

From: [Bonnie Beverly](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)
Subject: Proposed Ordinance -- Cannabis Use and Smoking in Public City Spaces
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 3:34:15 PM

To the Saint Paul City Council,

I wish to state my support for any ordinance provision that would prohibit the use or smoking of cannabis products in City-owned or -leased spaces, and any other public spaces if possible. I don't want myself or any other persons, especially children, to have to inhale second-hand smoke from cannabis or tobacco products.

Bonnie Beverly
1548 Fairmount Avenue
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55105-2316

From: [KRYSTIL ROSE](#)
To: [CouncilHearing_English \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Subject: Voice Mail (59 seconds)
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 2:39:59 PM
Attachments: [audio.mp3](#)

Good afternoon. My name is Crystal Rose. I'm a Saint Paul resident at 590 Snelling Ave. South, and I'm calling to comment on the public smoking ordinance. I think that it is unfair toward people who don't have the money to own their own home or property. And essentially it would take legalize marijuana and make it illegal for the poor people of the state. And I think that is absolutely not the direction we should be going. If we're legalizing marijuana smoking, we should be able to do so in public places. Thank you very much. Have a good day.

You received a voice mail from [KRYSTIL ROSE](#).

Thank you for using Transcription! If you don't see a transcript above, it's because the audio quality was not clear enough to transcribe.

[Set Up Voice Mail](#)

From: [Greg Lecker](#)
To: [#CI-StPaul Council](#)
Subject: comment regarding use of cannabis on city sidewalks especially congested downtowns
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 2:31:01 PM

Think Before You Click: This email originated **outside** our organization.

Here's my comment regarding use of cannabis on city sidewalks especially congested downtowns:

Since I've moved to Minnesota in 1992, I've seen the downtowns go steadily downhill. I'm going to get sick if I have to smell pot smoke walking to and from work. I'm fairly certain employers in suburbs can restrict cannabis use on their property – parking lots, sidewalks. I already have to watch what I eat (sugar, etc – drink enough water) to ward off migraines. If the City of St. Paul and its downtown employers cannot make rules to keep its workers safe and free of cannabis smoke and effects on their way to employment – then I must insist on being able to work from home 5 days a week. What's the point of prohibiting use of cannabis at the office if I'm going to be partaking on the sidewalk on the way to work simply by inhaling outdoor air? We could anticipate issues with the legalization – and this is just one of them. Some people become irritable with substance abuse – I can tell you I will be one of these irritable people!

From: [Thomas Fruen](#)
To: [#CI-StPaul_Council](#)
Subject: Do not support a smoking ordinance
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 12:33:30 PM

Think Before You Click: This email originated **outside** our organization.

Good morning,

I want to express my opinion about Mr Tolbert's proposed ordinance. We do not need this ordinance for many reasons.

1. Cannabis smoke is not all of a sudden, some major issue now that it's been legalized. This proposal further stigmatizes something that our government has worked hard to legalize for all Minnesotans.
2. Not everyone has space available to them to use this fully legal plant or other tobacco. This proposal makes it seem like only those with their own property can enjoy cannabis or other tobacco. The council should realize that access to spaces shouldn't be limited to those with means to afford a home with a yard.
3. Let's say for a minute that not all ways of consumption are equal (but they really are in the eyes of the law). If this is about smoke, and odor, then including the vapes to the list of banned consumption methods seems like the author is uninformed. I've been part of the MN Medical Cannabis program for years. The use of the vape is discrete and effective for my medical needs. Most have little to no odor at all.
4. I believe putting the police back into the mix when it comes to cannabis is just flat out a wrong and a waste of their time. The police in StP haven't been engaging with the public about cannabis use in a very long time. The police that i know personally, have also told me that they do not want to go backwards on this. We have a problem in StP with actual drug use, and the police would be better off investigating actual crime.
5. This whole thing just rubs me the wrong way. This is being brought up by the councilmember with the whitest and wealthiest ward in the whole city. <https://bestneighborhood.org/household-income-st-paul-mn/>.
6. Quick history lesson from 2018. By a vote of 6-1, the council approved a resolution supporting the "legalization and decriminalization" of the recreational use of cannabis in Minnesota for residents age 21 and older. The resolution, authored by Council Member Dai Thao and co-sponsored by Council Members Mitra Nelson and Rebecca Noecker, also calls for the "expungement of Minnesotan records of convicted cannabis crimes."

