate analog signals for spectral analysis and human operator studies of control performance. Finally, facilities are available for incorporating eye movement

recording into the system, permitting study of the relationships among visual search behavior, division of attention task loading, and task complexity.

Applications to Driver Performance Studies

The driving task consists of several components, including visual search, visual signal detection and recognition, manual control and information processing. A critical aspect of the overall driving task is the integration of each component task into a well-organized sequence of actions in which an appropriate level of attention is directed toward each component.

As indicated previously, the SPS system allows component tasks important for driving (e.g., control, visual search, detection, recognition, information processing) to be studied separately or in combination. Thus, the driving situation can be abstracted and performance can be examined under well-controlled conditions. Relative difficulty levels of component tasks can be varied, and the differential effects of stress or other independent variables on specific aspects of driving performance can be studied.

Summary of Data for
Stimulus Programming System (SPS) Participants

	BAC Group		All SPS Participants
	$\leq .10\%$	$\geq .10\%$	
	n=71	n=26	N=97
	45 men	19 men	64 men
	26 women	7 women	33 women
Mean Age (years)	26.82	27.54	27.00
Mean BAC	.033%	.123%	.057%
Q-F-V Classification:			
Light	29	0	30
Moderate	30	10	40
Heavy	12	16	27
Mean Scores:			
SPS			
Track E^2	73.75	81.78	75.90
RT (secs.)	7.02	8.65	7.45
Response Errors	4.55	8.65	5.65
Σz (Tracing, RT, Errors)	-0.43	1.15	-0.11
Sobriety Test Battery			
One-Leg Stand	2.31	3.48	2.61
Finger-to-Nose	2.51	3.87	2.86
Finger Count	2.58	4.69	3.14
Walk & Turn	2.58	4.96	3.23
Tracing	3.23	5.08	3.79
Nystagmus - Left	.94	4.58	1.92
- Right	.77	4.12	1.67
- Total	1.71	8.70	3.59
Total Score:	14.92	30.78	19.22

ADDENDUM
COMPARISONS OF MALE AND FEMALE PARTICIPANTS: DRINKING PRACTICES, BAC, AND TEST SCORES

Questions of gender-related differences are important to interpretations of the evaluation study findings and to potential use of the recommended sobriety test battery. It seems to be rather widely believed that, compared to men, women are (1) poorer drivers, (2) more susceptible to alcohol effects, (3) less likely to be arrested by the police, and (4) more difficult to deal with when under the influence of alcohol. Whether or not any of these beliefs is based in fact, some police officers report being reluctant to confront the intoxicated woman, who has a reputation for being uncooperative, belligerent, and tearful. This reluctance could create a bias in arrest rates, as could impairment assessment problems associated with sex-related differences in drinking-and-driving habits and alcohol-related impairment of driving skills.

In recruiting participants for the evaluation study, the variables of foremost interest were drinking practices and history, and it was not feasible to additionally specify exact numbers of men and women. Consequently the actual gender distribution simply reflects the male: female ratio of applicants. The total of 238 participants was comprised of 168 (71%) men and 70 (29%) women. Thus, in comparison to roadside survey data (Wolfe, 1974) which show 84% men and 16% women, or to the Borkenstein accident data (1964) with 78% men and 22% women, there is an over-representation of women. However, note that the two cited studies sampled night-time drivers primarily, and thus are not representative of the total driving population.

As will be discussed in detail in the following pages, the evaluation study data do not reveal any significant or important differences as a function of gender. However, it is necessary to add the qualifying statement that there are characteristics of these data which render findings in this particular area somewhat equivocal. Specifically, there were important differences, as can be seen in the following tables (Table A-1 and Table A-2) and figures (Figure A-1), between male and female participants in drinking practices and therefore in alcohol treatment level and BAC.

For example, almost half the men were heavy drinkers. In contrast, only 13% of the women were in the heavy-drinker category. These differences, which complicate the male-female comparisons, can be compared to drinking-category distributions in the general population. Cahalan et al. (1969) reported data from a nation-wide study of drinking practices. If those data are truncated, excluding abstainers and infrequent drinkers, as was the case

TABLE A-1
CLASSIFICATIONS OF PARTICIPANTS BY
DRINKING CATEGORY

	Q-F-V Category	Number of Participants	Percent of Participants
Men	Light	33	20
	Moderate	54	32
	Heavy	81	48
Total:		168	100
Women	Light	29	41
	Moderate	32	46
	Heavy	9	13
Total:		70	100

TABLE A-2
BAC DISTRIBUTIONS, BY GENDER

BAC	Number		% of Gender Group		Proportion by Gender of each BAC Level	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
0	55	23	33	33	71	29
0><.05%	11	10	6.5	14	52	48
.05%≥<.10%	49	27	29	39	64	36
.10%≥<.15%	37	10	22	14	79	21
.15%≥<.20%	16	--	9.5	-	100	-
	168	70				
	(71%)	(29%)				

FIGURE A-1: Drinking Category and BAC Distributions

with the evaluation study, and combining light and moderate drinkers as in the national data, the two samples can be compared. It can be seen in Table A-3 that classifications of the women in the two samples are remarkably similar, but there are substantial differences for the men. The evaluation study participants included a higher proportion of heavy drinkers than were reported by Cahalan et al.

Table A-4 presents a summary of correlation coefficients for test scores correlated with BACs. All r values are significant at the .01 level (with the exception of Finger Count Test, Women). Although the coefficients are higher for the men's data than for the women's, the differences are not statistically significant. Since the size of a correlation coefficient is directly related to the range of the correlated measures, the higher r for men in this case can be largely attributed to a wider range of both BAC and test scores (men: BAC 0 - .19%, scores 0 - 64; women: BAC 0 - .15%, scores 0 - 49). The correlations do not provide any evidence of differential scoring by the officers.

Of considerably more interest are the scatter plots of Figure A-2 and Figure A-3. Linear regression analyses, as detailed in Table A-5, locate the total-test-criterion scores (for prediction of above or below .10% BAC) at 28 for the men and 29 for the women. Using these criterion scores 81% of the women are correctly classified and 84% of the men are correctly classified. As can be seen in Table A-6 the officers' arrest/don't arrest decisions were considerably less accurate, but they demonstrated no important gender-related biases in the laboratory setting.

It is concluded that in the context of the evaluation study the tests served equally well for men and women, and the officers appear to have followed the same procedures and criteria for both. However, field study is needed to determine whether real-world circumstances would alter these findings with regard to differences by sex.

TABLE A-3
DRINKING CLASSIFICATION COMPARISONS:
EVALUATION STUDY AND NATIONWIDE
DRINKING PRACTICES STUDY

| | Evaluation Study | | Cahalan et al. (1969) | |
	% of Men	% of Women	% of Men	% of Women
Light + Moderate	52	87	69	88
Heavy	48	13	31	12

TABLE A-4
CORRELATIONS: TEST SCORES - BAC

	Women n=70	Men n=168
One-Leg Stand,*	.469	.483
Finger-to-Nose	.419	.511
Finger Count	.190	.334
Walk-and-Turn*	.418	.590
Tracing	.393	.450
Alcohol Gaze Nystagmus*		
Left Eye	.549	.666
Right Eye	.507	.684
Both Eyes	.542	.698
Total Test Score	.618	.719

*Recommended Test Battery

All values of r sig. at .01 level with exception of non-sig. r for Women - Finger Count.

Equation: $y = a_1x + a_0$

Women		Men	
$a_0 = 8.70$		$a_0 = 8.87$	
$a_1 = 201.06$		$a_1 = 189.55$	
BAC	Score	BAC	Score
.025	13.73	.025	13.61
.05	18.75	.05	18.35
.075	23.78	.075	23.09
.10	28.81	.10	27.83
.15	38.86	.15	37.30
.20	48.91	.20	46.78

FIGURE A-2: Scatter Plot of Total Test Score/BAC for 70 Women

FIGURE A-3: Scatter Plot of Total Test Score/BAC for 168 Men

TABLE A-6
PERCENT CORRECT ARREST DECISIONS
BY MEN AND WOMEN

		%	
		Women	Men
Officers' Decisions:	Correct	77	76
	Incorrect	23	24
By Criterion Score:	Correct	81	84
	Incorrect	19	16

REFERENCES

Wolfe, A.C. Nationwide Roadside Survey 1973. HIT Bulletin, Vol. 4, No. 11, 1974.

Borkenstein, R.F., Crowther, R.F., Shumate, R.P., Ziel, W.B., and Aylman, R. (Dale, A., ed.). The role of the drinking driver in traffic accidents. Bloomington: Indiana University, Dept. of Police Administration, 1964.

Cahalan, D., Cisin, I.H, and Crossley, H., American Drinking Practices. New Brunswick: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969.

