

Postcards received IN FAVOR OR Menthol Ban from BEAUTIFUL LIE UGLY TRUTH:

Neng Heur  
594 Iowa Ave East  
St Paul 55130

David Klevan, MD  
1470 East Shore Dr  
St Paul, MN 55103

Artesa Wheatley  
697 Cook Ave East –apt A  
St Paul 55106

Soua Her  
1470 York Avenue  
St Paul 55106

Keith Dowd  
697 Cook Ave E  
St Paul 55106

Pa Lor  
1320 Edgerton Street  
St Paul

Chue Vang  
782 Magnolia Ave  
St Paul 55106

Rhonda Flowers  
702 Magnolia Ave E  
St Paul 55106

Kamora Shambley  
687 Cook Ave E  
St Paul 55106

Vang Lor  
1333 Payne Ave  
St Paul 55106

Nikki Thao  
1581 Chamber Ave N  
St Paul 55106

Isaiah Coleman  
1017 Earl Street  
St Paul 55106

Jahaud Wheatley-Brown  
697 Cook Ave E- Apt A  
St Paul 55106

Chann Hill  
1879 Hoyt Ave E  
St Paul 55119

Printice Wheatley  
697 Cook Ave E – Apt A  
St Paul 55106

DeJanay Ingram  
866 Magnolia Ave E  
St Paul 55106

Za Moua Her  
732 Orange Ave E  
St Paul 55106

Caller left message it is adults' right to choose cigarettes and is against Menthol ban. No name or address

Caller left message it is unfair to take away adults right to Menthol. If it is about children, their parents should be the ones to direct them away from cigarettes. She is against Menthol ban. No name or address

Caller left message he is against Menthol ban. No name or address

Lynn left message it is unfair to not sell menthol as long as it is a legal substance it should be sold. No name or address

Jean Santiago left message she is against Menthol ban. No address

Caller left message opposing Menthol ban and wants the choice as long as it is legal. No name or address

Dear Councilmember Bostrom:

I am a constituent in ward 6 and wrote to you last week asking you to support an ordinance to get menthol tobacco products out of stores where kids can enter.

My children's exposure to these tobacco products at our neighborhood stores is of great concern to me so I have been watching the city council closely. I tried to call your office yesterday but could not reach you so I am sending this email.

I was deeply disappointed to learn that Councilmember Brendmoen wants to delay the council's voting on this urgent matter. The African American community in St. Paul has been working on the menthol issue for two years. We need to get these deadly products out of the corner stores in St. Paul now. Please do not delay voting on this significant health issue.

As your constituent, I am asking you to **please vote no on delaying the menthol tobacco vote.**

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Keshawn Williams  
697 Cook Ave E  
St. Paul  
Keshawn Williams

Ka Thao @ 1344 White Bear Ave called to say she is in IN FAVOR of Menthol ban.

Dear Mayor Coleman and members of the St. Paul City Council:

My name is Alison Lerman, and I am a second-year Internal Medicine/Pediatrics resident at the University of Minnesota. I heard about this ordinance from my residency program director and felt compelled to reach out to you regarding the menthol tobacco ordinance that is currently under deliberation. I feel strongly that these products should be removed from stores where young people may see and purchase them. The flavoring appeals to younger individuals and these products are directly marketed to these populations. These products are often the first tobacco that young people use and often sets them up for a lifetime of smoking and other tobacco use which has undisputed and profound negative health consequences. Tobacco is the leading preventable cause of death and disease in Minnesota, and it should be a goal of all legislators to prevent young people from starting to use and all tobacco products. As such, I urge you to pass an ordinance in St. Paul to get menthol tobacco products out of stores where young people may have access to them, such as gas stations and convenience stores.

Thank you!

Alison M. Lerman M.D.  
PGY-2  
UMN Internal Medicine and Pediatrics

From: Tyler Winkelman [<mailto:tylerwinkelman@icloud.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 3:27 PM

To: #CI-StPaul\_Ward3

Subject: Follow-up re: menthol tobacco policy

Council Member Tolbert,

Thank you for taking the time to meet and discuss restricting the sale of menthol to adult only shops with us last month. I wanted to follow up and pass along a letter to the editor that came out in the Daily this week from a public health student at the U that reiterates many of the reasons why this is such an important policy to protect youth from one of the tobacco industry's most appealing products. I hope you will support this measure and put the health of our community first.

Sincerely,

Tyler Winkelman

Cliff Britain – 1980 Goodrich – Picked up a flyer in a grocery store to call to stop the ban on menthol cigarettes, but he's calling in support of the ban and feels they should cost \$10/pack or completely ban tobacco all together.