This is just such a short-sighted waste of time that i'm struggling to believe that elected officials are moving this along. The city council should keep their word from 2018 and not decide to make something legal, illegal again.

Thank you,
Tom Fruen

From: [Robert Waltz](#)
To: [CouncilHearing \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Cc: [Robert Waltz](#)
Subject: Comment on Proposed Public Marijuana Use Ordinance
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 12:27:18 PM

Apologies if this is going to the wrong address. I could not tell, from the web site, what contact to use.

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing about your proposed ordinance on the public use of marijuana. I realize that you are in a difficult situation, as those who wish to smoke marijuana and those who wish to avoid the scent -- indeed, who are sickened by it -- have viewpoints that cannot be reconciled.

But there is more to be considered here. Marijuana, contrary to the claims of those who use it, is not a harmless drug. It is likely that it does have clinical uses, but in ordinary use, it is dangerous. Very dangerous, in fact, to some people. The evidence is now extremely strong that it can cause those with a genetic predisposition to develop schizophrenia. Its psychoactive effects are sufficient that the American Psychiatric Association recognizes FOUR different cannabis-related disorders: Cannabis Use Disorder, Cannabis Intoxication, Cannabis Withdrawal, and Cannabis-Induced Mental Disorders. It is absolutely certain that marijuana use can cause disinhibition of various sorts, leading to dangerous behaviors including driving while under its influence. This is not something that just affects the person who is smoking the drug; people get hit by cars driven by users who are high!

There is also evidence that consistent marijuana use can cause executive function and anxiety disorders in later life. These problems do not go away just because one quits smoking it.

Evidence is emerging that it increases the amount of heavy metals in the blood of users.

Some studies have shown that the CHILDREN of marijuana users are prone to more psychiatric disorders. Others have shown that the children of marijuana users are somewhat shorter than the children of non-users of similar socioeconomic background. Both these things can worsen the quality of life of the children.

There is reason to believe, too, that there are "second-hand marijuana" effects, just as there are "second-hand smoke" effects. The obvious one is that the smell can cause nausea (dangerous in public places!), but we know that inhaling almost any sort of smoke can damage the lungs and circulatory system.

In other words, despite the national rush to loosen marijuana laws, there are very strong reasons to believe that this loosening will damage public health, and not just the health of those who are using cannabis.

If you force people to not smoke on public sidewalks and in parks, you are barely inconveniencing those who do the smoking (indeed, you're actually doing them some good), since they can always smoke somewhere else. If you allow them to smoke in those places, you are endangering -- not inconveniencing, ENDANGERING -- those who do not wish to be exposed to marijuana.

There are freedoms TO DO things, and there are freedoms FROM having something done to you. Whatever you do, someone will lose a freedom. It's too bad that such a choice must be made. But I urge you to take the choice that does less harm and keep our parks and sidewalks free of cannabis. Do not loosen your ordinance; if anything, strengthen it. It is the right thing to do, for the public health and the entire population.

Thank you.

Robert Waltz
Colne Street, Saint Paul, MN
waltzmn@yahoo.com

Trouthe is the hyste thyng that man may kepe.

-- Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Franklin's Tale*, line 1479

From: [Joel Menk](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)
Subject: Comment regarding public cannabis consumption law
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 11:09:50 AM

Hello. I am a St. Paul resident, and I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed bans on tobacco and cannabis consumption in public. In the spirit of recreational legality, residents should have the freedom to consume cannabis on public grounds, particularly in public parks, sidewalks, etc. Many adults live in apartments that do not allow smoking on their grounds, and so a ban on public consumption would give no place for them to exercise their lawful right to consume recreational cannabis. A St. Paul where only private property owners can smoke cannabis is very inequitable and severely hinders the rights of renting St. Paul residents. With the exception of school grounds, all outdoor public space in St. Paul should be available for St. Paulians to consume cannabis lawfully.

Thank you.