Delta-9-THC - The main psychoactive substance found in marijuana. AKA. delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol ($\Delta 9$-THC), dronabinol

11- Hydroxy-THC - The main psychoactive metabolite of THC formed in the body after marijuana consumption. AKA: Hydroxy THC, 11-Hydroxy-$\Delta 9$-tetrahydrocannabinol (11-Hydroxy-$\Delta 9$-THC), 11-OH-THC

Delta-9 + Hydroxy = Impairment

11- nor-9- Carboxy-THC - The main secondary metabolite of THC formed after marijuana is consumed. It is NOT active, but indicates historical use. AKA: THC-COOH (most often seen this way), Carboxy THC, 11-nor-9-carboxy-delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (11-nor-9-carboxy-$\Delta 9$-THC), 11-COOH-THC

Cannabinoids - Group of active compounds found in marijuana.
Cannabidiol (CBD) - Non-psychoactive (a/k/a not impairing) cannabinoid. Found in medical strains.
Cannabinol (CBN) - THC metabolite (10% as psychoactive as THC), which may show recent or heavy use.
Chronic vs. Occasional - Terms denoting frequency of use.
  Chronic - Continuing for a long time or recurring frequently.
  Occasional - Happening infrequently and irregularly.
Psychoactive or Active - Causes euphoric and impairing effects (THC and 11-OH-THC).
Not active or inactive - Does NOT cause euphoric or impairing effects (THC-COOH).

Compensation - Behavior that develops either consciously or unconsciously to offset a deficiency.
Critical Tracking - A set of tasks used to determine impairment in a clinical setting.
Epidemiological - Is the study and analysis of the patterns, causes, and effects of health and disease conditions in defined populations.
First-order Elimination Kinetics - Elimination of a constant fraction per time unit of the drug quantity present and is proportional to the drug concentration.
Lateral Control - Control of side- to-side or sideways movement.
Limit of Detection (LOD) - Lowest quantity of a drug that can be distinguished from the absence of that drug.
Limit of Quantitation (LOQ) - Lowest amount of a drug in a sample that can

be quantitatively determined.
Measurement of Uncertainty - Best estimate of how far a quantity might be from "true value." If two people measure one cup of flour, the amount will always be different even if it's not noticeable to the naked eye.

Metabolite - A chemical created in the body as part of the process of breaking down the parent compound (e.g. 11-OH-THC and THC-COOH).
Parent compound or parent drug - The drug in the original form that it is ingested (e.g. THC).
Per Se Law - Statutory assignment of a blood concentration above which is an offense to drive.

Permissible Inference - A legally specified fact that the fact finder may infer.
Pharmacokinetics - The movement of a drug into, through & out of the body - the time course of its absorption.
Plasma vs. Whole Blood
  Plasma - The colorless fluid part of blood, lymph, or milk, in which corpuscles or fat globules are suspended.
  Whole Blood - Blood drawn directly from the body from which none of the components (such as plasma or platelets) have been removed.
Titrate - Continuously measure & adjust the balance of [a substance].
Tolerance - The capacity of the body to endure or become less responsive to a substance.

INTERNET RESOURCES
www.wsp.wa.gov/breathtest/dredocs.php (NHTSA/IACP Manuals)
www.ndaajustice.org/ntlc_home.html (Nat'l Traffic Law Center)
www.nih.gov/research-training (Research)
www.decp.org (Int'l Drug Eval. & Classification Program)

Jennifer R. Knudsen
Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor
Colorado District Attorneys' Council
1580 Logan Street Suite 420
Denver, CO 80203
(303) 830-9115
Jenn@cdac.state.co.us

2/17 Edition

Cannabis Impairment Assessment

EYES

Conjunctiva Tissue (looks like pink eye in both eyes), **Lack of Convergence, Dilated Pupils, & No HGN** (when cannabis alone).

Indica: Produces a 'stoned' feeling. Physically & mentally relaxing. Centered on the body. Enhances sensations of taste, touch, & sound. Euphoria & relaxed inhibitions.
Sativa: Produces the 'high' feeling (energetic). Less overpowering than the Indica 'stone.' Less likely to produce drowsiness. High described as: cerebral, energetic, creative, giggly & or psychedelic.
Psycho-Physical Tests: Generally slow performance; muscle tremors, especially in legs & arms.
Information processing: Likely diminished. Impaired memory & comprehension. Jumbled thought formation & lack of concentration.

* **Smoked: Impairment Peak:** 0-30 mins
  High Experience: 1-3 hours
  Impairment may last up to 24 hours, without awareness effects.

  Oral/ Edible: Impairment Peak: 1-3 hours
  High Experience: 4-8 hours
  Residual effects depend on dose.

MUSCLES

Tremors Observed in extremities, upper torso, & eyelids (closed eyes).

ODOR

Smell Burnt marijuana, additive flavor for vaping, & maybe for edibles.

OBSERVATIONS

Likened to attention deficit disorder, cognitive impairment. Altered distance perception.
Modified Romberg: Distorted internal clock. Eyelid Tremors.
Mood Changes: Including panic & paranoia.
Mouth: Flecks of Green Vegetable Matter (GVM - marijuana) in teeth. Possible green or white coating on tongue.

IMPORTANT STUDIES TO KNOW

* National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, *Drug and Alcohol Crash Risk*. (Report No. DOT HS 812 117) Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office (2015). Often cited by defense- Virginia Beach Study

* Hartman, R.L., Huestis, M.A., et al., *Cannabis Effects on Driving Lateral Control With and Without Alcohol*. "MUST KNOW" Drug and Alcohol Dependence. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.06.015 (2015)

* Huestis, M.A., et al., *Estimating the Time of Last Cannabis Use from Plasma Δ⁹-Tetrahydrocannabinol and 11-nor-Carboxy-Δ⁹-Tetrahydrocannabinol Concentrations*. Clinical Chemistry, 51(12), 2289-2295, doi:10.1373/clinchem.2005.058838 (2005)

* Hiroven, J., Huestis, M.A., et al., *Reversible and Regionally Selective Downregulation of Brain Cannabinoid CB 1 Receptors in Chronic Daily Cannabis Smokers*. Molecular Psychiatry, 59(3), 642-649, doi:10.1038/mp.2011.82 (2012).

* Bosker, W., Hiroven, J., Huestis, M.A., Ramaekers, J.S., et al., *Psychomotor Function in Chronic Daily Cannabis Smokers During Sustained Abstinence*. PLoS ONE, 8(1), e53127, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0053127(2013)

* Hartman, R.L., Huestis, M.A., et al., *Effect of Blood Collection Time on Measured Δ⁹-Tetrahydrocannabinol Concentrations: Implications for Driving Interpretation and Drug Policy*. Clinical Chemistry, 62.2, 367-377. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2015.248492 (2016)

* Hartman, R.L., Huestis, M.A., et al., *Controlled Cannabis Vaporizer Administration: Blood and Plasma Cannabinoids With and Without Alcohol*, Clinical Chemistry, 61(6), 850-869. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2015.238287(2015)

* Bergamaschi, M., Hiroven, J., Huestis, M.A., et al., *Impact of Prolonged Cannabinoid Excretion in Chronic Daily Cannabis Smokers' Blood on Per Se Drugged Driving Laws*, Clinical Chemistry, 59(3), 519-526. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2012.195503 (2013)

* Desrosiers, N., Huestis, M.A., et al., *Phase I and II Cannabinoid Disposition in Blood and Plasma of Occasional and Frequent Smokers Following Controlled Smoked Cannabis*, Clinical Chemistry, 60(4), doi:10.1373/clinchem.2013.216507 (2014).

* DRUID, *Analytical Evaluation of Oral Fluid Screening Devices and Preceding Selection Procedures*, (Project No. TREN-05-FP6TR-S07.61320-518404) Finland (2010)

* Grotenhermen, F., Drummer, O.H., Ramaekers, J.G., et al., *Developing Limits for Driving Under Cannabis*, Addiction, 102, 1910-1917, doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2007.02009.x (2007)

* Grotenhermen, F., Ramaekers, J.G., et al., *Developing Science-Based Per Se Limits for Driving Under the Influence of Cannabis (DUIC): Findings and Recommendations by an Expert Panel*. DUIC Report (2005)

* Papafotiou, K., et al., *An Evaluation of the Sensitivity of the Standardized Field Sobriety Tests (SFSTs) to Detect Impairment Due to Marijuana Intoxication*, Psychopharmacology. 180, 107-114, doi:10.1007/s00213-004-2119-9 (2005)

* Hartman, R.L., & Huestis, M.A., *Cannabis Effects on Driving Skills*. Clinical Chemistry, 59(3), 478-492, http://dx.doi.org/10.1373/clinchem.2012.194381 (2013)

* Hartman, R.L., Huestis, M.A., et al., *Drug Recognition Expert (DRE) Examination Characteristics of Cannabis Impairment*, Accident Analysis & Prevention, 92, 219-229, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2016.04.012 (2016)

GET. BLOOD. FAST.

