TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD TITLE PAGE

i

i

		TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD THEET AG			
Report No.	2. Government Access	ion No. 3. Re	cipient's Catalog No	•	
FAA-AM-73-12					
Title and Subtitle		5. R	5. Report Date		
		()	December 197		
	TONT NORPORT OF		erforming Organization	, Lode	
FLYING HIGH: THE AEROMEDICAL ASPECTS OF MARIJUANA			rforming Organization	Report No	
Author(s)			orforming Organization		
Mark F. Lewis, Ph.D., and		raro, Ph.D.	/ork Unit No.		
Performing Organization Name and Addre					
AA Civil Aeromedical Institute		11. 0	11. Contract or Grant No.		
<pre>?. O. Box 25082)klahoma City, Oklahoma 73125</pre>					
Alanoma Orty, Ontanoma / Sies		13. 1	13. Type of Report and Period Covered		
. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address	······································				
)ffice of Aviation Medicine			OAM Report		
ederal Aviation Administration					
300 Independence Avenue, S. W.		14. 5	ponsoring Agency Co	de	
Vashington, D. C. 20591					
- Supplementary Notes					
This research was conducted	d under Task N	o. AM-B-73-PSY-25.			
this rescared was concurrent					
. Abstract				posts of	
summary of the discussion	ons from the CA	MI Symposium on Ae	romedical As	pects of	
Marihuana is presented.					
ise and aviation, the expe					
effects of the drug. For					
period between marihuana	ise and work in	aviation, (2) no	radical chan	ges in	
AA policy towards marihu	ana use, and (3) additional resea	arch on aerom	edical	
aspects of marihuana.					
aspects of marindana.					
, Key Words		18. Distribution Statement			
larihuana		Availability is unlimited. Document may be released to the National Technical			
Aviation Medicine	licine be released to th			eld. Virginia	
Performance		Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151, for sale to the public.			
LETTOTIM HOC		ZZIJI, IOF Sale	co che public		
	20. Security Clas	if (of this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price	
. Security Classif. (of this report)	ZU. Security Clas	sin (or mis hage)	1		
Unclassified	Unclassi	fied	5	\$3.00	

m DOT F 1700.7 (8-69)

i E

· · · · · ·

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Mrs. Dorothy Gay who transcribed all of the Symposium discussion periods from tape recordings to typed copy for use in compiling this report.

l

1 . .

>

.

FLYING HIGH: THE AEROMEDICAL ASPECTS OF MARIHUANA

Introduction.

In June 1972, the Office of Aviation Medicine, AA, sponsored a Symposium on Aeromedical spects of Marihuana at the Civil Aeromedical stitute in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Most of e formal papers presented at that symposium e available elsewhere.¹ This paper summarizes aterial relevant to aviation medicine presented the formal papers or in the informal panel scussions. Much of the latter developed from estions submitted to the panel from representares of the aviation community.

. Legal Aspects.

Use of marihuana by an individual does not itself constitute grounds for denying an FAA edical certificate. Under the FAA medical gulations (Part 67), drug dependence (i.e., an ablished diagnosis of drug dependence) is disalifying for all classes of certification. A hisry of occasional, experimental use of marihuana not, of itself, disqualifying unless there has en a personality disorder that is severe enough have repeatedly manifested itself by overt acts. lditionally, a certificate may be denied by the deral Air Surgeon if he determines that a pernality disorder makes the applicant unable to rform safely the duties of an airman, or if the deral Air Surgeon finds that the disorder may isonably be expected to make the applicant able to perform those duties within two years ter the finding.

FAA regulations (Parts 61.15, 63.12, and .12) state that no person who is convicted of plating any Federal or State statute relating the growing, processing, manufacture, sale, sposition, possession, transportation, or importion of narcotic drugs, marihuana, and depresnt or stimulant drugs or substances is eligible r any certificate or rating . . . for a period of e year after the date of conviction. Addinally, FAA regulations (Part 91.12) hold that person may operate a civil aircraft within the United States with knowledge that narcotic drugs, marihuana, and depressant or stimulant drugs or substances as defined in Federal or State statutes are carried in the aircraft, unless that carriage is authorized by or under any Federal or State statute or by any Federal or State agency.

The Aeromedical Certification Branch of CAMI currently processes about 500,000 applications for medical certificates annually. The accompanying histories contain questions about the use of drugs. During the last three years, a small but significant number of applications (approximately 500 out of a total of about 1,000,000 in a two-year period) has been processed in which the applicant has admitted to previous use of marihuana. Such individuals have admitted to a crime, an admission that is carried in FAA records and that may prove potentially dangerous to those individuals in the future unless the confidentiality of individual records is protected. At the time of the symposium this issue had not been resolved.

