make this a model for a universal policy. Since Colorado does not provide a cap on the total amount of marijuana produced each year, it will likely result in surplus pot being illegally smuggled to other states; if there is too much marijuana flooding the system, retailers have to fight to keep costs down, which may cause them to cut corners on quality and safety measures (Gray 2013). Additionally, requiring the vertical integration of a business in order to obtain a license to sell may initially limit the number of businesses and therefore make it easier to control the market. Some like Aaron Smith, director of the National Cannabis Industry Association, argue that the policy allows the chance for industry monopolists to keep prices artificially high (Gray 2013). States with vertically integrated medical marijuana cultivation and dispensary operations often have the most restrictions on investors and carry the greatest risk of federal enforcement actions (Sankin 2013). Furthermore, Colorado's two-year residency requirement essentially prohibits out-of-state involvement in the growth and production of marijuana; this might stem a fear of competition from growers in other states (Gray 2013).

This is not to say that Colorado's program does not have potential benefits. Proponents say that taxing marijuana would bring about $100 million to state and local schools, despite El Paso County District Attorney Dan May arguing that not even $5 million of the projected $10 million has been collected from *medical* marijuana tax revenue and that it is burdening local taxpayers. Brian Vicente, co-director for the Amendment 64 campaign, says that by putting a loose framework of rights into the state constitution, it is helping to fix a broken system. The same thing was done 80 years ago with alcohol prohibition—a measure that arguably did not work, as it led to an underground market and the nation missed out on a lot of tax revenue. Additionally, Vicente rejects that legalization is making marijuana readily available to teens; he argues it is already available through the black market. Proponents believe that it would be harder to get marijuana from behind the counter where ID is required than on the street corners and alleyways (Burke 2013). These measures are a step in the right

direction, but more must be done to address the aforementioned deficiencies.

Colorado's marijuana law is gradually becoming more politically feasible in the eyes of the federal government, but not enough traction has been made. First, although the federal government is showing significant changes in its approach toward its prohibitive policy, its traditional stance on marijuana has been harsh. Second, the changing social climate is forcing the federal government to deal with enforcing its marijuana policy in ways different from the past, but marijuana policy reform is clearly in the early stages. Third, although significant discussion on marijuana tax reform is taking place, federal agencies like the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) are unlikely to change how they enforce marijuana tax policy without more action from Congress.

First, the federal government recently made a significant change in its approach to enforcing federal marijuana laws. Colorado's and Washington's legalization policies prompted the Department of Justice in August of 2013 to state that it will not sue to repeal the laws already legalizing pot in the states at this time (Southall and Healy 2013). Deputy Attorney General James Cole issued a memo to federal prosecutors detailing eight enforcement areas they should prioritize, which included keeping marijuana from those under the age of 21 and increasing the border patrol to limit its illegal trade (U.S. Department of Justice). Outside these areas, the federal government expects the states to implement "strong and effective regulatory systems" that will address the threats posed by state law to public safety. Colorado's regulations on marijuana attempts to address these threats to public safety where it bars those under 21 from its use and requires strict licensing of cultivators and producers (Colorado General Assembly).

With those at the top of the justice hierarchy—the President, Attorney General, and the chairman of the Senate Judiciary committee—agreeing that there are "bigger fish to fry," it is likely the policy will be given time to be implemented (Reilly and Grimm 2013). However, this does not end the debate