From: [redacted]
Date: Tue, Aug 18, 2015 at 10:31 AM
Subject: Historic Downtown Littleton's Proposed Smoking Ban
To: bhopping@littletongov.org, bbeckman@littletongov.org, dbrinkman@littletongov.org, pcernanec@littletongov.org,pcole@littletongov.org, bstahlman@littletongov.org, jvaldes@littletongov.org

To the Members of Littleton City Council;

My name is Scott Woods and I am the General Manager at Tavern Littleton. I am writing to you to voice Tavern Littleton's opposition to repealing and replacing Chapter 10 of title 6 of the City Code pertaining to the Colorado Clean Indoor Air Act.

First, let me say that I myself am a non-smoker and have also been employed in the bar and restaurant industry since the mid 90's. I have seen firsthand the impact The Colorado Clean Indoor Air Act has had on the bar and restaurant business both positively and negatively. While I am fully behind the premise of the Colorado Clean Indoor Air Act and it's positive impact on the dining experience for my non-smoking guests, I am highly concerned and frustrated with several merchants in the Historic Downtown Littleton Area with personal grievances against other merchants urging the City Council that the law is not restrictive enough.

My first concern is for the safety of my smoking guests if a replacement ordinance is instituted as this would relegate patrons of not only Tavern Littleton but other bars and restaurants on Main Street to smoke in parking lots or alley ways. This could potentially escalate crimes such as thefts and assaults which would then drive up costs for security for the business as well as additional Littleton Police Department presence. Additionally, will the City of Littleton be taking on the additional costs of adding more lighting to the areas it deems "appropriate" for smokers to help alleviate safety concerns? It may seem like an extreme scenario, however my concern is if one of my patrons is required to smoke in a parking lot or down a poorly lit street and is assaulted or robbed, who is ultimately responsible? Is it my establishment because they are my guest or the City because they changed the law?

Councilman Hopping was quoted in the Denver Post saying "I've seen people walk around clusters of smokers on the sidewalks here and it sets up conflict. We want shoppers to be able to be free to stroll the streets and look in windows and not have to pick their way through the smokers." I must ask, what conflict is Councilman Hopping referring to? As a non-smoker I personally have never started a "conflict" with a smoker because they were smoking in a public place. I have personally walked up and down Main Street on numerous occasions shopping, at various hours of the day and the majority of the times I have encountered "clusters of smokers" is in the later evening hours when the merchants are closed. These "clusters of smokers" are typically walking to and from the restaurants and bars along Main Street and are not deterring shoppers or creating conflicts with them.

Since Tavern Littleton has opened, we have worked diligently to balance taking care of our non-smoking guests as well as our guests who smoke. We have a third of our patio dedicated as a smoking section, and it is consistently full. When we designed the area, we installed a huge wall fireplace and elevated the area to assist with preventing the cigarette smoke from wafting into the "non-smoking" area. We thoughtfully designed this area to provide a comfortable area for our guests who smoke while doing our best to protect our non-smoking guests and their dining experience.

Passing this bill would be devastating to our business as this law will drive business away from Downtown Littleton and towards other bars and restaurants down Santa Fe and to Aspen Grove. If we're really being honest, this proposed law is really an attack on bars and restaurants on Main Street and more specifically establishments with patios. No other merchants permit smoking in their stores in the first place leaving bars and restaurants as the merchants who do. While their employees may go outside and smoke in the daylight hours, it does not drive business away. The proposed change to this law overwhelmingly impacts the Main Street hospitality industry's business in a negative manner. I am not privileged to the other merchant's numbers, however, I can state that in 2014 Tavern Littleton paid over $105,000 in city taxes alone. I would think as one of

the Downtown Historic Littleton's largest merchants, something that can drastically affect our business should be of great concern to the City.