"The Cycle" created by Courtney Popp, WA TSRP

Review

Cannabis Effects on Driving Skills

Rebecca L. Hartman[1,2] and Marilyn A. Huestis[1*]

BACKGROUND: Cannabis is the most prevalent illicit drug identified in impaired drivers. The effects of cannabis on driving continue to be debated, making prosecution and legislation difficult. Historically, delays in sample collection, evaluating the inactive Δ^9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) metabolite 11-nor-9-carboxy-THC, and polydrug use have complicated epidemiologic evaluations of driver impairment after cannabis use.

CONTENT: We review and evaluate the current literature on cannabis' effects on driving, highlighting the epidemiologic and experimental data. Epidemiologic data show that the risk of involvement in a motor vehicle accident (MVA) increases approximately 2-fold after cannabis smoking. The adjusted risk of driver culpability also increases substantially, particularly with increased blood THC concentrations. Studies that have used urine as the biological matrix have not shown an association between cannabis and crash risk. Experimental data show that drivers attempt to compensate by driving more slowly after smoking cannabis, but control deteriorates with increasing task complexity. Cannabis smoking increases lane weaving and impaired cognitive function. Critical-tracking tests, reaction times, divided-attention tasks, and lane-position variability all show cannabis-induced impairment. Despite purported tolerance in frequent smokers, complex tasks still show impairment. Combining cannabis with alcohol enhances impairment, especially lane weaving.

SUMMARY: Differences in study designs frequently account for inconsistencies in results between studies. Participant-selection bias and confounding factors attenuate ostensible cannabis effects, but the association with MVA often retains significance. Evidence suggests recent smoking and/or blood THC concentrations 2–5 ng/mL are associated with substantial driving impairment, particularly in occasional smokers. Future cannabis-and-driving research should emphasize challenging tasks, such as divided attention, and include occasional and chronic daily cannabis smokers.
© 2012 American Association for Clinical Chemistry

Nearly two thirds of US trauma center admissions are due to motor vehicle accidents (MVAs),[3] with almost 60% of such patients testing positive for drugs or alcohol (1). In 2010, 11.4% of Americans 12 years or older drove under the influence of alcohol, and 10.6 million drove under the influence of illicit drugs (2). Despite real or perceived impairment, individuals report a willingness to drive if there is a good reason (3, 4) or if they believe they are tolerant (5). Alcohol and cannabis are the drugs most frequently detected (6).

Cannabis is the most widely consumed illicit substance worldwide (2). In 2009, 125–203 million individuals 15–64 years of age ingested cannabis in the previous year (7). In the US in 2010, 6.9% of individuals ≥12 years old had smoked cannabis in the previous month (2). The 2007 National Roadside Survey reported cannabis as the most common illicit drug quantified in drivers' blood or oral fluid (OF), with 8.6% of nighttime drivers testing positive for Δ^9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) (6, 8). Thus, driving under the influence of cannabis (DUIC) is a growing public health concern.

The acute psychological effects of cannabinoids include euphoria, dysphoria, sedation, and altered perception (9). The intensity of euphoria/dysphoria varies with dose, administration route, and vehicle; expectations of effects; and the cannabis smoker's environment and personality. Cannabis is associated with subjective physical discomfort and effort, as well as with lethargy (10). Acute cannabis intoxication produces dose-related impairment in cognitive and psychomotor functioning, and it can produce risk-taking behavior that can impair driving skills (11, 12). Dose refers to

[1] Chemistry and Drug Metabolism, Intramural Research Program, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health, Baltimore, MD; [2] Program in Toxicology, Graduate Program in Life Sciences, University of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD.
[*] Address correspondence to this author at: Chemistry and Drug Metabolism, Intramural Research Program, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health, 251 Bayview Blvd., Suite 200, Rm. 05A-721, Baltimore, MD 21224. Fax 443-740-2823; e-mail mhuestis@intra.nida.nih.gov.

[3] Nonstandard abbreviations: MVA, motor vehicle accident; OF, oral fluid; THC, Δ^9-tetrahydrocannabinol; DUIC, driving under the influence of cannabis; RT, reaction time; THCCOOH, 11-nor-9-carboxy-THC; OR, odds ratio; BAC, blood alcohol content; FARS, Fatality Analysis Reporting System; CTI, clinical test for impairment; CT, critical tracking; DAT, divided-attention task; SDLP, SD of lateral position; DWI, driving while intoxicated.

THC content in cannabis preparations in milligrams or micrograms per kilogram. Factors influencing dose include user experience, smoking topography, and cannabis THC concentration, all of which vary worldwide. Cannabis effects include alterations in reaction time (RT), perception, short-term memory, attention, motor skills, tracking, and skilled activities (13, 14).

Objective and Search Methods

This review presents relevant published data and evaluates current knowledge of cannabis' effects on driving. The electronic databases PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Embase were searched through February 20, 2012, for the key words "cannabis"; "marijuana"; "automobile driving"; "accidents, traffic"; and "motor vehicles." Additional articles were selected from references in identified sources.

DUIC: Epidemiologic Data

Early DUIC epidemiologic studies did not provide strong evidence of cannabis causality, because individuals with only nonpsychoactive 11-nor-9-carboxy-THC (THCCOOH) in the blood were included in cannabis-exposed groups (15). THCCOOH has a long window of detection in blood, well after the acute effects dissipate (16). In less-than-daily cannabis smokers, THCCOOH was detected up to 7 days after the smoking of 1 joint containing approximately 38 mg THC (cutoff, 0.5 ng/mL) (17). THC blood concentrations decrease rapidly after smoking (16, 18). Blood collection occurs about 90 min after arrest (19) and 3 to 4 h after an accident (20)—long enough that many samples have become cannabinoid negative, although the blood may have been positive at the time of the event. There also were few cannabis-only cases; multiple drugs with potential to contribute to impairment were usually found.

Cannabis smokers share demographic characteristics similar to those of other groups with a high crash risk, including youth (ages 18–25 years), male sex, risk taking, and high drunk-driving incidence (8, 20–23). Cannabis tolerance may develop in frequent smokers, with less impairment than for occasional smokers with similar THC concentrations (24). Statistically controlling for these potentially confounding variables sometimes makes results equivocal (25, 26).

Ten epidemiologic studies from 6 countries have investigated the relationship of MVA to cannabis intake (Tables 1 and 2). Various case control designs used self-reporting or objective biological measurements. Adjusting for confounders reduced the apparent effect sizes relative to crude values and sometimes caused a loss of statistical significance (21, 27–29). Six studies

evaluated relationships between cannabis exposure and MVA by self-report (Table 1; see Table 1 in the Data Supplement that accompanies the online version of this review at http://www.clinchem.org/content/vol59/issue3). Examining cannabis consumption rather than DUIC has generally produced nonsignificant or lower odds ratios (ORs) than targeting DUIC. More frequent cannabis exposure (addiction patients; more than once a week, >4 days/week) was associated with a significantly increased MVA risk (risk ratio, 1.49; OR, 2.76 and 2.5, respectively) (27, 30, 31). A crude 11.4 OR for MVA injury within 3 h of cannabis smoking dropped to a nonsignificant OR of 0.8 after adjusting for confounders (28), whereas DUIC after smoking during the previous hour almost doubled crash risk [ORs, 1.84 (21) and 2.61 (27)], a finding that withstood adjustment for demographic characteristics (21, 27) and self-reported driving under the influence of alcohol (21). Driving within 1 h after smoking produced higher MVA ORs than driving within 2 h (32). Of 3 case control studies that included objective cannabis measurement (Table 2), two studies used urine samples and found no significantly increased ORs (33, 34), findings that are consistent with cannabis' extended urine-detection window. In the third study, 204 driver fatalities (blood THC ≥0.6 ng/mL) were compared with randomly selected control drivers (OF THC ≥5 ng/mL) (29). The crude OR for fatality was 13.9 for cannabis-positive drivers, and that result retained significance (OR, 8.6) after adjusting for demographics, time period, and season. Too few cannabis-only cases had accrued by then to establish a significant adjusted OR for THC alone. Two recent metaanalyses, each of which evaluated data from 9 epidemiologic studies (2 in common), documented a significantly increased MVA risk [OR, 2.66 (35) and 1.92 (36)], even after controlling for confounding variables.