From: Vivian Nelsen [<mailto:vjn@inter-raceinstitute.org>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 5:22 PM

To: #CI-StPaul\_Ward1-7

Subject: Tomorrow's Racist (?) Menthol Vote--Vivian Jenkins Nelsen

Importance: High

TO: St. Paul City Council Members

FROM: Vivian Jenkins Nelsen

RE: City Council Menthol Vote Tomorrow

DATE: 19 September 2017

I recently testified in support of a proposal to restrict menthol tobacco sales to adult-only stores in Minneapolis. St. Paul is now considering a similar proposal, and other cities are sure to follow.

When communities look to restrict menthol, one objection always comes up. The objection is, "Menthols are the cigarettes of Black people, so this proposal is racist."

You read that right. Here is a policy that will reduce smoking, save lives, improve health and protect pocketbooks in African American communities. And some people dare to say that's racist.

Who says this? Certainly the tobacco companies do. It's no mystery why. Menthols are some of the top-selling cigarettes in the country. I've heard them called the lifeline of the tobacco industry. When menthol restrictions come up, the tobacco companies are first in line to fight them. The reason is, they know a policy like this will work. It will keep tobacco away from kids in our communities, and make it easier for adults to make healthy choices. The harder they fight against it, the clearer that is.

But you may have heard others saying it. Before this issue came up in Minneapolis, I was listening to a show on the radio. The guests were introduced as "civil rights leaders" – which carries a lot of weight in the Black community. But they were spouting the same objections as Big Tobacco: menthol restrictions are racist, they're "a ban on Black smoking," they're another excuse for police to target Black men.

Well, a couple weeks later, the same show came clean: those "leaders" were in fact paid by R.J. Reynolds, maker of Newport menthol cigarettes, to spread misinformation. In fact, the menthol policy isn't a ban, there's no penalty on the buyer of the products, and there is absolutely no police enforcement component.

This is shocking, but also predictable. You see, it's part of a long game Big Tobacco's been playing, and Black people are the pawns. In the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, they decided menthol cigarettes would be "Black cigarettes." They put African Americans in ads, and placed those ads in Black neighborhoods and in Black magazines. The tobacco trials of the 1990s revealed how they researched us. Internal tobacco documents note that Black men associate menthol with "good

taste, style and masculine strength” and how “impactful” and “effective” advertising to “Black young adult smokers” could make that preference even stronger.

I remember it happening. Even into the 1980s, they would hand out free menthols in our neighborhoods. Minty, clean-tasting . . . and easy to smoke. The cigarette companies were everybody’s friend.

But when you think about it, it goes back even further – hundreds of years. It started when the first tobacco growers kidnapped Africans to pick the tobacco. Enslaved us, for tobacco. We’re still enslaved to tobacco. No wonder the disease burden from smoking today is greater for us than for the rest of the population.

Regarding the proposal in St. Paul, I say it’s about time. It’s about time somebody asked, “Why is it 88 percent of Black smokers smoke menthols . . . compared to only 26 percent of white smokers?” It’s about time somebody realizes that tobacco addiction is something the cigarette companies have done to us, done on purpose.

It’s about time our elected leaders wake up to how the tobacco industry preys on our people – Black people. There’s another famous quote from a Reynolds executive who said, “We reserve the right to smoke for the young, the poor, the Black and the stupid.” That shows the contempt they have for us, and decent people everywhere should do whatever we can to stop them.

Sincerely,

Vivian Jenkins Nelsen

Dear Councilperson Tolbert:

I urge you to support the restriction on menthol tobacco products. Restricting menthol products to adult tobacco shops will make it more difficult for youth to get these products and start the deadly habit. The tobacco industry and others who profit from selling tobacco have taken advantage of our youth for too long. St Paul has a great tradition of leading the way in youth prevention - please support this ordinance and continue the great progress!

Kristie Ellickson

Ward 3 resident

Ruth Parriott - 679 Sue Place

Just heard you are not supporting the menthol tobacco item and she’s urging you to support it, it is the right thing to do. Also, she’s heard there may be a motion to lay it over indefinitely and she would urge you to vote against that and to vote to support it right away.

Please add to public record these W5 telephone calls/voice-mails:

1. Rev. Daryl Spence  
Ward 5  
Against menthol restriction
2. Linda Johnson  
--8 Burr St – Ward 5  
Against ban on Menthol and flavored cigarettes. Bans are un-American
3. Lynn Kirschner  
Ward 5  
Against banning menthol and wintergreen favors
4. Ron Krey – Ward 5  
Opposes menthol tobacco ordinance change
5. Melinda Zamora  
118- Albemarle St – Ward 5  
Against menthol restriction

6. James Hawila  
20—Marshall Ave.

Owner of gas station with 4 employees who rely on him for employment. If enacted will have to cut their hours. He recommends raising legal age to 21. Not fair for Saint Paul to enact legislation when neighboring cities are not. He doesn't even sell energy drinks to under 18 year olds. Legislation changed to allow liquor stores to be open on Sundays. Looking a legalizing marijuana. This legislation doesn't make sense. He asks for council to vote against.