Joel Menk
50 Mounds Blvd
St Paul, MN 55106

From: [KNIPPENBERG ROG](#)
To: [CouncilHearing_English \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Subject: Voice Mail (1 minute and 8 seconds)
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 10:02:54 AM
Attachments: [audio.mp3](#)

My name is Beverly Knippenberg KNIPPENBEIG KNIPPENBERG ROG, 804 E Morton St. Saint Paul, 55107. I'm calling about the smoking weed and public places and that IPO that if they want to smoke, let them do it in their private property, in their private home, in their private car. I don't think I have to be subject to all that. And my children and my grandchildren, I don't feel that I pay taxes to smell their junk. That's my comment. Thank you 651-222-7555.

You received a voice mail from [KNIPPENBERG ROG](#).

Thank you for using Transcription! If you don't see a transcript above, it's because the audio quality was not clear enough to transcribe.

[Set Up Voice Mail](#)

From: [Connie duopu](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)
Subject: Concerns Regarding the Proposed Public Cannabis Smoking Ban
Date: Wednesday, September 6, 2023 7:46:53 PM

Dear St. Paul City Council Members,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concerns about the recently proposed ordinance that seeks to ban the public smoking of cannabis, even though the substance has been recently legalized. This ordinance raises a fundamental question: What is the point of legalizing cannabis if we continue criminalizing its use in certain contexts?

The legalization of cannabis was a significant step forward, driven by the recognition that the criminalization of cannabis has disproportionately affected individuals and communities, particularly those from marginalized backgrounds. This move toward legalization was meant to rectify historical injustices and create a more equitable and just society.

However, the proposed ordinance to ban public cannabis smoking seems to contradict the principles driving the legalization effort. It risks perpetuating the same injustices by criminalizing individuals who may not have access to private spaces for consumption. This potential prohibition may disproportionately impact marginalized communities, exacerbating existing disparities.

I urge the St. Paul City Council to consider the following points:

1. **Equity and Justice:** The primary motivation for legalizing cannabis was to address the disproportionate impact of cannabis prohibition on marginalized communities. This proposed ban contradicts the principle of equity and justice that legalization aimed to achieve.
2. **Public Safety:** While public safety is a valid concern, exploring alternative approaches to address it without resorting to punitive measures is crucial. Education, harm reduction, and responsible consumption can be more effective than prohibition.
3. **Dialogue and Engagement:** Engage in meaningful conversations with the community, including those who have been historically marginalized by cannabis prohibition. Listen to their concerns and involve them in shaping fair and inclusive regulations.
4. **Economic Impact:** Consider the economic implications of such an ordinance, including the potential loss of tax revenue and opportunities for local businesses in the cannabis industry.
5. **Criminal Justice System:** Reflect on the broader implications of continuing to involve the criminal justice system in non-violent cannabis-related offenses, which can harm individuals and communities.

In conclusion, I respectfully request that the St. Paul City Council reevaluate the proposed ordinance to ban public cannabis smoking in light of the principles and goals of cannabis legalization. Let us work together to create a regulatory framework that promotes responsible cannabis use, fosters equity, and ensures that all community members realize the benefits of legalization.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these concerns. I hope you will prioritize our community's interests and well-being as you make decisions regarding this important matter.

Sincerely,
Connie

From: [Eric Bergamini](#)
To: [#CI-StPaul_Council](#); [CouncilHearing \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Subject: Ordinance on Smoking on City Owned Lands [Hearing]
Date: Wednesday, September 6, 2023 5:35:53 PM

Good Evening Saint Paul City Council,

The hearing regarding this issue was held during my working hours, as I suspect was the case for many who felt compelled to voice their opinion on it. I am writing to you, as a ~3 year citizen & resident of Lowertown, who is infrequently involved in nor interested in local political matters. This particular issue, however, conjoined with previous council action regarding the sale of mentholated cigarettes within the border of the City of Saint Paul, caught my attention. I am vehemently opposed to this or any other similar ordinance being enacted by the council that curtails the commonly expected rights of independent adult citizens while conducting their daily lives. If a substance is legal to possess or use by a citizen then, in open outdoor settings almost anywhere (perhaps nearby schools or hospitals is a valid exception [trying to offer a rational alternative for your blanked ban], for example), its possession or use, including in city parks or on sidewalks anywhere there is open air, must not be totally forbidden.

Thank you for considering this citizen's view. Please avoid in the future attempting to criminalize or curtail normal behavior of otherwise law abiding independent adult citizens in your statutes and ordinances.