I am unsure as to who has started this initiative as the Colorado Clean Indoor Air Act has been on the books since 2006. Olde Towne Tavern opened in 2005, Ned Kelly's opened in 2009 and Tavern Littleton opened in 2011. Until recently, this has not been an issue and I am curious as to why it is now. I understand that while some merchants such as the Pottery Studio, who was quoted in the Denver Post article in favor of the repeal, other merchants such as the owner of The Willow, are not. In fact, the majority of the merchants I have spoken with seem to be against the proposed change and don't believe that smoking in Downtown Littleton is enough of an issue to change a law that would negatively impact numerous Main Street businesses.

There are numerous concerns with the proposed change to this law; The financial impact on bar and restaurant business, the segregation of a citizen the council deems as less than important then another citizen by relegating them to back alleys and parking lots and the safety of the citizens when relegated to back alleys. Additionally, the wellbeing of Downtown Littleton's overall commerce as this law will drive people away from Downtown Littleton and to other shopping and dining areas such as Aspen Grove and the Streets at Southglenn. With these overall concerns being said, my biggest concern is the impact on my business, obviously. By the proposed change limiting only Historic Downtown Littleton to this law, it can potentially damage my business while increasing business at bars just outside of the proposed area. Places like, The Castle, Dubb's Pub, Breckenridge Brewery, D's Tavern which is a mile from my front door, or Platte River Bar and Grill which is 2600 feet from my front door. How am I expected to engage in fair competition, if this proposed change potentially damages my business while potentially increasing business at these other locations, feet from my doorstep?

As the General Manager of one of Main Street's largest businesses, I urge you to please carefully consider the ramifications on businesses that this law affects, not only the business that complains about smokers being in front of their store.

I strongly urge you to vote against this proposed change. However, if the Council insists on passing these changes I ask that you make the law city wide, not just limited to Historic Downtown Littleton.

Thank you for your time.

SCOTT WOODS
GENERAL MANAGER
TAVERN LITTLETON
c (303) 638-6556
o (303) 730-7772

From the Desk of
Ann Marie Dinkel
[redacted]

August 27, 2015

Bill Hopping
District 1 Littleton City Councilman

RE: Proposed Smoking Ban

Dear Mr. Hopping:

I am a member and officer of Littleton Elks Lodge #1650, located at 5749 S. Curtice Street. We have a smoking patio for our members to use while visiting the lodge. This patio is covered to keep our members out of the weather. I am strongly against this proposed smoking ban. For the following reasons:

1. We are forcing smokers to move onto private properties in which to smoke, hence causing patrons of restaurants, taverns, and other locations to be forced to smoke in dark parking lots, on private yards, in private alleys. This causes a safety issue late at night for private residents in the area.

2. This will also affect restaurants, taverns and local bars in lost revenue, hence decreasing the tax dollars being spent in our community.

3. Littleton is trying to force a ban that would not only impact the businesses in the area, but also the city revenue in lost tax dollars.

For these reasons I ask that you please vote against the smoking ban.

Very truly yours

Ann Marie Dinkel

Ann Marie Dinkel

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Keven Kinaschuk** [redacted]
Date: Friday, August 28, 2015
Subject: Smoking Ban
To: "Bhopping@littletongov.org" <Bhopping@littletongov.org>
Cc: Keven Kinaschuk [redacted]

8/28/15

Councilman Bill
Hopping:

Thank you in advance for reading my letter.

I live in Littleton and have a business in Downtown Littleton on Main Street. It has been brought to my attention that the city has brought up a measure to ban smoking in downtown Littleton. When I first heard about the proposed smoking ban I had mixed feelings. I think all tobacco products are extremely hazardous to everyone's health and I personally would not miss the smell of cigarette smoke. Opinions aside please consider the following issues with the proposed ban:

1) How will this be enforced?
2) Why is it just Downtown Littleton targeted and not all of Littleton?

First of all I feel the city has not provided us with enough details on how this proposed ban will be enforced. When you start telling people what they can and cannot do (especially outside) people get defensive (especially people who are not law or code enforcement).