One question frequently raised at the FAA's AME seminars is "Do you think in another five years or so we'll have an eight-hour rule for marihuana as we have for alcohol presently?" A similar question was posed to the panel: specifically, in the event that the private use of marihuana is decriminalized, as suggested by the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, what is the minimum interval which must elapse before the user may be permitted to engage in aviation-related activities? This question provoked considerable discussion about the difficulty in defining what for each individual may be different. Obviously, a safe limit would be one week, since all of the drug is metabolized and disposed of by the body in this time interval. Although periods of 8 to 12 hours were suggested the panel was unable to agree upon a reasonable minimum period based on current data. Taken orally, the drug is still active up to 12 hours. If a distinction is made based upon route of administration, the panel seemed to agree that safe minimum intervals would be: 8-12 hours, if inhaled; 12-20 hours, if ingested. The panel agreed that specification of a reasonable minimum period would be controversial at this time.

III. Military Experience.

Two papers discussed the impact of marihuana use on military aviation. Lt. Col. William H. Hark (U.S. Army) reported that a 1969 field survey of flight surgeons suggested that the use of marihuana occurred primarily among rear support units and rarely involved actual flying personnel. No evidence of maintenance impairment attributable to marihuana was found and no aircraft accidents were attributed to marihuana use among Army personnel.

Capt. Victor M. Holm (MC, USN) reported a paucity of data relating marihuana use to Naval aviation. Only a few cases were isolated and it was felt that the rigors of training and of operational tours act to deselect chronic marihuana users. While stressing the need for careful appraisal of individual cases, Capt. Holm concluded that there was no evidence to indicate that previous experimentation with marihuana should be grounds for disqualification.

IV. Acute Effects.

Generally, the acute effects of marihuana included disruption of both simple and complex performance tasks. One researcher² reported a biphasic phenomenon: at low doses, marihuana appeared to have excitatory effects, while at high doses the drug was a depressant. Both Ferraro² and Dornbush⁴ reported studies in which marihuana (or the principal active ingredient, Δ^9 -THC^{*}) produced decrements in short-term memory. Dornbush ascribed these memory decrements to disruptions produced by the drug during the encoding phase.

Moskowitz⁵ reported that marihuana produced deficits in peripheral signal detection, as well as very large effects on autokinesis. He obtained no effects on visual acuity, dark adaptation. or vertical phoria, but found a pronounced influence on lateral phoria, a result that may be relate to the autokinetic effects of the drug.

Hall⁶ described research that strongly sugges that the effects of marihuana may be augmentby conditions of hypoxia.

V. Chronic Effects.

A large part of the research reported at t symposium was concerned with the developme of tolerance to marihuana. Tolerance may defined as a return of a dependent variable baseline levels upon repeated administrations a constant drug dose following an initial chan in the baseline when the drug is first admi istered, or as the maintenance of a recover baseline (following initial disruption when t drug is first given) with increments in chroi drug dose.

There was general agreement that the effect of marihuana on simple behaviors demonstrate a rapid development of tolerance. McMill demonstrated that tolerance can develop to su an extent that changes in the lethality of t drug are observed.³ Nevertheless, some behavior are remarkably resistant to tolerance. Th Ferraro found that short-term memory remain disrupted during chronic administration Δ^{9} -THC.

Benjamin surveyed research concerning ma huana users and driving; although the evider did not indicate that marihuana use increas accident rates, there was evidence that drivi ability may be impaired by use of marihuana

VI. Some Myths.

The panel was most emphatic in debunki many of the myths that have been propagat about marihuana use. Thus, while there was disagreement about "flashback" experiences curring with other drugs (i.e., with some dru such as LSD, the users report experiences drug-like effects that occur some time well af the initial drug-produced experiences have \dot{c} appeared and, importantly, in the absence of : ditional drug taking), the panel agreed that "flashback" phenomenon was very unlikely marihuana. Indeed, it was suggested that ports of a "flashback" phenomenon by marihua users were probably due to the adulteration the "marihuana" purchased on the street. ports were cited of marihuana being adultera with LSD, mescaline, peyote, and various of

^{*} Although it is the principal active ingredient, Δ^{9} -THC is only one active ingredient found in the marihuana plant. Δ^{8} -THC, for example, is also psychoactive, but not to the same extent as Δ^{9} .