Studies that presented culpability risk associated with cannabis use are summarized in Table 3 (see Table 2 in the online Data Supplement for additional details). Increased blood THC concentrations were associated with a higher culpability OR. In 2004, Drummer et al. (15) demonstrated a statistically significant increase in the adjusted OR for crash responsibility (2.7) for drivers with any measurable blood THC relative to drug-free drivers. When the blood THC concentration was ≥5 ng/mL, the OR increased to 6.6, a culpability comparable to that of a 0.15% blood alcohol concentration (BAC). Among alcohol-negative drivers who were positive for cannabinoids, the 1.39 unadjusted OR was significant for having at least 1 driver-related factor, which is defined as a potentially unsafe behavior or action contributing to the collision, in 10 years of Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) data (22). After demographics and driving record were controlled,

Table 1. Self-reported risk of MVA while DUIC.

Location/country	Cases	Cases, n	Controls	Controls, n	CB[a] exposure time before driving	CB only	Parameter	OR or RR	95% CI or P value	Crude or adjusted (factors)	Reference
Atlantic Canada	10th- and 12th-grade students, DUIC	877	10th- and 12th-grade students, no CB	3178	≤1 h	—	MVA	4.14[b]	<0.001	C	Asbridge et al. (21)
Atlantic Canada	10th- and 12th-grade students, DUIC	877	10th- and 12th-grade students, no CB	3178	≤1 h	—	MVA	1.84[b]	<0.001	Demographics, DUIA	Asbridge et al. (21)
Ontario, Canada	Adults, drove within 1 h of CB intake in past year	70	Adult drivers	2606	≤1 h	—	MVA	3.89[b]	2.30–6.59	C	Mann et al. (27)
Ontario, Canada	Adults, drove within 1 h of CB intake in past year	70	Adult drivers	2606	≤1 h	—	MVA	2.61[b]	1.45–4.68	Demographics	Mann et al. (27)
Auckland, New Zealand	Drove within 3 h of CB intake	37	Did not drive within 3 h of CB intake	1102	≤3 h	—	MVA-I[c]	11.4[b]	3.6–35.4	C	Blows et al. (28)
Auckland, New Zealand	Drove within 3 h of CB intake	37	Did not drive within 3 h of CB intake	1102	≤3 h	—	MVA-I[c]	0.8[b]	0.2–3.3	Demographics, time of day, no. of passengers, risky behavior (BAC, speed, seatbelt use)	Blows et al. (28)
Spain	Regular cocaine users, driving within 1 h of CB intake	68	Same population, not driving within 1 h of CB intake[e]	68	≤1 h	—	NFDI, past year	7.0[d]	3.1–16	—	Pulido et al. (32)
Spain	Regular cocaine users, driving within 2 h of CB intake	68	Same population, not driving within 2 h of CB intake[e]	68	≤2 h	—	NFDI, past year	2.2[d]	1.0–4.9	—	Pulido et al. (32)
Spain	Regular cocaine users, driving within 1 h of CB intake	45	Same population, not driving within 1 h of CB intake[e]	45	≤1 h	CB only	NFDI, past year	5.8[d]	2.4–14	—	Pulido et al. (32)
Spain	Regular cocaine users, driving within 2 h of CB intake	45	Same population, not driving within 2 h of CB intake[e]	45	≤2 h	CB only	NFDI, past year	2.2[d]	0.9–5.2	—	Pulido et al. (32)
Spain	Regular cocaine users, driving within 1 h of CB intake and 2 h of alcohol	19	Same population, not DUID[e]	19	≤1 h	Plus alcohol in past 2 h	NFDI, past year	10.9[d]	1.3–88	—	Pulido et al. (32)

[a] CB, cannabis; RR, relative risk; C, crude; DUIA, driving under the influence of alcohol; MVA-I, MVA with injury; NFDI, nonfatal driver injury; DUID, driving under the influence of drugs.
[b] OR.
[c] Cars in MVA with ≥1 occupant hospitalized or killed.
[d] RR.
[e] Case-crossover design.

Table 2. Risk of MVA after analytical documentation of cannabis exposure.

Country	Drivers, N	Cases	Cases (THC+),[a] n	Controls	Controls (THC+), n	Analytical matrix	THC cutoff, ng/mL	CB Only	Parameter	OR	95% CI	Crude (C) or adjusted (factors)	Reference
The Netherlands	926	Injured drivers	110 (13)	Randomly selected drivers (roadside survey)	816 (49)	Urine and/or blood	Not given	—	MVA-DI	1.22	0.55–2.73	Demographics, drugs, time of day, season	Movig et al. (33)
Norway	10 744	Killed drivers	204 (<24)	Randomly selected drivers (roadside survey)	10 540 (≤53)	Blood (cases), OF (controls)	Blood, 0.6; OF, 5	—	MVA-DF	13.9	6.6–29.2	C	Gjerde et al. (29)
Norway	10 744	Killed drivers	204 (<24)	Randomly selected drivers (roadside survey)	10 540 (≤53)	Blood (cases), OF (controls)	Blood, 0.6; OF, 5	—	MVA-DF	8.6	3.9–19.3	Demographics, time period, season	Gjerde et al. (29)
Norway	10 744	Killed drivers	204 (<24)	Randomly selected drivers (roadside survey)	10 540 (≤53)	Blood (cases), OF (controls)	Blood, 0.6; OF, 5	CB only	MVA-DF	1.9	0.3–13.7	C	Gjerde et al. (29)
Norway	10 744	Killed drivers	204 (<24)	Randomly selected drivers (roadside survey)	10 540 (≤53)	Blood (cases), OF (controls)	Blood, 0.6; OF, 5	CB only	MVA-DF	0.9	0.1–7.3	Demographics, time period, season	Gjerde et al. (29)
Norway	10 608	Killed drivers in SVA	68 (<10)	Randomly selected drivers (roadside survey)	10 540 (≤53)	Blood (cases), OF (controls)	Blood, 0.6; OF, 5	No CB-only cases	SVA-DF	18.9	6.5–54.6	C	Gjerde et al. (29)
Norway	10 608	Killed drivers in SVA	68 (<10)	Randomly-selected drivers (roadside survey)	10540 (≤53)	Blood (cases); OF (controls)	Blood, 0.6; OF, 5	No CB-only cases	SVA-DF	9.0	2.7–30.3	Demographics, time period, season	Gjerde et al. (29)
Thailand	1049	Injured drivers[b]	200 (4)	Drivers with no traffic injury history in past 6 months	849 (20)	Urine	50	—	RTI	0.78	0.25–2.40	C	Woratanarat et al. (34)
Multiple	9 Studies	Metaanalysis: epidemiologic studies							MVA	2.66	2.07–3.41		Li et al. (35)
Multiple	9 Studies	Metaanalysis: epidemiologic studies							MVA	1.92	1.35–2.73		Asbridge et al. (36)
Multiple	3 Studies	Metaanalysis: case control studies							MVA	2.79	1.23–6.33		Asbridge et al. (36)
Multiple	6 Studies	Metaanalysis: culpability studies							MVA	1.65	1.11–2.46		Asbridge et al. (36)
Multiple	5 Studies	Metaanalysis: studies with fatal collisions							MVA	2.10	1.31–3.36		Asbridge et al. (36)
Multiple	4 Studies	Metaanalysis: studies with nonfatal collisions							MVA	1.74	0.88–3.46		Asbridge et al. (36)

[a] THC+, THC positive; CB, cannabis; C, crude; MVA-DI, MVA with driver injury; MVA-DF, MVA with driver fatality; SVA, single-vehicle accident; SVA-DF, SVA with DF; RTI, road traffic injury.
[b] Admitted to hospital within 24 h.

Table 3. Risk of driver culpability or responsibility in MVAs after cannabis exposure.[a]

Location/country	Cases	Controls	Cases, n	Controls, n	Analytical matrix	THC cutoff, ng/mL	CB[a] only	Parameter	OR	95% CI	Crude (C) or adjusted (factors)	Reference
Victoria, NSW, and WA, Australia	Fatally injured drivers, THC+	Fatally injured drivers, THC−	58	1704	Blood	Not given	CB only	MVA-DC	2.7	1.02–7.0	Demographics, crash type, BAC, year, year × crash type	Drummer et al. (15)
Victoria, NSW, and WA, Australia	Fatally injured drivers, THC ≥5 ng/mL	Fatally injured drivers, THC−	49	1704	Blood	5	CB only	MVA-DC	6.6	1.5–28	Demographics, crash type, BAC, year, year × crash type	Drummer et al. (15)
France	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC+ (1–2 ng/mL)	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC−	298	9013	Blood	1	—	MVA-DC	2.54	1.86–3.48	C	Laumon et al. (37)
France	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC+ (1–2 ng/mL)	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC−	298	9013	Blood	1	—	MVA-DC	1.54	1.09–2.18	Demographics, BAC, blood THC concentration, time of crash	Laumon et al. (37)
France	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC+ (≥5 ng/mL)	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC−	240	9013	Blood	5	—	MVA-DC	4.72	3.04–7.33	C	Laumon et al. (37)
France	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC+ (≥5 ng/mL)	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC−	240	9013	Blood	5	—	MVA-DC	2.12	1.32–3.38	Demographics, BAC, blood THC concentration, time of crash	Laumon et al. (37)
US	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC+	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC−	1647	30 896	Blood or urine	Not given	0% BAC	MVA-DRF	1.39	1.21–1.59	C	Bédard et al. (22)
US	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC+	Drivers in fatal crashes, THC−	1647	30 896	Blood or urine	Not given	0% BAC	MVA-DRF	1.29	1.11–1.50	Demographics, driving record	Bédard et al. (22)

[a] See Table B in the online Data Supplement for complete table further stratified by THC concentration.

