

From: [Kayla Fearing](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#); [#CI-StPaul Ward1](#); [#CI-StPaul Ward2](#); [#CI-StPaul Ward3](#); [#CI-StPaul Ward4](#); [#CI-StPaul Ward5](#); [#CI-StPaul Ward7](#); [#CI-StPaul Ward6](#)
Subject: Following up from City Council Meeting 9/6/23
Date: Friday, September 8, 2023 1:23:37 PM

Good Afternoon, and Happy Friday, Saint Paul City Council Members-

After Wednesday's public testimony on the proposed Cannabis Smoking Ban in Saint Paul, I wanted to follow up with all of you. Again, my name is Kayla Fearing, and I am the owner of Healing Fear Consulting, a healthcare consulting company that helps, and encourages, patients to give up opioids and switch onto cannabinoid based products- sometimes those products are THC, and Smokable Cannabis.

As I mentioned in my testimony, I am a pulmonary patient myself, having lung surgery in August of 2019 and removing 1/3 of my right lung in order for me to beat a virus called BOOP. BOOP webs your lungs, in an attempt to "protect your lungs from the rest of your body"- I had a fever of 103 for almost a month, and needed surgery in order for the rest of my organs to NOT shut down. At 33 years old, I now have lungs of an 80year old female. Even after having lung surgery, you know what brought the best pain relief to my pulmonary system? Smoking (or Vaping) Cannabis.



(K. Fearing's BOOP Diagnosed Lungs, August 2019).

I feel as though the City Council members who brought this proposal forward are misinformed about the "harms" of cannabis smoke on pulmonary health, or, did not do their job in researching the up to date research. However, you may catch up on the current research

here: [Smoking cannabis doesn't carry same risks as tobacco, UCLA study finds \(May 2023\)](#)

As a pulmonary patient, and a Saint Paul resident, I cannot allow my own city council to spread the misconception, and misinformation that Cannabis smoke carries the "SAME" risks as tobacco smoke. Please look for the RECENT research.

I left copies of my business card behind Wednesday evening, but yet, none of you have reached out to learn more about cannabis in healthcare in Minnesota? Even after long, and thought provoking testimony? I've now attached a digital copy of my business card for all of your convenience. Please reach out before voting, to learn more, and to clear up any misinformation after smoking cannabis.

Or, just reach out if you have questions; Education goes hand in hand with cannabis. Help end the stigma of a medicinal plant.

--

Kayla Fearing
Healing Fear Consulting
651-307-9269

[Your Friend in HeaLTHCare](#)

Go from Opioids to Cannabis, a Cannabinoid at a time.



[Please leave Healing Fear Consulting a review on Google](#)

From: [Christopher Smith](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)
Subject: Statement made at the smoke-free outdoor ordinance public hearing 09/06/23
Date: Friday, September 8, 2023 9:56:41 AM

Council President Brendmoen and Councilmembers,

I am a renter and have been living in Lowertown for nearly ten years now. I've served on the Capitol River Council, was appointed to the HREEO Commission, am a current board member for Sustain St. Paul, and am a volunteer for Friends of Mears Park. I am also the Community Engagement Organizer for the Association for Nonsmokers MN and have been working on the Smoke-Free Housing Policy team.

Recent statements on social media have raised concern about inequities if St. Paul were to institute a smoke-free outdoor ordinance. One stated, for example:

"Unless you own a single-family home private residence in the City of Saint Paul and can afford your own backyard, under this policy, you would likely not be able to use a substance that was just legalized by the state."

Today, I am here to share some facts with the Council:

According to the CDC, 1 in 3 renters are exposed to second-hand smoke in their homes. In a Ramsey County survey, almost half of respondents reported exposure to secondhand smoke in their homes. The survey also found that respondents with lower incomes or who identified as people of color were overrepresented in smoking-permitted properties. A key finding from that same Ramsey County survey found that most respondents don't allow smoking in their homes, including 97 percent in smoke-free properties and 86 percent in smoking-permitted properties. Currently, there are no federal smoke-free rules for Section 8 or Section 42 subsidized housing, so it's the property owner's choice on whether smoking is permitted or prohibited in their building.

Councilmembers, St. Paul residents, who are renters, in particular from BIPOC communities are already being deprived the right to live smoke-free **in their own homes**. If you choose to accommodate a person's choice to smoke in the parks and trails, just be aware you are also taking another person's right away to live smoke-free.

I want a Yes vote for the Saint Paul smoke-free outdoor air ordinance.