stances. Dornbush related that in a study in ece of very heavy hashish users the "flashk" phenomenon was never reported. Reports flashback may be due partly to learning. urmacologically, the flashback phenomenon sn't exist for marihuana.

mong the other myths refuted was the claim marihuana users tend to avoid alcohol. It pointed out that although early reports based surveys of older users suggested that the s did not drink while smoking marihuana, re recent data indicate that there is a rising rest in the combined use of alcohol and marina. The effects of such combined use have not a definitively elucidated.

nother question concerned marihuana's repuon for being an aphrodisiac. Ferraro cited orts from surveys of marihuana smokers in ch it was reported that they were less likely nitiate sexual activity while using marihuana, once sexual activity was initiated, enjoyment augmented. Ferraro attributed this latter ct to the overestimation of temporal intervals the drug produces; the man feels he's wonful during intercourse, because ten minutes a more like an hour.

s a final myth, some mention must be made he marihuana "high." Barratt was convinced : 50% of the people who say that they get 1 on marihuana never get physiologically They get a social high. Lewis⁸ has asn. ed that in the absence of evidence that marina use is self-sustaining, we must conclude ; marihuana use is sustained principally by social reinforcement provided by the milieu he "pot party" and that this social reinforceit may be sufficiently powerful to transform it may be an unpleasant or neutral drug effect an apparently pleasant stimulus condition; rather than being a primary reinforcer, marina is a conditioned reinforcer that derives power from the potent reinforcements proed by social interactions. Thus, the "social " is an individual's production of the external is of marihuana use to obtain social reinforceit in the absence of reinforcement provided by drug. Lewis⁸ explains the lassitude and thy of the heavy marihuana user⁷ as being, part, due to the acquired reinforcing power he drug, a power that is socially maintained pite wide fluctuations in the potency of the ilable drug supply.

VII. Marihuana and Civil Aviation.

The primary question asked of the panel concerned the need to develop rational aeromedical policies, in the event that the recommendations of the National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse to decriminalize the private use of marihuana may be made into law. For example, how much marihuana use is unsafe? The panel agreed that there was no rational method for defining safe use. For one thing, the casual marihuana user who makes purchases in the street cannot tell in advance what the THC content of the marihuana he buys will be and, in fact, a lot of it has been dipped in opium. One member of the panel suggested that use be defined in terms of the number of times an individual gets high, since most marihuana users titrate themselves in terms of smoking; i.e., they smoke until they are high and then stop. However, when pressed to define a high, this researcher could define the term only as the point at which the user stopped smoking, a definition that was, admittedly inadequate.

Earlier, we mentioned the lack of agreement about the minimum time that should elapse between marihuana use and work in aviation-related activities. While the panel was unable to suggest a definite number of hours, many members felt that something of the order of 12 to 16 hours would be appropriate.

Another question concerned the effects of marihuana on performance under emergency conditions. Citing studies of shock avoidance in animals, one researcher stated that since these behaviors seem to be fairly resistant to the effects of Δ^{9} -THC, very high doses had to be taken before performance deficits would occur. Other members of the panel felt that the behavior in question had to be more clearly defined before any generalizations could be made.

The panel was asked if pilots who volunteered to participate in controlled studies of the use of marihuana on flying proficiency, either in-flight or in simulated flight, should be grounded for the duration of the study and/or for any period thereafter. The panel generally agreed that there would be good reason for grounding participating pilots during the study. Since restrictions would have to be placed on these subjects, such as restricting their alcohol intake, grounding them would be advisable; and by observing them during the study and by making post-drug tests, the researcher could determine when it became safe for the pilot to be returned to flight status.

Finally, the panel was asked if the FAA should conduct research on the aeromedical aspects of marihuana. Here, there was complete agreement. All panel members felt that the academic community was not equipped to extend itself into this area of interest. Therefore, the FAA should perform the research required.

VIII. Recommendations of the Panel.

1. The panel would not recommend any rad changes in FAA policy with respect to m huana use, at the current time.

2. The panel suggested that a 12- to 16-l period between marihuana use and work in a tion activities would not be unreasonable.

3. The panel recommended that the FAA gage in research on aeromedical aspects of m huana.

Appendix I Members of the Symposium Panel

E. Barratt, Behavioral Science Laboratory, Department of Neurology and Psychiatry, The University of Texas, Galveston, Texas.

