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LawAtlas is the central, authoritative place for systematically collecting, measuring and displaying laws.

LawAtlas is a tool designed to help policy-makers, advocates and researchers understand what the laws are on a given topic, know how the laws differ over time and across jurisdictions, and evaluate their impact.

Explore the Law
Access maps, tables and reports.

Choose a topic

Data
Download data, codebooks and protocols.

Go to Data page

Featured Datasets

Medical Marijuana Laws for Patients
The U.S. federal government has not endorsed the medical benefits of marijuana, and the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 makes marijuana use illegal on the federal level, classifying it as a Schedule I drug with no currently accepted medical use. Despite the federal ban on medical marijuana, this map explores the 21 jurisdictions that have passed laws explicitly legalizing medical marijuana use. Read more

Naloxone Overdose Prevention Laws
Unintentional drug overdose is now considered to be a leading cause of preventable death in the United States. Administering naloxone hydrochloride ("naloxone") can reverse an opioid overdose and prevent these unintentional deaths. Read more
Welcome to the Workbench

A Demonstration Dataset - Explore the Features of Workbench

This dataset is for demonstration purposes. The questions and laws have been taken from the Sports Concussion Laws dataset, which displays laws requiring removal from play, specifying return to play requirements, and requiring awareness raising programs. The completed dataset can be found on LawAtlas.org

Questions: 8
Tags: demo, LawAtlas

A Demonstration Dataset - how to add and edit questions

A dataset to illustrate how to add and edit questions in the workbench

Questions: 1
Tags: PHILR, training, demo dataset

Air Quality with Oil and Gas Development

This dataset examines air quality regulations pertaining to oil and gas development. The jurisdictions selected for measurements are Colorado, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming. These jurisdictions were chosen because each state is experiencing new or increased shale oil and shale gas development, and there is tremendous value in looking at other jurisdictions to guide statutory construction and rulemaking.

Questions: 42
Tags: air quality, oil, gas, development, NSPS Subpart OOOO, green completions

Anti-Bullying Laws

This is a cross-sectional dataset focused on anti-bullying laws across the U.S.

Questions: 28
Tags: TBD
Alaska Stat. § 12.65.155 Factors in aggravation and mitigation

(a) Except as provided in (e) of this section, if a defendant is convicted of an offense and is subject to sentencing under AS 12.65.125(c), (d), (e), or (i) and

(1) the low end of the presumptive range is four years or less, the court may impose any sentence below the presumptive range for factors in mitigation or may increase the active term of imprisonment up to the maximum term of imprisonment for factors in aggravation;

(2) the low end of the presumptive range is more than four years, the court may impose a sentence below the presumptive range as long as the active term of imprisonment is not less than 50 percent of the low end of the presumptive range.
Alaska Stat. § 12.55.155 Factors in aggravation and mitigation

(a) Except as provided in (e) of this section, if a defendant is convicted of an offense and is subject to sentencing under AS 12.55.125(c), (d), (e), or (i) and

(1) the low end of the presumptive range is four years or less, the court may impose any sentence below the presumptive range for factors in mitigation or may increase the active term of imprisonment up to the maximum term of imprisonment for factors in aggravation;

(2) the low end of the presumptive range is more than four years, the court may impose a sentence below the presumptive range as long as the active term of imprisonment is not less than 50 percent of the low end of the presumptive range for factors in mitigation or may increase the active term of imprisonment up to the maximum term of imprisonment for factors in aggravation.

(b) Sentences under this section that are outside of the presumptive ranges set out in AS 12.55.125 shall be based on the totality of the aggravating and mitigating factors set out in (c) and (d) of this section.

(c) The following factors shall be considered by the sentencing court if proven in accordance with this section, and may allow imposition of a sentence above the presumptive range set out in AS 12.55.125:

(1) a person, other than an accomplice, sustained physical injury as a direct result of the defendant’s conduct;

(2) the defendant’s conduct during the commission of the offense manifested deliberate cruelty to another person;

(3) the defendant was the leader of a group of three or more persons who participated in the offense;

(4) the defendant employed a dangerous instrument in furtherance of the offense;
Edit - Good Samaritan Overdose Prevention Laws

Does the jurisdiction have a drug overdose Good Samaritan Law?
- Yes
- No

What protection, if any, does the law provide from controlled substance possession laws?
- Arrest
- Charge
- Prosecution
- None

What protection, if any, does the law provide from alcohol-related crime laws?
- Arrest
- Charge
- Prosecution
- None

What protection, if any, does the law provide from drug paraphernalia laws?
- Arrest
- Charge
- Prosecution
- None

Source of Legal Text
- CA ST 11766.5

Legal Text

Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11766.5 Medical assistance exception to controlled substance or paraphernalia possession and related offenses; persons experiencing drug-related overdose; no exception to laws prohibiting sales, forcible administration, or liability for actions made dangerous by controlled substance use

(a) Notwithstanding any other law, it shall not be a crime for a person to be under the influence of, or to possess for personal use, a controlled substance, controlled substance analog, or drug paraphernalia, if that person, in good faith, seeks medical assistance for another person experiencing a drug-related overdose that is related to the possession of a controlled substance, controlled substance analog, or drug paraphernalia of the person seeking medical assistance, and that person does not obstruct medical or law enforcement personnel. No other immunities or protections from arrest or prosecution for violations of the law are intended or may be inferred.