So who will enforce this? To me it looks like the business owners will be caught in the middle. I sincerely doubt that the police department will be dispatched like it is an emergency so who will be enforcing this ban… managers, owners, employees, council members or citizens? I guarantee there will be confrontations between smokers and non-smokers. On the surface it seems like a good thing to do but the reality it is going to do more harm than good to our downtown.

Secondly, **IF YOU ARE GOING TO BAN SMOKING IN LITTLETON IT SHOULD BE ALL OF LITTLETON!** It should not be targeted in one area over another. If you ban it in the Downtown area it should also be banned everywhere… open space, bike paths, residential areas, commercial areas, all of Littleton, everywhere in Littleton. This just makes the City look weak, looks bad, sends the wrong message and it makes the downtown businesses feel targeted.

Lastly the root of the problem is that people need to quit smoking. Raising the city tax on tobacco products or banning the sales of tobacco in Littleton would be the most effective way to target smokers. The city should be attacking the problem at the source rather than causing rifts between the people that live in Littleton.

A decision of this magnitude must be carefully discussed and planned with detail. The consequences and impact need to be considered carefully before implementing any "Ban" of any type. Please consider the issues in this letter and vote "No" on the proposed smoking ban.

Keven Kinaschuk

[redacted]

[redacted]

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Susan Grubb** [redacted]
Date: Thu, Aug 27, 2015 at 10:36 PM
Subject: Electronic Smoking Devices
To: "pcole@littletongov.org" <pcole@littletongov.org>

Please vote to include electronic smoking devices in the no smoking ban. The fumes from these devices are harmful.

Susan Grubb
[redacted]

Susan Grubb

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Kurt Nevergold** [redacted]
Date: Fri, Aug 28, 2015 at 6:26 AM
Subject: Electronic Smoking Devices
To: pcole@littletongov.org

Council,

I would like to express my support for the new non-smoking ordinance to include electric cigarette and vaporizers. These devices vaporize a solution of propylene glycol (petrol derivative) and nicotine was well as nearly a dozen other harmful toxins like formaldehyde which are known carcinogens. As it may appear harmless since the visible vapor dissipates quickly the toxic particulates have polluted the air we breath.

These devices have become extremely popular in the last five years. Many of the local restaurants and bars around town are now full of these devices. Many business have allowed tolerance to these devices being used indoors. This issue is grave and effects everyone equally.

Boutique smoke shops targeting these buyers have popped up all over town. Many of these shops carelessly manufacture the toxic liquids in house and are not only selling an additive product but also the propaganda that these products are 99% safe, in fact many openly advertise this! People just don't seem to have the common sense to understand that anything burned and inhaled is very dangerous to themselves and everyone around us.

These shops bring questionable people in to our quite city and has become a public nuisance.

My hope is if cities through out the Metro area start enforcement on these devices people will start to understand the dangerous nature of these products.

Please Vote in Favor of the New Non-Smoking ordinance to include electric smoking devices.

I've included a couple citation on the facts I've discussed.

Thank you for your service,

Kurt Nevergold

[redacted]

http://www.drugabuse.gov/publications/drugfacts/electronic-cigarettes-e-cigarettes

http://www.medicaldaily.com/do-e-cigarettes-have-carcinogens-french-consumer-study-finds-some-toxins-same-levels-cigarettes

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

All Positions sorted chronologically

As of October 20, 2015, 4:14 PM

As with any public comment process, participation in OpenLittleton is voluntary. The positions in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

As of October 20, 2015, 4:14 PM, this forum had:

Attendees:	113
All Positions:	80
Hours of Public Comment:	4.0

This topic started on September 4, 2015, 10:22 AM.

