

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FINAL BILL ANALYSIS

BILL #:	CS/HB 505	FINAL HOUSE FLOOR ACTION:		
SUBJECT/SHORT TITLE	Florida Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act	112	Y's 0	N's
SPONSOR(S):	Criminal Justice Subcommittee; Trumbull and others	GOVERNOR'S ACTION:	Approved	
COMPANION BILLS:	CS/SB 1002			

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

CS/HB 505 passed the House on March 30, 2017, and subsequently passed the Senate on May 2, 2017.

Chapter 893, F.S., sets forth the Florida Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act ("the Act"), which regulates controlled substances and provides criminal penalties for the unlawful possession, sale, manufacture, delivery, and trafficking of such substances. Section 893.03, F.S., classifies all controlled substances into five categories, known as schedules I through V. The distinguishing factors between the different drug schedules are the "potential for abuse" of the substances listed therein and whether there is a currently accepted medical use for the substance.

Currently, ioflupane I 123 is a schedule II controlled substance in Florida because of its derivation from cocaine via ecgonine, both of which are schedule II substances. Prior to September 2015, ioflupane I 123 was also a schedule II controlled substance under the federal Controlled Substances Act. However, effective September 11, 2015, the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration removed ioflupane I 123 from that schedule because the drug is not subject to abuse and currently has a medically acceptable use in DaTscan. DaTscan is a drug product used to visualize striatal dopamine transporters in the brains of adult patients with suspected Parkinsonian syndromes.

The bill amends s. 893.03, F.S., to remove ioflupane I 123 from the list of substances that are classified under schedule II in Florida's controlled substance schedules.

Additionally, in order to ensure that all of Florida's statutes are automatically updated whenever the Act is amended, the bill creates s. 893.015, F.S., to specify that cross-references throughout the Florida Statutes to the Act, or any portion thereof, include all subsequent amendments to the Act.

The Criminal Justice Estimating Conference determined on March 2, 2017, that the bill will have no impact on the state prison population.

The bill was approved by the Governor on June 14, 2017, ch. 2017-110, L.O.F., and will become effective on July 1, 2017.

I. SUBSTANTIVE INFORMATION

A. EFFECT OF CHANGES:

Regulating Controlled Substances

The Florida Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act

Chapter 893, F.S., sets forth the Florida Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act. The Act includes provisions: identifying the substances that are controlled in this State; authorizing the Attorney General to identify new controlled substances by rule in order to keep pace with designer drugs created by criminals; and providing regulations for the lawful distribution, labeling, and packaging of controlled substances.

Section 893.03, F.S., classifies controlled substances into five categories, known as schedules. These schedules regulate the manufacture, distribution, preparation, and dispensing of the substances listed therein. The distinguishing factors between the different drug schedules are the “potential for abuse”¹ of the substances listed therein and whether there is a currently accepted medical use for the substance.² The Controlled Substance Schedules are as follows:

- Schedule I substances have a high potential for abuse and have no currently accepted medical use in the United States. This schedule includes substances such as cannabis and heroin.³
- Schedule II substances have a high potential for abuse and have a currently accepted but severely restricted medical use in the United States. This schedule includes substances such as raw opium, cocaine, and codeine.⁴
- Schedule III substances have a potential for abuse less than the substances contained in Schedules I and II and have a currently accepted medical use in the United States. This schedule includes substances such as stimulants and anabolic steroids.⁵
- Schedule IV substances have a low potential for abuse relative to the substances in Schedule III and have a currently accepted medical use in the United States. This schedule includes substances such as benzodiazepines and barbiturates.⁶
- Schedule V substances have a low potential for abuse relative to the substances in Schedule IV and have a currently accepted medical use in the United States. This schedule includes substances such as mixtures that contain small quantities of opiates and codeine.⁷

The majority of provisions criminalizing behavior related to controlled substances are found in s. 893.13, F.S., which criminalizes the possession, sale, purchase, manufacture, and delivery of controlled substances. The penalty for violating these provisions depends largely on the schedule in which the substance is listed.⁸ Other factors, such as the quantity of controlled substances involved in a crime or the location where the violation occurs can also affect the penalties for violating the criminal provisions of ch. 893, F.S.

¹ Section 893.035(3)(a), F.S., defines “potential for abuse” to mean that a substance has properties as a central nervous system stimulant or depressant or a hallucinogen that create a substantial likelihood of its being: 1) used in amounts that create a hazard to the user's health or the safety of the community; 2) diverted from legal channels and distributed through illegal channels; or 3) taken on the user's own initiative rather than on the basis of professional medical advice.

² See s. 893.03, F.S.

³ s. 893.03(1), F.S.

⁴ s. 893.03(2), F.S.

⁵ s. 893.03(3), F.S.

⁶ s. 893.03(4), F.S.

⁷ s. 893.03(5), F.S.

⁸ See, e.g., s. 893.13(1)(a) and (c), F.S.