[b] CB, cannabis; C, crude; NSW, New South Wales; WA, Western Australia; THC+, THC positive; THC−, THC negative; MVA-DC, MVA with driver judged culpable; MVA-DRF, MVA with ≥1 driver-related factor (potentially unsafe driving action) contributing to crash.

the OR remained significant (1.29). FARS drug test results are based on blood or urine; including urine data may contribute to low ORs, owing to the extended cannabinoid-detection windows. In France, drivers who had detectable blood THC concentrations and were involved in fatal crashes had a 3.17 OR for crash responsibility (1.7 OR after adjustment for demographics, BAC, THC concentration, and crash time) (37). The driver-responsibility OR increased with increasing blood THC concentration. Crude (adjusted) ORs were 2.18 (1.57), 2.54 (1.54), 3.78 (2.13), and 4.72 (2.12) for <1, 1–2, 3–4, and ≥5 ng/mL, respectively. Although relatively few studies have evaluated the relationship of driver responsibility and cannabis intoxication, an increased blood THC concentration was strongly associated with driver MVA culpability.

The debate on cannabis' effects on driving continues despite these findings, creating challenges for implementing effective drugged-driving policies (15, 37, 38). To date, 17 states and the District of Columbia have enacted medical marijuana laws (39). Colorado, which legalized medical marijuana in 2000, has seen increased numbers of DUIC cases and is considering a 5- ng/mL blood THC per se law. This proposal generated strong debate, despite the evidence showing increased culpability (40). In Drummer's 58 cannabis-only culpable MVA cases (15), the median blood THC concentration was 12 ng/mL, with 84% of the cases having THC concentrations ≥5 ng/mL. Increasing blood THC concentrations predict increasing driving impairment. The median blood THC concentration for 456 Norwegian suspected drugged drivers (1997–1999) with blood samples positive for cannabis only was 2.2 ng/mL (range 0.3–45.3 ng/mL) (24). The physician who performed the clinical test for impairment (CTI) judged 54% of the individuals as impaired. Grouping drivers by concentration range and adjusting for sex, needle marks, and self-reported regular cannabis consumption produced impairment ORs of 2.4, 2.5, and 3.2 for blood THC concentrations of 3.0–4.8, 4.9–10.1, and >10.2 ng/mL, respectively. Although some investigators have described a strong linear relationship between serum and OF THC concentrations, linear relationships between performance impairment and serum and OF concentrations are weak (41), and the results for interindividual variation show that it is inaccurate to predict plasma concentrations from OF concentrations (42).

In Australia, it is illegal to drive with any detectable blood THC (43). Police randomly test blood or OF for THC. In the first year of testing, median THC OF and blood concentrations were 81 ng/mL (range, 5–6484 ng/mL) and 6 ng/mL (range, 3–19 ng/mL), respectively (44). One year later, the median OF THC concentration was 66.5 ng/mL (median for blood, 6 ng/mL) (43).

Mean OF and blood concentrations were 274.3 and 7.6 ng/mL. In 2005, Switzerland imposed a punishable blood THC limit of 2.2 ng/mL (45). Of 1704 drivers confirmed to be THC positive (≥1.0 ng/mL), 1292 (76%) had THC concentrations >2.2 ng/mL. Mean, median, and maximum blood concentrations were 5.8, 3.8, and 62 ng/mL, respectively. In cannabis-only cases (57.7%), mean (8.1 ng/mL vs 5.9 ng/mL) and median (5.8 ng/mL vs 4.1 ng/mL) concentrations were significantly higher for single vs polydrug users, respectively. A 10-year study of driving under the influence of drugs in Sweden (8794 THC-positive cases) revealed mean and median blood THC concentrations of 2.1 ng/mL and 1.0 ng/mL, respectively (19). Drivers claiming regular cannabis consumption (177 of 456) were significantly less often (32% vs 55%) to be judged as impaired by CTI than occasional smokers, with no difference in the median blood THC concentration (24). A multiple regression model controlling for THC concentration revealed a 1.8 impairment OR for occasional vs regular cannabis smokers.

A 2007 international expert evaluation of epidemiologic and experimental evidence concluded that risk-based legal limits were unsupportable (38). The consensus proposal was a serum lower limit of 7–10 ng/mL, which was based on metaanalyses of experimental data, with a safety margin added for individual variability and laboratory error. In contrast, Jones et al. (19) advocated that zero tolerance based on THC limits of quantification is more pragmatic, because any nonzero science-based per se laws would allow many individuals to evade prosecution. The debate is complicated by the temporal dissociation of THC concentrations from acute driving impairment. Karschner et al. (46) recently reported THC concentrations (≥0.25 ng/mL) in whole blood and plasma samples obtained from chronic daily cannabis smokers monitored continuously for abstinence for >7 days. Recently Bosker et al. (47) documented psychomotor impairment in chronic daily cannabis smokers relative to matched occasional drug users with respect to validated driving-impairment indicators [critical tracking (CT) and divided attention] through 21–23 days of abstinence. Residual cognitive impairment (48) and withdrawal effects, such as sleep disruption (49), were reported after chronic cannabis smoking. These effects may impair driving performance.

DUIC: Experimental Data

Experimental studies of driving performance under the influence of cannabis are the most rigorous way to evaluate impairment causality. Tables 4 and 5 summarize the results of laboratory studies on cannabis-induced neurocognitive function and driving (simulator and

Table 4. Summarized effects of cannabis and alcohol on neurocognitive function: laboratory studies.

Task/outcome measure[a]	Cannabis intake history[b]	Studies showing THC impairment	Studies not showing THC impairment	Studies showing cannabis–alcohol interaction	Studies not showing cannabis–alcohol interaction
Free recall	NS	—	Chait et al. (56)	—	Chait et al. (56)
Time/distance perception	F	—	Weinstein et al. (62)	—	—
RT	NS	Chait et al. (56)	—	Chait et al. (56)	—
	O	Ramaekers et al. (5)	—	—	—
	F	Ramaekers et al. (5)	Ramaekers et al. (63)	—	Ramaekers et al. (63)
	NS	Ramaekers et al. (41)	—	—	—
Standing steadiness/equilibrium	NS	Liguori et al. (65)	Chait et al. (56)	—	Chait et al. (56), Liguori et al. (65)
Wisconsin Card Sorting Task	F	Weinstein et al. (62)	—	—	—
Digit–symbol substitution test	NS	Chait et al. (56)	—	—	Chait et al. (56)
Backward digit span	NS	—	Chait et al. (56)	—	—
Logical reasoning	NS	—	Chait et al. (56)	—	Chait et al. (56)
Gambling task[c]	F	Weinstein et al. (62)	—	—	—
Tower of London	O	—	Ramaekers et al. (5)	—	—
	F	—	Ramaekers et al. (5), Ramaekers et al. (63)	—	Ramaekers et al. (63)
	NS	Ramaekers et al. (41)	—	—	—
Virtual maze	F	Weinstein et al. (62)	—	—	—
CT task	O	Ramaekers et al. (5)	—	—	—
	F	—	Ramaekers et al. (5), Ramaekers et al. (63)	—	Ramaekers et al. (63)
	NS	Ramaekers et al. (41)	—	—	—
DAT	O	Ronen et al. (3), Ramaekers et al. (5)	—	Ronen et al. (3)	—
	F	Ronen et al. (63)	Ramaekers et al. (5)	Ramaekers et al. (63)	—
	NS	Chait et al. (56)	—	—	Chait et al. (56)

[a] See Tables C (cannabis only) and E (cannabis and alcohol) in the online Data Supplement for specific outcome measures, THC doses, study details, and results.
[b] NS (not specified) denotes history not given, or various (see Tables C and E in the online Data Supplement for specific cannabis history). F (frequent) denotes ≥3 times per week or ≥12 times per month. O (occasional) denotes <12 times per month.
[c] THC effect on the percentage of choosing less-likely outcomes.

Table 5. Summarized effects of cannabis and alcohol on simulated and on-road driving.