(b) Notwithstanding any other law, it shall not be a crime for a person who experiences a drug-related overdose and who is in need of medical assistance to be under the influence of, or to possess for personal use, a controlled substance, controlled substance analog, or drug paraphernalia, the person or one or more other persons at the scene of the overdose, in good faith, seek medical assistance for the person experiencing the overdose. No other immunities or protections from arrest or prosecution for violations of the law are intended or may be inferred.

(c) This section shall not affect laws prohibiting the selling, providing, giving or exchanging of drugs, or laws prohibiting the forcible administration of drugs against a person’s will.

(d) Nothing in this section shall affect liability for any offense that involves activities made dangerous by the consumption of a controlled substance or controlled substance analog, including, but not limited to, violations of Section 23103 of the Vehicle Code as specified in Section 23103.5 of the Vehicle Code, or violations of Section 23152 or 23153 of the Vehicle Code.

(e) For the purposes of this section, “drug-related overdose” means an acute medical condition that is the result of the ingestion or use by an individual of one or more controlled substances or one or more controlled substances in combination with alcohol, in quantities that are excessive for that individual that may result in death, disability, or serious injury. An individual’s condition shall be deemed to be a “drug-related overdose” if a reasonable person of ordinary knowledge would believe the condition to be a drug-related overdose that may result in death, disability, or serious injury.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>FIPS Code</th>
<th>Begin Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>goodsam-codesname</th>
<th>goodsam-iteration</th>
<th>goodsam-law</th>
<th>goodsam cs Arrest</th>
<th>goodsam cs Change</th>
<th>goodsam cs Prosecution</th>
<th>goodsam cs_NONE</th>
<th>goodsam-alcohol Arrest</th>
<th>goodsam-alcohol Change</th>
<th>goodsam-alcohol Prosecution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/8/2008</td>
<td>6/30/2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/1/2008</td>
<td>9/30/2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>9/12/2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/13/2010</td>
<td>6/30/2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/19/2012</td>
<td>5/31/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/12/2012</td>
<td>9/18/2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1/2007</td>
<td>5/31/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/1/2007</td>
<td>5/31/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table continues with similar entries.
Codebooks & Protocols

LawAtlas
The Policy Surveillance Portal

Codebook for Prescription Monitoring Program Laws

This codebook describes the variables in a dataset that examines variation in state laws establishing prescription drug monitoring programs. This dataset is longitudinal and covers 1998-2011. The jurisdictions selected for measurements are the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

There are six standard variables in every LawAtlas dataset. They are:

FIPS Code: The Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) codes are a standardized set of numeric codes issued by the National Institute of Standards and Technology to ensure uniform identification of geographic entities through all federal government agencies.
Jurisdiction: This is a dropdown selection in each coding form. It includes the jurisdictions coded in the dataset.
Effective Date: This date (MM/DD/YYYY) is the most recent effective date of the legal text captured for this place. The effective date represents the date the policy went into effect.
Ineffective Date: The ineffective date (MM/DD/YYYY) is the last date the policy was in effect as reflected by the legal text captured to code this policy.
Legal Text: This is a text box that captures all legal text relevant to the coding questions. This will not download into Microsoft Excel.

---

LawAtlas
The Policy Surveillance Portal

PMP Law Search Protocol

Summary Table

Summary Table of Actions Based on Statute/Regulation Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Clearly Rel</th>
<th>Possibly Rel</th>
<th>Possibly Rel Def</th>
<th>Clearly NOT Rel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter results from Test Search</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly Describe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a X Ref Search</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a TOC Search</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter results from X Ref Search</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter results from TOC search</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Citing Cases</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check History</td>
<td>Y (only for statutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I: Getting Started

1. Westlaw, Sign On;
2. Click Westlaw tab;
3. View Westlaw Directory (left side of screen);
4. US State Materials, Statutes; Statutes Annotated—Individual States & US Jurisdictions;
5. If a state has more than one code, Matt will provide you with the annotated code that you should use.