As with any public comment process, participation in OpenLittleton is voluntary. The positions in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

Name not available (unclaimed) October 14, 2015, 6:00 PM

I say No

Name not available (unclaimed) October 3, 2015, 4:11 PM

I say No

Bryon Schelk outside Littleton Council Districts (on forum) October 3, 2015, 2:05 PM

I say No

My name is Bryon and I do not feel these products should be in the classification as tobacco cigarettes, forcing people to use such products (which have been found to be healthier and safer than conventional cigarettes) in the same areas and under the same regulations as smoking cigarettea/cigars would be a huge step backwards in our fight to better our lives. This decision would also affect my decisions in doing business and visiting Littleton as well

---

Name not available (unclaimed) October 3, 2015, 6:00 AM

I say No

It is not smoke. Please investigate thoroughly before making any decisions please

---

Name not available (unclaimed) October 3, 2015, 3:07 AM

I say No

Kevin Price outside Littleton Council Districts (on forum) October 2, 2015, 10:59 PM

I say No

Vapor products are NOT the same as tobacco. They do contain nicotine but so does eggplant, potatoes, and several other plants yet they are not considered a tobacco product. Categorizing something with nicotine as tobacco would be the equivalent of saying that anything with caffeine in it is Soda pop, it is not logical. Vaping is allowing smokers a chance to finally quit smoking using something that is FAR less harmful and more effective than other smoking cessation methods. I am also an E-Juice manufacturer based in Littleton.

Name not available (unclaimed) October 2, 2015, 7:06 PM

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

I say No

Name not shown outside Littleton Council Districts (on forum) October 2, 2015, 7:04 PM

I say No

Vaping was designed to be vastly different from smoking cigarettes. By placing a ban on these products, you are punishing ex-smokers who were finally able to make a healthier switch in their lives. I have been cigarette free for almost two months now. Vaping has been a positive change on my life that has increased my energy, my health, and my well being. When people say vaping is a lifestyle, that's not a joke. We are a group of people that are committed to making sure everyone has the freedom to put down their cigarettes once and for all with a healthy alternative. Please do not treat us as smokers.

Name not available (unclaimed) October 2, 2015, 6:59 PM

I say No

According to Public Health England, e-cigarettes are up to 95% safer for consumers, meaning that they are that much safer for those who inhale the second hand vapor. Therefore, they should not be treated like cigarettes and cigars.

Julie Rowe outside Littleton Council Districts (unverified) October 2, 2015, 6:47 PM

I say No

E cigarettes are safer than tobacco products and should not be shunned. People who use e cigarettes are trying to better their life and find a healthier alternative for them. There is no second hand effects according to the published material and no reason to ban it.

Alanna Peel outside Littleton Council Districts (on forum) September 30, 2015, 4:35 PM

I say No

According to Public Health England, e-cigarettes are up to 95% safer for consumers, meaning that they are that much safer for those who inhale the second hand vapor. Therefore, they should not be treated like cigarettes and cigars.

Name not shown inside 3 (on forum) September 30, 2015, 12:58 PM

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 1 (on forum) September 29, 2015, 1:13 PM

I say Yes

Electronic smoking should be enjoyed in someone's personal residence.

Name not shown inside 2 (on forum) September 27, 2015, 9:11 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 1 (on forum) September 27, 2015, 8:17 AM

I say Yes

Electronic smoking devices are every bit as annoying and dangerous as smoking cigarettes, cigars, etc.

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 23, 2015, 11:41 AM

I say Yes

Electronic smoking devices should be treated in the same manner as cigarettes and cigars. Many times, it takes close inspection to distinguish and smoking regulations should be made simple.

Name not available (unclaimed) September 23, 2015, 11:29 AM

I say No

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 20, 2015, 9:15 PM

I say Yes

These devices should be regulated the same as other forms of smoking.

Name not available (unclaimed) September 19, 2015, 11:12 AM

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

I say No

Name not shown inside 2 (on forum) September 17, 2015, 5:13 AM

I say Yes

Just as it is a matter of choice to smoke, it is also a choice to not smoke. Allowing smoking in public places takes that choice (freedom) away from those who choose not to smoke. Keep all smoking restricted to designated areas. This is a logical compromise preserving everyone's freedom of choice.