Christopher Smith
250 6th Street E.
Apt 334
St. Paul, MN 55101
Ward 2
C: 651-206-9953

From: [Alicia Schaal](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)
Subject: Public Hearing 9/6/23 Cannabis in public
Date: Friday, September 8, 2023 9:09:50 AM

Good morning,

I attended the hearing yesterday; however, being a Minneapolis resident, I didn't feel comfortable testifying on behalf of your residents. I have been a nurse for over 20 years and have gradually changed my perception of cannabis as an illicit substance to something that actually has the potential to help someone. I can appreciate the need for clean air and the battle against secondhand smoke, but I think there needs to be some consideration of cannabis as a medicine. Cannabis is recognized as a medicine by the American Nurses Association, and there is a national organization for cannabis nursing, the American Cannabis Nurses Association. I can tell you there has never been such an organization for tobacco/cigarettes. I am in a master's program for Medical Cannabis Science and Therapeutics at the University of Maryland. Another piece of evidence this is not a cigarette.

Please consider the medical aspect for your residents. If your mother or grandmother lived in senior living and smoked cannabis for glaucoma to see, would you confine her to a public sidewalk? My suggestion is to be patient and see what your community tells you. Don't further create a socioeconomic divide in your community.

Thank you for your time,

Alicia Schaal BS, BSN, RN, PHN

Clark, C. S. (2021). *CANNABIS : a handbook for nurses*. Wolters Kluwer Medical.

<https://www.cannabisnurses.org/>



From: Caroline Daykin
To: [*CLSPaul Contact Council](#)
Subject: Smoking Ordinance Amendment
Date: Friday, September 8, 2023 8:49:24 AM

Dear St. Paul City Council Members,

As you begin the task of determining where smoking will be allowed in St. Paul, please keep in mind that the vast majority of Minnesotans are non-smokers. In 2021 13.4% of Minnesota adults were current tobacco smokers, and in 2019 7.9% reported using cannabis in the past month.

While I mostly agree with Council Member Noecker's amendment, the City Council should consider adding residences and bus stops to the areas in which smoking is restricted, which currently includes only public places and places of employment.

The ordinance currently uses the definition of "public place" as defined by MN Statute 144.413. The only residential spaces included in this definition are the common areas of rental apartments. The City Council should consider adding "residences not owned or rented by the individual smoking" to the prohibition on smoking within 25 feet of the entrances, exits, windows, and ventilation intakes of public buildings and places of employment.

In densely populated areas this would prevent people from being exposed to secondhand smoke in their own homes because someone is smoking on nearby public property. While this would result in smoking being prohibited on some sidewalks and boulevards, it would benefit the vast majority of St. Paul residents who are nonsmokers.

While there has been concern expressed for the rights of renters to smoke marijuana, a discussion of this issue's impact on renters is not complete without acknowledging the impact of secondhand smoke on low income residents. It has been noted that people with lower incomes tend to smoke at higher rates. While this is true, even among the lowest income Minnesotans the adult tobacco smoking rate is still only 23.4%.

The majority of nonsmoking low-income residents are especially vulnerable to the effects of secondhand smoke because they are more likely to live in densely populated areas in which outdoor smoke may be more prevalent and because they are more likely to rely on public transportation and on walking places. In addition to the majority of low-income adults who are nonsmoking, children are also exposed to secondhand smoke in these situations.

Prohibiting smoking from occurring within 25 feet of residences would help reduce low-income residents' exposure to secondhand smoke. The City Council could also protect the health of people waiting at bus stops by prohibiting smoking within 25 feet of a bus stop.

In addition to using signage to designate smoking areas in parks, the City Council could also use the signs to educate the public and to combat misinformation. At the hearing this week a lobbyist for the cannabis industry claimed that secondhand smoke isn't harmful outside. The US Environmental Protection Agency disagrees, and numerous studies are at odds with this claim.

Likewise, in a letter submitted to the City Council, a cannabis business owner stated that secondhand tobacco smoke causes cancer, while cannabis may have medicinal properties. While these statements are true, the letter omits the fact that secondhand cannabis smoke contains many of the same chemicals as secondhand tobacco smoke. By including objective information on the park signs, the City Council can help ensure that members of the public don't receive their health information from those who stand to benefit financially from smoking.

Finally, I agree that a \$300 fine is way too much for violating this ordinance. If it is not possible for the city to institute administrative citations, members of the public should be assured that a petty misdemeanor is not a crime and St. Paul landlords are prohibited from denying housing to tenants based on a petty misdemeanor record. In addition to using a modest fine as a deterrent for smoking in prohibited areas, the city could consider amending its Building and Housing Code to state that multi-unit buildings that fail to ensure that their residents follow this ordinance are nuisance properties.

Thank you for your dedication to this issue.