Part II: Step by step guide to identifying PMP statutes and regulations

Step 1: Annotated statute text search: (controlled w/1 substance) OR (prescription!) OR (drug!) w/1 (report) OR monitor! OR database OR repository)

Step 2: BEFORE YOU REVIEW ANY OF THE TEXT OF ANY OF THE STATUTES, enter the following information for ALL OF THE STATUTES from your text search:

- The 2-letter abbreviation for the state:
- The statute citation:
- An S in the Law_Type column
- A 1 in the Text_Search column

PUBLIC HEALTH LAW RESEARCH
Distracted Driving Map

With the spread of smart phones, GPS devices and other wireless technologies, there has been a steady increase in the number of injuries and deaths related to distracted drivers in recent years. In response to National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates, the federal government has pushed for stricter distracted driving laws across the country. Currently, all but two states have passed laws addressing distracted driving. The existing state laws vary, but most laws have focused on prohibiting texting while driving, and cell phone use by young or inexperienced drivers.

This page focuses specifically on distracted driving caused by cell phone use. The laws displayed here are organized by restrictions based on the type of driver (all drivers generally), inexperienced drivers, restrictions based on age and school bus drivers, restrictions based on hands-free, and restrictions based on texting (text messaging, emailing, texting), as well as how each state enforces the law and what penalties are associated with a first-time violation.

To explore these laws use the question box below. This page displays distracted driving laws from January 1, 1998 to February 28, 2014.
Good Samaritan Overdose Prevention Laws Map

Unintentional drug overdose is now considered to be a leading cause of preventable death in the United States. Overdose bystanders may not call for medical assistance for fear of being arrested for drug-related crimes. In response, some states have enacted "Good Samaritan" laws that create immunities or other legal protections for people who call for help in the event of an overdose. Some states have passed comprehensive Good Samaritan overdose prevention laws that provide broad protection. Other states have passed laws that consider seeking medical assistance for a person experiencing an overdose as an affirmative defense, or as a mitigating factor during sentencing.

This is a longitudinal dataset, displaying laws from January 1, 2007 to May 31, 2014. To explore these laws click the "Start here" button below.

Related Resources
- PHLR-funded research: Preliminary findings: Good Samaritan Drug Overdose Law

Content Expert
- Cory Davis, JD MPH

Did you know?
The number of states with Good Samaritan overdose prevention laws more than quadrupled from 2010 to 2014.

Read more
Unintentional drug overdose is now considered to be a leading cause of preventable death in the United States. Overdose bystanders may not call for medical assistance for fear of being arrested for drug-related crimes. In response, some states have enacted “Good Samaritan” laws that create immunities or other legal protections for people who call for help in the event of an overdose. Some states have passed comprehensive Good Samaritan overdose prevention laws that provide broad protection. Other states have passed laws that consider seeking medical assistance for a person experiencing an overdose as an affirmative defense, or as a mitigating factor during sentencing.

This is a longitudinal dataset, displaying laws from January 1, 2007 to May 31, 2014. To explore these laws click the “Start here” button below.
Did you know?
The number of states with Good Samaritan overdose prevention laws more than quadrupled from 2010 to 2014.

Read more

Pick a year

2012
The United States' overdose epidemic may not be for medical assistance or fear of being arrested for drug-related crimes. In response, some states have enacted "Good Samaritan" laws that create immunities or other legal protections for people who call for help in the event of an overdose. Some states have passed comprehensive Good Samaritan overdose prevention laws that provide broad protection. Other states have passed laws that consider seeking medical assistance for a person experiencing an overdose as an affirmative defense, or as a mitigating factor during sentencing.

This is a longitudinal dataset, displaying laws from January 1, 2007 to May 31, 2014. To explore these laws click the "Start here" button below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Valid Through</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Good Samaritan Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>09/19/2012</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>01/01/2013</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>10/01/2013</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10/01/2013</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Of Columbia</td>
<td>03/19/2013</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>08/31/2013</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>10/01/2012</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>04/24/2014</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>03/31/2012</td>
<td>06/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>03/26/2014</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>08/02/2012</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>10/01/2009</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>04/09/2013</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>03/31/2013</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>06/15/2007</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>09/18/2011</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>06/18/2012</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>03/28/2014</td>
<td>05/31/2014</td>
<td>![view](View Law)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compare State Law

State Minimum Wage: Applicable Wage Rate

Choose States To Compare:
- Arizona
- Arkansas
- California
- Colorado
- District Of Columbia
- Florida
- Georgia
- Hawaii
- Idaho
- Illinois
- Connecticut
- Delaware
- Michigan
- Pennsylvania
- United States - Federal

PUBLIC HEALTH LAW RESEARCH
Local Data

Seattle-King County

Policy exists that addresses tobacco and/or nicotine use in parks
- Yes
- No
- Types of tobacco products restricted by the policy (Choose up to three)
  - Smoked tobacco products
  - Smokeless tobacco products
  - E-cigarettes

Smoking is prohibited without exception in all park areas
- Yes
- No

Enforcement mechanism specified in policy

Query where All of these selections apply
- Is there a policy on tobacco and/or nicotine product use/possession? Yes
- Does the policy require parks to be 100% smoke free? Yes

5 Policies Found

Washington - Seattle-King County
- Bothell

Washington - Seattle-King County
- SeaTac

Washington - Seattle-King County
- Woodinville