Name not available (unclaimed) September 17, 2015, 5:03 AM

I say Yes

Just as it is a matter of choice to smoke, it is also a choice to not smoke. Allowing smoking of whatever kind in public areas takes the choice (or freedom) of not smoking way from those who choose not to. Keep all smoking restricted to designated smoking areas. It is a logical compromise preserving everyone's freedom of choice.

Name not shown inside 3 (on forum) September 16, 2015, 2:52 PM

I say No

Name not available (unclaimed) September 16, 2015, 9:57 AM

I say No

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 16, 2015, 8:15 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 3 (on forum) September 15, 2015, 10:53 PM

I say Yes

Name not available (unclaimed) September 15, 2015, 7:26 PM

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

I say Yes

Alana Dylan inside 3 (on forum) September 12, 2015, 11:55 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 1 (on forum) September 12, 2015, 9:18 AM

I say Yes

Lindsay Haas inside 1 (on forum) September 11, 2015, 4:21 PM

I say No

Name not available (unclaimed) September 10, 2015, 9:26 PM

I say Yes

It's a nasty habit and we are not teaching our children to avoid smoking by acting like e-cigarettes are not bad for you. Get rid of them too!

Name not available (unclaimed) September 10, 2015, 9:24 PM

I say Yes

Anyone that thinks electronic smoking devices are solving the cigarette and cigar smoke issues is in denial. It's just another way to ignore what smoking does to second hand citizens.

Name not shown inside 2 (on forum) September 10, 2015, 8:01 PM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 10, 2015, 4:10 PM

I say Yes

The vapor could be harmful to babies and the elderly. My daughter has asthma and it's hard enough fighting all the other pollutants that set it off. For the sake of those of us that have a hard time breathing..., yes.

Name not available (unclaimed) September 10, 2015, 12:51 PM

I say Yes

Name not available (unclaimed) September 10, 2015, 9:02 AM

I say Yes

Smoke is smoke from e-cigarette/electronic cigarette/vapor pen. These products are sold as an alternative to cigarettes and should be treated as such, cigarettes. Those of us who choose not to smoke or be around smoke should not be subject to it in public places unless otherwise designated as a smoking area. I don't want to have to move in the middle of dinner b/c some starts up a smoking devise.
My Aunt has lung cancer and she never smoked a day in her life - she grew up in home with two smokers. No second hand cancer for me thank you!

Name not available (unclaimed) September 10, 2015, 8:05 AM

I say No

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 10, 2015, 4:23 AM

I say No

I am beginning to be very disappointed in this community. You don't want people to smoke so you try to make laws to stop them. Then when they attempt to quit by trying a different product you shut them down with more laws and give them no options.

If you have not done your own research on this type of product then you probably shouldn't be voicing an opinion until you do some research. Just because e-cigarettes appear to be the same as tobacco-cigarettes does not mean that they are the same. If you are more inclined to believe the fear mongering and histrionics then you should probably just go and empty your medicine cabinets, pantries, and bathrooms, because you are most probably already using and consuming the same ingredients that are used in e-cigarettes (except, maybe, for the nicotine - but not all e-cigs contain nicotine). Water, flavorings, vegetable glycerin and/or propylene glycol are very likely lurking around your house in far more products than you would ever believe. But just because they are put together in this form you appear to believe it must be dangerous. Propylene glycol is probably the most scary sounding but no, it is not the same as ethylene glycol, and yes, it is probably in your shampoo, toothpaste, perfume, lotion, deodorant, salad dressing, cookies, and even your beer, and far more. It

has also been used in asthma inhalers for over 50 years. The FDA and WHO both regard it as "Generally Recognized As Safe" for Human consumption.