Regards,
Eric Bergamini
180 Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN

From: [Nigel Parry](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)
Cc: [#CI-StPaul Ward4](#); [#CI-StPaul Ward1](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Proposed Smoking Ban
Date: Wednesday, September 6, 2023 5:14:56 PM

I thought we would have three minutes in-person, not two. I am therefore submitting this as a written comment. I live in Ward 1.

Nigel Parry
300 Dayton Ave, St Paul, MN 55102
612-220-1846

Public Comment for Proposed Smoking Ban

The Minnesota Clean Indoor Air Act went into force on the 1st of October 2007, 16 years ago, and in 2019, the MCIAA was amended again to expand the definition of smoking to include vaping. So indoor vaping is already covered by the MCIAA.

Smoking is defined by the act as "inhaling, exhaling, burning or carrying any lighted or heated cigar, cigarette, pipe or any other lighted or heated product containing, made or derived from nicotine, tobacco, marijuana, or other plant intended for inhalation." So cannabis is already covered.

However, the MCIAA *permits* outdoor smoking, "regardless of distance from building openings". That last part, which you often see signs for outside buildings, is something building management companies enforce. It's not currently part of the law.

Second hand smoke is a real issue. And second hand smoke from narcotics is additionally problematic. A couple months ago on a Minneapolis City bus, someone on the back seat where I was sitting fired up a crack or meth pipe. I caught a whiff of it before passengers kicked that guy off the bus. Note that the passengers did it. The driver didn't need to. Despite only catching a whiff of it, I arrived at the job interview I was heading to, in a word "stupid". Second hand smoke is a real issue.

If there is to be some attempt to prevent similar things happening to others, it needs to be done wisely. The Minnesota Indoor Clean Air Act lumps all smoking together. Tobacco, cannabis, all forms of vaping are all lumped together. Any similar city legislation is going to have to do the same. There's no realistic way for law enforcement to determine in the streets what is and what isn't nicotine or cannabis.

So we're talking about banning smoking and vaping in public parks and streets. This is not just about cannabis. So where are people going to smoke? I live in an apartment building where you are not even allowed to smoke or vape in the garden. You'd have to own your own garden or home to be able to smoke.

Obviously that's not a realistic law to expect people to follow and would result in more of the same policing discrimination we already see in the city. You can't ban smoking and vaping in public parks and streets. It creates all sorts of new problems that don't currently exist.

Second hand smoke is a real issue. If there are changes to be made, the only realistic solution

that doesn't ban public smoking or discriminate is to add an outdoor distance clause, which I would support, which makes it illegal to smoke within--say--25 feet of someone without their consent.

This would take care of both what building management companies are trying to address with their signs near their front doors, so visitors to the building don't have to walk through a wall of smoke, and address the need for people to be able to enjoy their walk along a city street or their time in a city park without being bothered by any smoke. The obvious example is a family picnic in a park. You wouldn't want your kids exposed. That's a real concern and that's fair enough.

The fact is that you WANT people to be smoking outdoors, away from other people. And parks and streets are pretty much where that needs to happen. If you enact any legislation that effectively bans outdoor smoking--and the way the legislation has worked so far tells us that it will ban every kind of smoking and vaping--people will quite rightly ignore it because it's overly restrictive, an overreach.

On the other hand, targeting any legislation at the actual problem--which is people being exposed without their consent to any smoke or vapor from other people--by enacting a distance rule, is more likely to receive the same common sense respect that it did in 2007, when smoking in public places such as restaurants was banned.

We were smokers but we accepted the law because it made sense. Don't pass anything that doesn't.

[ends]

From: [Michael Herrmann](#)
To: [CouncilHearing \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Subject: Smoke-Free Ordinance Letter of Support
Date: Wednesday, September 6, 2023 4:40:48 PM

Dear Saint Paul City Council Members,

I would like to express my support for the smoking ordinance. When the state passed the legalization of cannabis, I was in support of the decriminalization and understood the negative impacts on various communities. However, in the last month it has become clear that the stench of smoking cannabis has caused the need to keep windows closed and for those of us that do not smoke nor enjoy the smell it has caused a decrease in our ability to enjoy the outdoors. I have no problem with THC use, but the smoking of cannabis has a greater impact than those in support of smoking anywhere can even understand. Our standard of living has decreased, I would hope no-one wants to live in a city that has a cloud of cannabis smoke around every corner.

Thank you,
Michael Herrmann
892 Dayton Ave