Ioflupane I 123

Federal Law

Federal Law, pursuant to the Controlled Substances Act,⁹ also classifies certain substances into schedules based on potential for abuse and whether there is a currently accepted medical use for it. Until 2015, federal law recognized ioflupane I 123 as a schedule II controlled substance because of its derivation from cocaine via ecgonine, both of which are schedule II substances.¹⁰ Ioflupane I 123 is the active pharmaceutical ingredient in the drug product DaTscan.¹¹ The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the New Drug Application for DaTscan, for the indication of visualizing striatal dopamine transporters in the brains of adult patients with suspected Parkinsonian syndromes.¹²

In 2010, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) recommended to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) that ioflupane I 123 be removed from the list of schedule II substances.¹³ In response, the DEA completed a review of FDA-approved diagnostic products containing ioflupane I 123, which at the time was only DaTscan.¹⁴ The DEA agreed to remove ioflupane I 123 from the federal Controlled Substances Act based on the following:

- There is no data demonstrating that individuals are administering quantities of DaTscan sufficient to create a hazard to their health or to the safety of other individuals or to the community. Approximately 6,000 vials of DaTscan would be required to produce a subjective “high” in humans from exposure to ioflupane I 123. The volume of 6,000 vials is about 15 liters of fluid, an amount that would be lethal if administered intravenously.
- Over 168,000 doses of DaTscan were administered to patients worldwide and there was no clinical evidence of pharmacological effects.
- Meaningful extraction of ioflupane I 123 from DaTscan would be impossible due to its limited production and availability and because extraction is technically complex and would require advanced equipment not available to the general public.
- There have been no reports of abuse of ioflupane I 123 or seizures as a result of ioflupane I 123.
- Because of the limited amounts of manufactured DaTscan, the low concentration of ioflupane I 123 per vial, and the existence of stringent regulatory controls on the manufacturing and handling of DaTscan, abuse of DaTscan is not possible as a practical matter.
- There was no psychic or physiological dependence potential of FDA-approved diagnostic products containing ioflupane I 123.
- Ioflupane I 123 is not an immediate precursor of a substance already controlled under the Controlled Substances Act.¹⁵

Accordingly, ioflupane I 123 was removed from the schedule of the federal Controlled Substances Act on September 11, 2015.¹⁶

Florida Law

Ioflupane I 123 is a schedule II substance under s. 893.03(2)(a)(4), F.S.

⁹ 21 U.S.C. § 812.

¹⁰ Department of Justice, *Schedules of Controlled Substances: Removal of Ioflupane I 123 from Schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act*, https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/fed_regs/rules/2015/fr0603.htm (last visited Feb. 6, 2017).

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ Department of Justice, *Schedules of Controlled Substances: Removal of Ioflupane I 123 from Schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act*, https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/fed_regs/rules/2015/fr0911.htm (last visited Feb. 7, 2017).

Cross-References to the Florida Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act

There are two types of statutory cross-references, general and specific. A general reference is a cross-reference to a general body of law, e.g., a reference in a statute to the “Florida Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act” would be considered a general reference. A specific reference is a cross-reference to a specific section of law, e.g., a reference to s. 893.03, F.S., would be considered a specific reference.

Under case law, a general reference in statute incorporates the referenced law and any subsequent amendments of that law.¹⁷ A specific reference in statute, however, incorporates the referenced statute as it existed at the time the cross-reference was adopted. Such specific reference is unaffected by subsequent amendments to the incorporated statute,¹⁸ unless the specific reference is reenacted by the legislation that amends the incorporated statute.

To avoid the necessity of reenacting specific references to sections within certain chapters of law, the Legislature has codified provisions that allow for all specific references to sections of law within certain chapters to automatically incorporate all subsequent amendments. Such chapters of law include ch. 435, F.S., entitled “Employment Screening,” and ch. 938, F.S., entitled “Court Costs.”¹⁹

Currently, there are hundreds of specific references to sections contained in ch. 893, F.S. There is no statutory authority allowing such specific references to automatically incorporate subsequent amendments.

Effect of the Bill

The bill amends s. 893.03, F.S., to remove ioflupane I 123 from the list of substances classified under Schedule II.

The bill also creates s. 893.015, F.S., to specify that the purpose of ch. 893, F.S., is to comprehensively address drug abuse prevention and control in this state, and, as such, unless expressly provided otherwise, a specific reference to ch. 893, F.S., or any section thereof incorporates all subsequent amendments to ch. 893, F.S., or any section thereof.

Subject to the Governor’s veto powers, the bill provides an effective date of July 1, 2017.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues: The bill does not appear to have an impact on state revenues.
2. Expenditures: The Criminal Justice Estimating Conference determined on March 2, 2017, that the bill will have no impact on the state prison population.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues: The bill does not appear to have an impact on local government revenues.

¹⁷ See *Williams v. State ex rel. Newberger*, 100 Fla. 1567, 125 So. 358 (1930), rev’d on other grounds on rehearing, 100 Fla. 1570, 131 So. 864 (1930); *State ex rel. Springer v. Smith*, 189 So. 2d 846 (Fla. 4th D.C.A. 1966); *Reino v. State*, 352 So. 2d 853 (Fla. 1977).

¹⁸ See *Overstreet v. Blum*, 227 So. 2d 197 (Fla. 1969); *Hecht v. Shaw*, 112 Fla. 762, 151 So. 333 (1933); *Van Pelt v. Hilliard*, 75 Fla. 792, 78 So. 693 (1918); and *State ex rel. Springer v. Smith*, *ibid.*

¹⁹ See ss. 435.01 and 983.31, F.S.

2. Expenditures: The bill does not appear to have an impact on local government expenditures.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR: None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS: None.