Also, please recognize that most people who are using e-cigarettes are extremely cognizant of the effects of real cigarette smoke upon those around them. That is more than likely one of the major reasons they are using the e-cigs. They are trying to be conscientious of non-smokers and trying and alleviate those effects. Why is it necessary to slap them for wanting to be better neighbors?

I am truly disappointed that it appears Littleton wants to go down this road.

Please do your own research. Avoid the fear-mongerers, look for reasonable information, and don't just accept the vilification of something by others as reason for you to vilify it as well.

Let's get over this, we have far bigger fish to kill - like the horrible "The Grove" proposal at Main and Bemis, and the terrible "Sullivan Lofts" proposed for S. Rapp Street.

Name not shown inside 3 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 8:54 PM

I say Yes

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 8:52 PM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 6:21 PM

I say Yes

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 4:38 PM

I say Yes

As per recent studies by UC Riverside and UCSF, it is shown that there is not only First Hand, but up to Third Hand dangers with the vapors from electronic devices.

7 things you need to know about ecigs | Al Jazeera America:
http://america.aljazeera.com/watch/shows/techknow/blog/2013/11/5/-techknow-need-toknow7thingstoknowaboutelectroniccigarettes.html

A few years ago Aljazeera did the exposé linked below. More recently a new piece was done with the UC

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

Riverside study that is not available on line yet.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WtM6m8rnuW4&index=5&list=PLTrL9Pkswi3jnI9LJinTY1lDKWj0vwTVN

UCR Today: Graduate Students Participate in Workshop on Electronic Cigarettes and Public Health:
http://ucrtoday.ucr.edu/26738

Name not shown inside 2 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 3:16 PM

I say No

No. These devices are not a problem and the city does not need to impose additional restrictions on people spending time downtown.

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 3:07 PM

I say No

The hard part about living in a free society is respecting the preferences and behaviors of people other than ourselves, but if you don't then you can't expect anyone to respect yours. I do not use tobacco, marijuana, or e-cigs, but it's offensive to me that we would consider banning something just because we don't partake of it or understand it.

Name not shown inside 2 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 2:55 PM

I say Yes

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 2:55 PM

I say Yes

The act of smoking, whether it is smoke or some other vapor-content, is unhealthy and offensive. There is no control on the content, strength and/or type of substance used in the e-cigarette. Vaporing is simply another method to mask the delivery of chemicals to the body and should be regulated to a user's private personage away from the public.

Name not shown inside 1 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 2:18 PM

I say Yes

I enjoy good clean air and don't want another form of pollution.

Name not shown inside 3 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 2:06 PM

I say Yes

E-cigarettes are virtually the same as the other forms of smoking.

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 1:56 PM

I say No

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 12:11 PM

I say Yes

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 12:03 PM

I say Yes

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 12:02 PM

I say Yes

We would not go to a restaurant that had smoking of any kind.

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 11:36 AM

I say Yes

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 11:36 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 2 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 11:35 AM

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 1 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 10:48 AM

I say No

Name not shown inside 2 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 10:29 AM

I say Yes

As others have noted, the health effects are not known; let's err on the side of caution and regulate them like cigarettes and cigars. I've been in bars where they are not prohibited and the clouds of "harmless" vapor smelled unpleasantly like actual cigarette smoke. Completely ruined the taste of the chicken wings.

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 10:23 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 10:19 AM

I say Yes

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 10:10 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 1 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 10:01 AM

I say Yes

The cigarette/e-cigarette issue is so minor, when there are bigger issues to address, so I say yes, just to take this off the table so we can move on to things that really matter.

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 9:58 AM

I say No

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 9:55 AM

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

I say No

Name not shown inside 4 (unverified) September 9, 2015, 9:49 AM

I say Yes

Full testing of electronic cigarettes has not been completed therefore the effects of 2nd hand smoking is not known. Therefore, a ban of all cigarette smoking should be passed and enforced.