Outcome measure[a]	Cannabis intake history[b]	Simulator studies showing THC impairment	Simulator studies not showing THC impairment	On-road studies showing THC impairment	On-road studies not showing THC impairment	Studies showing cannabis-alcohol interaction	Studies not showing cannabis-alcohol interaction
RT	O	Ronen et al. (10), Rafaelsen et al. (64)	Anderson et al. (55)	—	—	—	—
	NS	Lenné et al. (53), Liguori et al. (57)	Liguori et al. (65)	—	Robbe (59)	Robbe (59), Ramaekers et al. (67)	Lenné et al. (53), Liguori et al. (65)
Headway maintenance	NS	Lenné et al. (53)	—	—	Robbe (59)	—	Lenné et al. (53), Robbe (59), Ramaekers et al. (67)
Headway variability	NS	Lenné et al. (53)	—	Robbe (59), Ramaekers et al. (67)	—	Robbe (59), Ramaekers et al. (67)	Lenné et al. (53)
Road tracking, SDLP	O	Ronen et al. (10)	Ronen et al. (3), Anderson et al. (55)	—	—	Ronen et al. (3)	—
	NS	Lenné et al. (53)	—	Robbe (59), Ramaekers et al. (67)	—	Robbe (59), Ramaekers et al. (67)	Lenné et al. (53)
Road tracking, Other	O	Ménétrey et al. (60)	—	—	—	—	—
Speed	NS	Papafotiou et al. (66)	Liguori et al. (57)	—	Robbe (59), Ramaekers et al. (67)	Robbe (59), Ramaekers et al. (67)	—
	O	Ronen et al. (3), Ronen et al. (10), Anderson et al. (55)	Liguori et al. (57)	—	—	Ronen et al. (3)	—
Speed variability	NS	Lenné et al. (53)	—	—	Robbe (59)	—	Lenné et al. (53)
	O	Ronen et al. (10), Rafaelsen et al. (64)	Ronen et al. (3), Anderson et al. (55)	—	—	—	Ronen et al. (3)
Divided attention	NS	Lenné et al. (53)	Liguori et al. (57)	—	Robbe (59)	—	Lenné et al. (53)
	O	Anderson et al. (55)	—	—	—	—	—
Visual search/processing speed/short-term memory	NS	Lenné et al. (53)	—	—	—	—	Lenné et al. (53)
	O	Ménétrey et al. (60)	—	—	Lamers et al. (4)	Lamers et al. (4)	—
Collisions[c]	O	Ronen et al. (3), Ronen et al. (10)	—	—	—	Ronen et al. (3)	—

[a] See Table D in the online Data Supplement for specific outcome measures, THC doses, study details, and results.
[b] O (occasional) denotes <12 times per month. NS (not specified) denotes history not given, or various (see Table D in the online Data Supplement for specific cannabis history).
[c] Collisions in the studies were too few for statistical analysis; data are reported as studywide number of collisions.

on-road). Study details—including THC dose, the participants' history of cannabis use, performance measures, and results—are presented in Tables 3 and 4 in the online Data Supplement. Past experimental studies often were inconclusive because outcome measures lacked sensitivity and had not been tailored to specific THC effects (50, 51). Cannabis drivers appeared to be aware of impairment and attempted to compensate by driving more slowly and taking fewer risks (4, 10, 52–55). Perceived driving effort increased under the influence of THC (4). Others reported that it was not possible to fully compensate because of a control cost (53). THC's impairing effects increase with task complexity, so a realistic driving task involves subtasks requiring simultaneous attention. Study participants performed worse (a) on divided-attention tasks (DATs) (≥2 subtasks performed simultaneously) (52, 53, 56); (b) during unexpected circumstances and choices; or (c) during long, monotonous drives. Cannabis-associated impairment may manifest as a failure to demonstrate expected practice effects, a result suggesting drivers lose some benefit afforded by prior experiences (55). An increased RT is among the most common cannabis-associated impairments (10, 12, 50, 53, 57, 58). Road tracking (maintaining the correct road position) is one of the most sensitive, dose-dependent measures (59). THC intake increases lane position variability (weave) or SD of lateral position (SDLP) (10, 53, 59, 60), as well as steering wheel variability (10, 53). A recent study demonstrated significant THC-induced cognitive performance decrements (immediate recall, attention, working memory, executive function) (61) in occasional smokers over a wide range of prior cannabis exposure (2–1000 lifetime episodes). One 3.95% THC cigarette produced a degree of body sway and brake latency similar to that observed for a 0.05% breath alcohol content (57).

Five controlled cannabis-administration studies examined smoked cannabis' effects on neurocognitive function (Table 4; see Table 3 in the online Data Supplement). THC doses of 13 mg and 17 mg did not produce time or distance perception effects in chronic daily cannabis smokers at approximately 1.25 h after smoking (62). Individuals who smoked cannabis one or more times per month underestimated 60- and 120-s intervals 1.25 h after smoking two 3.6% THC cigarettes (4 puffs/cigarette) administered 2 h apart (56). THC intake (13 and 17 mg) produced minor but significant dose-dependent impairment in a card-sorting task at approximately 0.75 h after smoking (62) and in a digit–symbol substitution test (56). At 1 hour after smoking, neither 13 mg nor 17 mg THC significantly affected decision-making speed in a gambling task (62), although the percentage of participants who chose least-likely outcomes was significantly higher af-

ter the higher dose than after ingesting placebo. RT in a Tower of London test (decision-making) after 400 and 500 µg/kg THC (approximately 28 mg and 35 mg, respectively) was not significantly affected in occasional (≤1 day/week) or frequent (>4 days/week) smokers (5, 63). The number of correct decisions in the Tower of London tests decreased significantly at 0.75–5.75 h after recreational smokers (≥5 times in the previous year) consumed 500 µg/kg THC (41), but frequent smokers (>4 days/week) were not significantly affected after 1 h (5). Complex tasks requiring multiple neurocognitive and/or neuromotor skills were particularly sensitive to THC's impairing effects and displayed less tolerance. In a virtual maze, ingestion of 17 mg THC significantly increased wall collisions (5.5) relative to the placebo (2.9), and 13 mg THC also increased wall collisions (3.2) (62). Significant CT performance decrements were observed in occasional smokers 0.25–5.25 h after they smoked 250 µg/kg (approximately 17.5 mg) THC (41) and at 0.17–7.08 h after they smoked 500 µg/kg (5, 41). In these experiments, THC did not significantly affect CT in frequent smokers (>4 days/week) (5, 63), but DATs (5, 56, 63) and RTs (stop-signal task) (5, 41) reflected impairment in both frequent and occasional smokers.

The results of simulator and on-road studies are briefly summarized in Table 5 and are fully characterized in Table 4 in the online Data Supplement. Driving-simulator studies offer greater face validity than laboratory studies for measuring effects of THC on driving effects and are less risky for participants. Simulators also allow measurement of specific performance decrements in ways unachievable in actual road-driving experiments. Nine simulator experiments were examined. RT, road tracking, speed, and speed SD were the most commonly measured outcomes. THC ingestion dose-dependently increased RT in 4 of 6 studies (10, 53, 55, 57, 64, 65). Low THC doses (13 and 17 mg) produced significant and dose-dependent increases in RT in a DAT (10), suggesting a particular sensitivity of a DAT to THC effects. Only 1 simulator experiment included headway maintenance (53). Smoked THC (19 and 38 mg) significantly and dose-dependently increased the headway mean and SD relative to placebo. The most sensitive road-tracking measure was SDLP, results of which revealed THC-associated impairment in 2 of 4 studies. Relatively low-dose (13 and 17 mg) smoked THC increased SDLP relative to placebo in occasional smokers (1–4 times per month) (10), and 19 mg and 38 mg also produced significant increases (4 cm and 7 cm, respectively) (53). No significant increases in SDLP were reported after 13 mg in occasional smokers (1–4 times per month) (3) or after 22.9 mg in smokers who smoked 1–10 times per month (55). Other monitored road-tracking outcomes were

the number of cones knocked over (57), the percentage of time in a lane (60), and "straddled line" variables (66). Significant THC-induced impairment was demonstrated 60–330 min (60) and 80 min (66) after 14–52 mg THC was smoked. At an earlier time point (30 min after smoking), results did not attain significance, but there were trends toward impairment in "straddling the solid line" (i.e., dividing different-direction lanes, $P = 0.09$) and "straddling the barrier line" (broken line dividing same-direction lanes, $P = 0.08$) (66).