I

ł

Fred B. Benjamin, Research Institute, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

Rhea L. Dornbush, New York Medical College, Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospital, New York, N.Y.

Douglas P. Ferraro, Department of Psychology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Stanley D. Glick, Herbert M. Singer Laboratory of Neurosciences and Addictive Diseases, Beth Israel Medical Center, and Department of Pharmacology, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, New York, N.Y.

Peter Hall, Department of Physiology and Biophysics, Colorado State University, Greeley, Colorado. William H. Hark, Office of the Surgeon General, Army, Washington, D.C.

Victor M. Holm, Bureau of Medicine and Sur Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

D. E. McMillan, Department of Pharmacology, Scho Medicine, University of North Carolina, Chapel North Carolina.

Herbert Moskowitz, Departments of Engineering Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Psychology, California State Unive: Los Angeles, California.

Frank J. Sodetz, Department of Experimental Ps: logy, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, W ington, D.C.

Appendix II Relevant Bibliography

Abel, E. L.: Marihuana and Memory: Acquisition or Retrieval?, SCIENCE, 173: 1038-1040, 1971.

Caldwell, D. F., S. A. Myers, E. F. Domino, and P. E. Marriman: Auditory and Visual Threshold Effects of Marihuana in Man, PERCEPTUAL AND MOTOR SKILLS, 29: 755-759, 1969.

Clark, L. D., and E. N. Nakashima: Experimental Studies of Marihuana, AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHIA-TRY, 125: 379–384, 1968.

Crancer, A., J. M. Dille, J. C. Delay, J. E. Wallace, and M. D. Haykin: Comparison of the Effects of Marihuana and Simulated Driving Performance, SCIENCE, 164: 851-854, 1969.

Dornbush, R. L., M. Fink, and A. M. Freedman: Marihuana, Memory and Perception, AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY, 128: 194–197, 1971.

.

Jones, R. T.: Tetrahydrocannabinol and the Marih Induced Social "High," or the Effects of the Min Marihuana, ANNALS OF THE NEW YORK ACAD OF SCIENCES, 191: 155-165, 1971.

Kalant, H.: Marihuana and Simulated Dri SCIENCE, 166: 640, 1969.

Manno, J. E., G. E. Kiplinger, N. Scholz, and R. Fol The Influence of Alcohol and Marijuana on Motor Mental Performance, CLINICAL PHARMACOI AND THERAPEUTICS, 12: 202–211, 1971.

Melges, F. T., J. R. Tinklenberg, and L. Hollister: poral Disintegration and Depersonalization During : juana Intoxication, ARCHIVES OF GENERAL CHIATY, 23: 204-210, 1970.

Tinklenberg, J. R., F. T. Melges, L. E. Hollister. H. K. Gillespie: Marihuana and Immediate Mei NATURE, 226: 1171-1172, 1970.

REFERENCES

Lewis, M. F.: Current Research in Marijuana, New York, Academic Press, 1972, 219 pp.

¹erraro, D. P.: Effects of Δ° -Trans-Tetrahydrocannainol on Simple and Complex Learned Behavior in nimals, *Current Research in Marijuana*, New York, 1cademic Press, 1972, 49–95.

IcMillan, D. E., and W. L. Dewey: On the Mechanism f Tolerance to Δ^{9} -THC, Current Research in Mariuana, New York, Academic Press, 1972, 97-114.

Dornbush, R. L., G. Clare, A. Zaks, P. Crown, J. 'olavka, and M. Fink: 21-Day Administration of Mariuana in Male Volunteers, *Current Research in Mariuana*, New York, Academic Press, 1972, 115-128.

Ioskowitz, H., S. Sharma, and M. Schapero: A Comarison of the Effects of Marijuana and Alcohol on Visual Functions, Current Research in Marijuana, New York, Academic Press, 1972, 129–150.

- Hall, P., J. W. Fitch, V. J. Riegel, and J. B. Best: Effects of Altitude and Psychological Stress on the Response of the Rat to Cannibolic Compounds, *Current Research in Marijuana*, New York, Academic Press, 1972, 151-162.
- Barratt, E., W. Beaver, R. White, P. Blakeney, and P. Adams: The Effects of the Chronic Use of Marijuana on Sleep and Perceptual Motor Performance in Humans, *Current Research in Marijuana*, New York, Academic Press, 1972, 163-193.
- Lewis, M.: Marijuana Today: An Overview, Current Research in Marijuana, New York, Academic Press, 1972, 215-219.

÷

ł

ł

; ł I · · · · · · · ·