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 9:43 AM

I say Yes

Betty Harris inside 2 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 9:42 AM

I say No

This kind of pollution is minor compared to all the cars that belch all kinds of pollutants that cause all manner of health issues... so this is a waste of effort if we are on the other hand trying to encourage more and more people to live in this small town bringing with them their cars to pollute the air in greater quantities. Focus on the big issues first. Provide incentives for the smaller issues.

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 9:41 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 1 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 9:41 AM

I say Yes

Yes - there haven't been enough studies to show that electronic devices aren't harmful to bystanders. Until there is more evidence to prove their safety, these devices should be treated the same as conventional cigarettes and pipes. Even small amounts of carcinogens can have big health impacts.

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 9:36 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 3 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 9:34 AM

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

I say No

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 9:32 AM

I say Yes

I think smoking of all cigarettes should be allowed outside in public areas.

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 9:29 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown outside Littleton Council Districts (on forum) September 9, 2015, 9:28 AM

I say Yes

Electronic cigarettes/smoking devices should be treated in the same manner as regular cigarettes as the effects of 1st/2nd hand exposure have not been scientifically proven to not be harmful, and therefore users should be required to follow the same rules as smokers.

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 9:25 AM

I say No

Name not available (unclaimed) September 9, 2015, 9:24 AM

I say Yes

Porter Lansing inside 1 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 9:21 AM

I say No

These devices are benign and exhibit no disruption or distraction to my downtown experience.

Name not shown inside 3 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 8:49 AM

Poll: Regulation of Electronic Smoking Devices?

Should the City of Littleton regulate electronic smoking devices by prohibiting them from the same places as cigarettes and cigars?

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 8:25 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown outside Littleton Council Districts (on forum) September 9, 2015, 7:22 AM

I say Yes

Name not shown inside 4 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 6:00 AM

I say Yes

My preference would be to ban all smoking all together, including electronic cigarettes.

Name not shown inside 2 (on forum) September 9, 2015, 5:23 AM

I say Yes

Littleton

Wendy Heffner <wheffner@littletongov.org>

Fwd: hello

1 message

Peggy Cole <pcole@littletongov.org> Mon, Oct 26, 2015 at 7:44 PM
To: Wendy Heffner <wheffner@littletongov.org>
Cc: Monica MCKENNA <mamckenna29@msn.com>

City Clerk Heffner,

Please include Monica McKenna's email in the public record for the second reading on the proposed ordinance on smoking scheduled for Nov. 3, 2015.

Thank you.

Peggy Cole
Council Member at Large

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Monica MCKENNA** <mamckenna29@msn.com>
Date: Mon, Oct 26, 2015 at 6:01 PM
Subject: hello
To: "pcernanec@littletongov.org" <pcernanec@littletongov.org>, "bbeckman@littletongov.org" <bbeckman@littletongov.org>, "brinkman@littletongov.org" <brinkman@littletongov.org>, "pcole@littletongov.org" <pcole@littletongov.org>, "bhopping@littletongov.org" <bhopping@littletongov.org>, "bstahlman@littletongov.org" <bstahlman@littletongov.org>, "jvaldes@littletongov.org" <jvaldes@littletongov.org>

I would like to support an ordinance to add

electronic smoking devices to Littleton's existing smoke-free policy and
create a some-free outdoor area in front of businesses on Main St in Downtown Littleton..

I was at a Bronco game when a man in front of us pulled out an electronic smoking device..There was smoke all over us and it was so bad to have all the smoke around us and that we had to inhale it..
Thank heavens, the usher saw this and immediately had the man put it away..

I do not like to walk down streets in Littleton and smell smoke .A smoke free area in front of businesses would make for a healthy city and I would shop downtown more often.