The results of Standardized Field Sobriety Tests 55 and 105 min after smoking corresponded to those of 80-min simulator results in >65% of cases for 14- and 52-mg THC doses. Standardized Field Sobriety Tests classified several participants as "impaired" when driving performance suggested otherwise, but line straddling is a relatively insensitive impairment measure. Four of 5 studies detected compensatory decreases in mean speed after THC doses ≥13 mg (3, 10, 53, 55). When cannabis history was described, all participants were occasional smokers. No significant THC effect was observed (1.77% or 3.95% THC cigarettes) for participants who smoked at least weekly but not daily (57). Speed variability increased after THC smoking relative to placebo in 3 of 6 studies (10, 53, 64), suggesting that the drivers had less vehicular control. DATs were used in only 2 simulator studies. After smoking 22.9 mg THC, participants failed to demonstrate the practice effects that were observed with placebo on a paced auditory serial-addition test during an otherwise uneventful drive (55). During combined car-following and sign-detection tasks, smoking of 38 mg THC increased the headway mean and SD (53). In occasional smokers, 45.7 mg THC also decreased visual search and processing speed (60).

A series of on-road studies (4, 59, 67) conducted in the Netherlands evaluated the effects of smoked THC on actual driving performance (Table 5). In a 22-km road-tracking, closed-course test, 100, 200, and 300 μg/kg of smoked THC (approximately 7, 14, and 21 mg, respectively) increased SDLP relative to placebo with no significant differences in the speed mean or SD (4). The degree of SDLP impairment was the same at 40 min and 100 min after the start of smoking. In a highway experiment with an escalating dose (100, 200, and 300 μg/kg THC), 16 participants started driving 45 min after commencing smoking (59). The drive included a 16-km car-following task (approximately 15 min), a 64-km road-tracking task (approximately 50 min), and a second 16-km car-following task. THC smoking increased SDLP dose dependently: The lowest dose produced a slight and nonsignificant SDLP increase, the medium dose a significant but modest increase, and the highest dose a significant and substan-

tial increase. The mean headway in the car-following test increased 8, 6, and 2 m for the 100-, 200-, and 300-μg/kg doses, respectively. The authors suggested the inverse headway–dose relationship was a practice effect due to decreasing driver caution with increasing experience with the task, rather than pharmacodynamic tolerance. THC smoking (100 and 200 μg/kg) impaired driving performance on 40-km car-following and road-tracking tasks (67). Drives were conducted 30 and 75 min after smoking. The headway SD and SDLP increased significantly relative to placebo after each active dose (headway SD, by 2.9 and 3.8 m for 100 and 200 μg/kg, respectively; SDLP, by 2.7 and 3.5 cm). The participants' SDLP values were higher in the second drive than in the first. The final on-road study administered placebo or 100 μg/kg smoked THC at 25 min before a 45-min drive through a city (4). Performance was evaluated with the Driving Proficiency Test. Smoking THC had no significant effect on total score, vehicle checks, handling, action in traffic, traffic observation, or turning.

Combined Alcohol and Cannabis Intake

Cannabis and alcohol share some cognitive and psychomotor effects (10, 41, 68). Both are central nervous system depressants, and alcohol activates the cannabinoid CB1 receptor pathway (69); however, different effects on driving behavior were noted at the THC doses evaluated. Alcohol consumption led to faster driving (3), whereas the cannabis doses typically studied reduced driving speed. Alcohol inflates self-confidence, causing underestimation of impairment (10). In contrast, cannabis-influenced drivers occasionally appear more cautious in experimental settings.

Alcohol and cannabis are commonly identified together in MVA victims. DUIC is more common among people who also drive drunk (70). Among 322 MVA victims, 30% of the THC-positive individuals had been drinking alcohol also (1). A larger French case control study found that >40% of 681 THC-positive drivers involved in fatal crashes had BACs above the 0.05% legal limit (37). Over a 90-day period, 30.6% of 108 drivers admitted to the University of Maryland Medical Center Shock Trauma Center tested positive for alcohol (93.5% with BAC values ≥0.07%); one third of the drivers also tested positive for cannabis (urinalysis, 50 ng/mL cutoff; analyte not specified) (23). Alcohol was detected with THC in nearly 20% of Swiss cases in which the THC concentration in blood exceeded the 2.2- ng/mL legal limit (45).

Among 727 French drivers involved in fatal accidents with blood THC concentrations ≥1 ng/mL, 40% of the drivers also had an illegal BAC, ≥0.05% (20). Drunk driving (with or without cannabis) produced a

higher single-vehicle accident incidence (62%) than did DUIC (34%). Drivers whose blood contained only cannabis were 2.3 times more likely to be culpable than those without cannabis or alcohol. This responsibility index (the percentage responsible divided by the percentage not responsible) increased to 9.4 for those with only alcohol in their blood, and to 14.1 with both alcohol and cannabis. THC-positive drivers with BAC values ≥0.05% had a culpability OR 2.9, relative to those with a BAC ≥0.05% alone (15), implying that THC enhanced alcohol's impairing effects. In a case-controlled logistic regression analysis, patients in Ontario, Canada, who sought treatment for combined alcohol and cannabis abuse had a significantly higher likelihood of a prior conviction for driving while intoxicated (DWI) (OR, 3.65) relative to randomly chosen driver controls matched by age and sex (71). Cannabis-only patients were not significantly different from controls for DWI convictions, whereas alcohol-only patients had a prior DWI conviction OR of 5.19. DWI convictions were not necessarily concurrent with consumption of drug(s) for which the individuals were subsequently treated. A significant risk ratio of 5.8 for a driving-related injury within an hour after cannabis exposure (case-crossover self-report study) nearly doubled, to a 10.9 risk ratio for alcohol and cannabis combined (32).

Four studies included laboratory data on alcohol and cannabis interactions (Table 4; see Table 5 in the online Data Supplement). In a time-estimation task, two 3.6% THC cigarettes (4 puffs each, 2 h apart) yielded underestimated time targets (56). Alcohol consumption [0.6 g/kg (male) and 0.5 g/kg (female)] produced overestimations. In combination, these effects canceled each other. Two of 3 studies showed a cannabis–alcohol interaction on DATs, suggesting this test was a sensitive measure. In occasional smokers (once to 4 times per month), some THC (13 mg) or alcohol (target BAC, 0.05%) impairment effects occurred 15–75 min after smoking (3). Although each substance increased false-alarm responses, the greatest effect occurred in combination. Performance impairment and subjective effects were generally strongest after consuming both drugs. Frequent smokers (≥4 days/week) showed increased control losses after 400 μg/kg THC and 0.05% and 0.07% BACs (63). Combinations produced the greatest effects, although whether alcohol and THC produced additive or synergistic effects was unclear. The percentage of drivers judged as impaired increased with increasing blood THC concentration and BAC (72). When neither alcohol (blood cutoff, 0.001%) nor THC (blood limit of detection, 0.2 ng/mL) was detected, 14% of CTI observations showed impairment. Alcohol alone at BACs of 0.001%–0.05% (low) and >0.05% (high) was associated with 77% and

95% impairment, respectively. THC concentrations between 0.30 and 1.6 ng/mL were associated with 45%, 91%, and 97% impairment for 0, low, and high BACs, respectively. THC concentrations ≥1.6 ng/mL were associated with corresponding impairments of 53%, 93%, and 100%. These CTI data indicate progressive and increasing impairment with increasing alcohol and THC combinations.

One simulator study showed a cannabis–alcohol interaction (Table 5). In occasional smokers (once to 4 times per month), a 0.05% target BAC and 13 mg smoked THC increased the SDLP relative to either drug alone or placebo, which did not differ (3). Alcohol alone increased drive speed relative to that for THC; THC alone decreased speed. The combination produced a borderline-significant speed increase relative to THC alone. No significant effect was observed for the speed SD. Alcohol and THC consumption increased the total number of collisions (5 of 12) relative to either drug alone (2 of 12 and 3 of 12 for alcohol and THC, respectively).

The most straightforward cannabis–alcohol effect appeared in a study that administered 0, 100 μg/kg (approximately 7 mg), or 200 μg/kg (approximately 14 mg) THC and alcohol (target BACs, 0% or 0.04%) (Table 5) (59, 67). Alcohol plus the high THC dose increased the RT by 36%; this dosing condition was the only one that affected RT. Alcohol or the low THC dose alone slightly increased SDLP; the higher THC dose caused moderate impairment. Neither drug alone significantly increased the time out of lane. Combining either THC dose with alcohol severely increased SDLP and dose-dependently increased the time out of lane. Combining the 100- and 200-μg/kg doses with 0.04% BAC created a degree of impairment equivalent to that of 0.09% and 0.14% BAC, respectively. Visual search for traffic at intersections was significantly decreased by 3% relative to placebo for a 0.04% BAC and after consumption of 100 μg/kg THC, an effect not observed with either drug alone (4).