Sincerely,

Caroline Daykin

References:

https://data.web.health.state.mn.us/smoking_basic#~:text=Smoking%20in%20Minnesota%20over%20time&text=in%202021%2C%20about%2013%25%20of,and%20those%20that%20have%20quit

<https://www.minnpost.com/state-government/2019/11/expert-recreational-marijuana-in-minnesota-could-bring-in-300-million-in-taxes/>

[https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/outdoor-exposure-secondhand-smoke-comparable-indoors#~:text=Air%20Quality%20\(IAQ\)-,Is%20outdoor%20exposure%20to%20secondhand%20smoke%20comparable%20to%20indoors%3F,away%20as%20quickly%20as%20outdoors](https://www.epa.gov/indoor-air-quality-iaq/outdoor-exposure-secondhand-smoke-comparable-indoors#~:text=Air%20Quality%20(IAQ)-,Is%20outdoor%20exposure%20to%20secondhand%20smoke%20comparable%20to%20indoors%3F,away%20as%20quickly%20as%20outdoors)

<https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/2021-02/Tenant%20Screening%20Guidelines%20Policy%20Bulletin.pdf>

From: [Helen O'Brien](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)
Subject: 2023 09 06 City Council Public Hearing #61
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 6:05:19 PM
Attachments: [2023 09 05 City Council Public Hearing.pdf](#)

I have attached my full statement addressing agenda #61 (Order regarding rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 621 Bidwell), brought before the City Council for public hearing on September 6, 2023.

I was not able to share this statement in full even though I was in attendance with my neighbors. Our group arrived at 3:15 as directed and waited until approximately 5:30 to speak. We were not aware of the 2-minute time limit ahead of the public hearing.

Thank you for considering this written statement for your discussion of this order, held over to September 20, 2023.

Helen Wells O'Brien

From: [Cindy Kellerman](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)
Subject: Adult Public Cannabis Use
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 4:39:05 PM

Good afternoon Saint Paul City Council Members,

I have worked and lived in St. Paul for nearly all of my life. I am currently employed by a law firm in Lowertown St. Paul as their Office Manager; we represent soon to be cannabis businesses and existing low-dosage hemp businesses. I have been an advocate for legalization for over 30 years. I moved to Colorado Springs ten (10) years ago just so I could witness the cannabis industry firsthand and I obtained a license in CO to work in the cannabis industry and became a patient coordinator at two (2) different medical dispensaries. I met with over 1,0000 medical cannabis patients and spoke one-on-one with them about their life and conditions. I consider myself an expert of sorts on cannabis.

I am begging you not to overly regulate this very useful plant. I do not want to see the capital of Minnesota become a city that is anti-public use of cannabis. This especially affects the lower income people! Only people who do not own a home or who are visiting from out of town will be affected by restricting adult public use. These are some of the most stressed out people among us - we should not "target" them.

If you are not accustomed to being around cannabis, it might seem ominous to imagine that there might be a wide influx of adults consuming cannabis in public. That is not the case (...yet). For the most part, public cannabis usage will remain the same as it was before prohibition - the same people who were using cannabis before legalization will be the same people using now, and they are *not* the people who would be walking down the street smoking joints, etc. the people who are walking down the street smoking cannabis are not a threat to society in any way and should not be treated like criminals. I urge you to "wait and watch" before you start considering enacting public use restrictions -- and in all fairness, that will not happen until 2027.

Again, what you are proposing will MAINLY affect the lower income population who do not own homes in St. Paul. I have two adult children who rent smoke free apartments in St. Paul and they are forced to walk down the street simply to have a cigarette or a joint. My children are responsible users and I would be very upset if they were fined for smoking while walking down their street when there is nowhere else nearby that they can consume.

All cannabis is medicine and plants should not be illegal. I have used cannabis myself since I became an adult (I am now 50 years old) and I could not live a normal life without it because I have a qualifying medical condition and without cannabis in my life, I would not be half as productive or happy. STRESS is the #1 killer of people, and cannabis helps people stay sane - it is truly a "gift from god"! With the current mental health crisis upon us as well as the opiate crisis, we need to be especially friendly and welcoming to natural options/alternatives as possible. Cannabis is not a cure-all, and it is NOT a toxin unlike alcohol; it is a natural "medicine" that is not addictive - it heals people.

I sincerely hope the Council does not restrict adult public cannabis use before you have enough time to actually see how it will affect St. Paul. Restricting usage now sends the wrong message and it will simply perpetuate the stigma associated with cannabis. I personally have

been harmed by this stigma and I would like to see *real and meaningful* change. **Minnesota is "The North Star State" and we need to be freedom-friendly if we want to be a model to the nation - this includes adult public usage of cannabis.** If you have any questions or comments for me, I would be happy to address them with you.

Thanks so much for reading,
Cindy Christians
763-222-8530
Find me on LinkedIn [here](#)
Find me on Facebook [here](#)

From: [Adam Yust](#)
To: [Greg Weiner](#)
Subject: FW: Do not support a smoking ordinance
Date: Thursday, September 7, 2023 4:35:36 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Please add to public
record, thanks.

From: Thomas Fruen <thomas.fruen@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 7, 2023 12:33 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council <Council@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Do not support a smoking ordinance

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