7. Linda Wall  
Against Ordinance Change regarding Menthol

8. Michael  
Smoker, government can't tell him what kind of cigarette he can purchase with his hard-earned money. Vote against.

9. Jean Forester  
Professor Emeritus, School of Public Health  
Urges support for the proposed ordinance change. Very important

Note: Ward 5 received "6" Anonymous phone calls against menthol ordinance change

Note: Ward 5 received "22" postcards in support of menthol ordinance change

Postcards from BEAUTIFUL LIE UGLY TRUTH in favor or Menthol ban.

Leon Yang  
1808 Sims Ave  
St Paul 55119

Arthur Vang  
1932 Mechanic Ave  
St Paul 55106

Kwan Puen Vang  
608 Hawthorne Ave E  
St Paul 55106

Hello,

I'm Carrie Wade, the director of harm reduction policy at the R Street Institute. I write to you out of concern over the proposed ordinance listed above. *Under this ordinance, electronic cigarettes and other vapor products are classified as tobacco products and, therefore, subject to prohibition of flavors.* While well-intentioned, this will adversely affect public health by limiting safer alternatives to combustible cigarettes to the very people that this bill aims to protect.

As an academic, I spent my graduate and postgraduate career studying the neural mechanisms of addiction and evaluating neurochemical and anatomical changes occurring in the brain following the onset of addiction. I've seen a lot of progress in the field, especially at universities and research institutes across the country. I now firmly believe a harm-reduction approach to smoking cessation positively affects the health and welfare of people who use addictive substances, in ways other methods simply cannot.

Below is a summary and explanation for why and how we think the ordinance should be amended:

- **Eliminate e-cigarettes and other vapor products from the umbrella of tobacco products.**

Defining e-cigarettes as tobacco products is misleading and inappropriate. The fundamental distinctions between traditional cigarettes and e-cigarettes are the absence of the tobacco plant, which contains at least two dozen other phytochemicals and combustion, a process that releases thousands of other harmful chemicals whenever anyone lights up. E-cigarettes, on the other hand, contain far fewer chemicals and impurities, which have predicted levels that are not harmful to humans.

- **Recognize that electronic cigarettes are a *much* safer alternative to combustible cigarettes**

While e-cigarettes are not totally safe or healthful, they are far less harmful than cigarettes. Public Health England estimates that electronic cigarettes are no less than 95 percent safer than combustible cigarettes and both Public Health England and the Office of the Surgeon General report that e-cigarettes have a similar risk profile to other nicotine replacements, such as the patch and nicotine gum.

- **Recognize the potential for flavors to positively impact decisions to switch to a safer form of nicotine**

*The International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* reports that limitations in flavor choices negatively impact user experience. About 40 percent of former and current adult smokers predict that removing their ability to choose flavors would make them less likely to remain abstinent or attempt to quit [6]. In fact, data in this report suggest current smokers are partial to the flavor of traditional tobacco, while fruit and sweet flavors are preferred by former smokers.

## **Conclusion**

- **E-cigarettes are a crucial harm reduction tool to combat the incidence of disease associated with smoking.**

Policies that treat and tax e-cigarettes equal to traditional cigarettes encourage current smokers to continue doing enormous harm to their health by discouraging a switch from combustible products. Conversely, policies that reflect the reduced harm of e-cigarettes can significantly reduce the enormous burden of disease that combustible cigarettes impose on society. This includes policies that

allow a variety of flavors of e-cigarettes to be available for current smokers *alongside cigarettes that are sold at non-specialty stores*. I predict that these impacts would be particularly high among groups with above-average smoking rates, such as lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people and Medicaid recipients and those who overwhelmingly use flavored tobacco, such as African-Americans and younger smokers.

I applaud the efforts of the citizens of St. Paul to reduce the prevalence of smoking and associated diseases. However, it is important that the potential of e-cigarettes to mitigate risks associated with combustible cigarettes be recognized if we wish to encourage a healthful populace.

Thank you,  
Carrie Wade  
Senior Fellow  
R Street Institute

**Postcards from BEAUTIFUL LIE UGLY TRUTH in favor or Menthol ban.**

Reynu Ocumpo @ 607 Minnehaha Ave E

Hlay Poe @ 830 Jenks Ave

Tonia Boyd @ 1159 Supornick Lane

Selcora Morales @ 617 Rose Ave E

Keshawn Williams @ 697 Cook Ave E – Apt B

Ge Vang @ 1611 Clarence Street

Susan Armetry @ 1349 Arcade Street