Although several studies have reported additive or synergistic cannabis–alcohol effects, some studies reported no interactions. The inconsistencies were likely due to differences in procedures, outcome measures, and cannabis history for the study populations. After combining moderate drug doses in occasional smokers, no interaction effect was observed on free word recall, digit–symbol substitution, logical reasoning (56), standing steadiness, or equilibrium (56, 65). Frequent smokers did not show a cannabis–alcohol interaction in a Tower of London task, a stop-signal task, or CT after smoking 400 μg/kg (approximately 28 mg) THC and ingesting 0.05% or 0.07% BAC (63). A 3.3% (approximately 30 mg) THC cigarette decreased equilibrium scores, and 0.5 g/kg alcohol increased brake

latency, with neither effect significantly altered with the combination (65). The authors speculated that the lack of interaction was an impairment-awareness artifact, coupled with the expectation of an "emergency." A recent 9-session simulator experiment that investigated 0, 19, and 38 mg THC and 0, 0.4, and 0.6 g/kg alcohol in all possible combinations demonstrated substantial impairment caused by THC alone (both active doses) (53). Both alcohol doses increased SDLP; the lower alcohol dose also increased the speed mean and SD. No interaction effects were observed, most likely because the alcohol doses were low. The mean achieved BACs were 0%, 0.02%, and 0.05% for placebo, low alcohol, and high alcohol conditions, respectively.

Preventing DUIC

One of the greatest challenges is dealing with public attitudes toward DUIC. One fourth (26.3%) of 320 drivers who smoked cannabis in the previous year indicated a >90% likelihood of future DUIC, even after having been shown data on increased crash risk (73). Only 7.5% reported they would be unlikely to drive (0%–10% likelihood). The majority indicated a >50% probability of future DUIC, even given the higher MVA risk. Regular smokers who had previously DUIC emphasized that publicity campaigns would not deter them from future DUIC (74). Past experience had convinced them that they could compensate for cannabis-associated performance decrements. Most believed cannabis caused minimal driving impairment; a few considered it to have no or even a positive effect on driving. A high likelihood of apprehension and punishment was a better deterrent. Given a hypothetical scenario with no chance of punishment, three quarters indicated a >50% chance for DUIC, and half indicated a >90% likelihood (73). In contrast, given a hypothetical scenario of a high degree of certainty of punishment, participants were significantly less willing to DUIC (OR, 0.2; $P < 0.001$). In a small study on DUIC attitudes, however, no one who reported having been stopped by police while DUIC indicated that they were deterred by this experience (none were charged) (74). Study findings suggested that random roadside testing (with arrest of those found cannabis positive) would be a better deterrent than advertising campaigns promoting the hazards of DUIC.

Conclusions/Discussion

Many epidemiology studies have involved selection bias. Some evaluated only specific populations, such as deceased drivers or those being treated for substance abuse or addiction. Case control studies are highly useful, but they may be biased by the selection of controls.

Case and control populations may come from different time periods or include different cannabis-detection cutoffs or matrices (e.g., blood analysis for killed drivers vs OF for living drivers). The accuracy of self-reported information varies, depending on the data-collection methods. Self-reported prevalence estimates are often underestimated, owing to the sensitivity of illicit drug-related information (27, 28). Even when objective measures of cannabis exposure were used, detection cutoffs were varied and not always reported. Urine testing has an extended cannabis-detection window and cannot establish a valid temporal association with crash risk.

Several studies have shown increased crash and culpability risks, even after adjusting for such confounders as age, sex, risky behaviors, and polypharmacy. Increased blood THC concentrations and driving within an hour after smoking were strongly associated with higher crash and culpability risks. Human laboratory-controlled drug-administration studies showed THC-induced driving-performance decrements within the first hour that lasted ≥2 h after smoking, results that are largely consistent with epidemiologic data. Laboratory-based impairment experiments identified DATs and executive-function tasks as the most sensitive to cannabis' effects. Investigations of actual driving performance have demonstrated dose-dependent THC impairment in road tracking, although only low to moderate THC doses were administered because of safety concerns. Simulator technology has improved since it was first used for impairment experiments, having progressed from rudimentary controls and a projected cyclorama (64) to full passenger cars, interactive screens with more complete fields of view, advanced driver monitoring via built-in cameras, realistic 3-dimensional audio output to enhance the simulated drive, and motion platforms that simulate physical driving sensations (10, 53, 55). Such advanced driving simulators are an ideal platform for future research because they combine realistic driving scenarios with highly controlled and measurable environments and provide a degree of safety not possible with on-road experiments. Driving simulators are particularly necessary when challenging drivers with difficult tasks (such as DATs and real-time decision-making processes) and when evaluating higher THC doses. Simulator studies from the last decade have demonstrated significant THC impairment of RT and the SDLP. THC smoking (22.9 and 38 mg) inhibited expected practice effects on DATs and produced deleterious performance effects, respectively (53, 55). Depending on the THC dose, driving speed may be reduced (3, 10, 53), particularly while multitasking (55), and headway may be increased (53). These results sug-

gest impairment awareness and compensation but do not preclude control decrements.

Inconsistencies in findings are likely due to differences in study design; the population and setting (simulator vs road); the sophistication of the equipment; the sensitivity and specificity of the tasks (including drive length); THC dosage; and time after smoking. Differences in driver compensation while under observation may contribute to the variability in results. Future work should focus on extended segments of monotonous driving (which draw drivers into a state of complacency or sleepiness) followed by sudden changes requiring reaction, realistic situations presenting decision dilemmas, and DATs. These constructs appear the most sensitive to THC's impairing influence.

Combining alcohol with THC exacerbated the observed effects, especially with respect to RT and SDLP. Low (100 μg/kg) and moderate (200 μg/kg) THC doses, combined with a 0.04% BAC produced road-tracking impairment to a degree similar to BACs of 0.09% and 0.14% (59). Because consuming alcohol and cannabis together is common, fully evaluating their combined impact on driving performance is essential. The use of clinically relevant THC and alcohol doses in future studies is necessary to generate findings that can better inform public policy. In previous research, the administration of low THC and alcohol doses often accounted for a lack of observed effects, at least in part. Cannabis smokers typically self-titrate doses, and alcohol drinkers consume enough alcohol to attain BACs $\geq$0.05%. Most self-administered cannabis and alcohol doses are higher than the doses administered in many research studies.

Tolerance to acute impairment is an important consideration for future research and policy debates. DAT and tracking tasks have demonstrated impairment in chronic cannabis smokers, but other parameters have not (5, 63). The debate regarding per se and zero-tolerance drugged-driving laws is a prominent issue. Increased blood THC concentrations are strongly associated with increased crash risk, but there is no direct correlation between driving impairment and THC concentration.

DUIC is an important public health and safety concern that requires the development of an evidence-based policy and legislation targeted at drugs and driving. Impaired driving endangers individuals inside and outside the vehicle. Consuming cannabis before driving, with or without alcohol, is a common occurrence that produces substantial morbidity and mortality on the roadway. Research is needed to further define cannabis' effects on driving performance and to provide the scientific basis for laws to improve road safety.

References

1. Walsh JM, Flegel R, Cangianelli LA, Atkins R, Soderstrom CA, Kerns TJ. Epidemiology of alcohol and other drug use among motor vehicle crash victims admitted to a trauma center. Traffic Inj Prev 2004;5:254–60.

2. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Results from the 2010 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: summary of national findings. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; 2011. http://www.samhsa.gov/data/nsduh/2k10nsduh/2k10results.htm (Accessed November 2012).

3. Ronen A, Chassidim HS, Gershon P, Parmet Y, Rabinovich A, Bar-Hamburger R, et al. The effect of alcohol, THC and their combination on perceived effects, willingness to drive and performance of driving and non-driving tasks. Accid Anal Prev 2010;42:1855–65.

4. Lamers CTJ, Ramaekers JG. Visual search and urban city driving under the influence of marijuana and alcohol. Hum Psychopharmacol 2001; 16:393–401.

5. Ramaekers J, Kauert G, Theunissen E, Toennes S, Moeller M. Neurocognitive performance during acute THC intoxication in heavy and occasional cannabis users. J Psychopharmacol 2009;23:266–77.

6. Compton R, Berning A. Results of the 2007 national roadside survey of alcohol and drug use by drivers. Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; 2009.

7. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). World drug report 2011. Vienna: UNODC; 2011. p 272. http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/WDR-2011.html (Accessed November 2012).

8. Lacey JH, Kelley-Baker T, Furr-Holden D, Voas RB, Romano E, Ramirez A, et al. 2007 National roadside survey of alcohol and drug use by drivers: drug results. Washington (DC): National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Office of Behavioral Safety Research; 2009.

9. Ashton CH. Adverse effects of cannabis and cannabinoids. Br J Anaesth 1999;83:637–49.

10. Ronen A, Gershon P, Drobiner H, Rabinovich A, Bar-Hamburger R, Mechoulam R, et al. Effects of THC on driving performance, physiological state and subjective feelings relative to alcohol. Accid