Thank you for your time

Monica Mckenna

Littleton

Colleen Norton <cnorton@littletongov.org>

Fw: Littleton Action Alert Reminder for the Public Hearing - smoking

1 message

Peggy Cole [redacted] Fri, Oct 30, 2015 at 12:52 PM
To: cccn@littletongov.org

Colleen,

Please include the following message in the official record for the next Council meeting's public hearing on downtown smoking.

Peggy

—— Original Message ——
From: [redacted]
To: Peggy Cole
Cc: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 9:46 PM
Subject: FW: Littleton Action Alert Reminder for the Public Hearing - smoking

Hi, Peggy,

I really want this to pass. Charlie worked with this guy on smoking issues for many years. It was a sad irony that Charlie put together the coalition that passed the smoking ordinance in Littleton only to be felled by lung cancer (he never smoked but a lot of people around him did).

Can you tell me what you think about the chances of this passing? Do you know what might up the odds &/or where everyone on council stands? I also want to be at your combined victory party but maybe I can do both.

Gloria

*** *If the people lead, the leaders will follow* ***

From: Pete Bialick [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 10:49 AM
To: undisclosed-recipients:
Subject: Littleton Action Alert Reminder for the Public Hearing

This is a reminder to please contact the city council to support the proposed ordinance to further restrict smoking in public places and include electronic cigarettes (e-cigs). The vape industry and militant vapors were at the last hearing so it is important that the council hear a lot of support. **If you are planning to talk at the hearing, please let me know (reply to this email and include your phone number in case I do not have it).** GASP is working with the Tri-County Health department and helping mobilize our Littleton supporters.

Here's the alert once again in case you do not have it.

Take Action - We Need Your Voice to Reduce Secondhand Smoke in Littleton!

On Tuesday, November 3, 2015 at 6:30pm

Littleton City Council will hold a ***Public Hearing*** and ***City Council Will Vote*** on an ordinance to:

- Add electronic smoking devices to Littleton's existing smoke-free policy, and
- Create a smoke-free outdoor area in front of businesses on Main Street in Downtown Littleton

We Need YOU to Attend on November 3rd to Voice and Show Your Support to City Council in Favor of a Stronger Smoke-Free Ordinance

***When*:** **6:30 pm, Tuesday, November 3rd**

***Where*:** **Council Chambers, Littleton Center, 2255 West Berry Avenue**

***Why*:** **City Council Needs to See and Hear from Littleton Residents who support a stronger smoke-free ordinance for a healthier Littleton community - Your Attendance is Important!**

(Council didn't pass the ordinance at a prior hearing because of strong attendance by opponents.)

Tips: When speaking, focus on the health issue; tell a personal story in your own words of why you favor smoke-free policies; be positive, courteous, calm and concise.
Everyone attending can sign in to show support. It's best for speakers to limit comments to 2-4 minutes each.

What you can do now, before November 3rd: Contact City Council members to express your support for strengthening Littleton's smoke-free ordinance. You can email Council Members anytime (include all contacts in your email) or call them (at reasonable hours):

	Phone	*E-mail*
Phil Cernanec, Mayor	720-254-6097	pcernanec@littletongov.org
Bruce Beckman	303-347-9141	bbeckman@littletongov.org
Debbie Brinkman	720-224-1314	dbrinkman@littletongov.org
Peggy Cole	303-795-9552	pcole@littletongov.org
Bill Hopping	303-809-3053	bhopping@littletongov.org
Bruce Stahlman	720-987-7955	bstahlman@littletongov.org
Jerry Valdes	303-794-6475	jvaldes@littletongov.org

Why Support a Stronger Smoke-Free Ordinance in Littleton?
Talking Points FOR the Nov. 3rd Littleton City Council Meeting:

- State that you live in Littleton - If applicable; say you represent a larger group of Littleton residents. Give number of group members, if possible.

- State that you **SUPPORT** the ordinance. **Tell your personal story or experience of why you favor smoke-free policies - this can be very persuasive.**

- State that you're more likely to visit downtown businesses and restaurants if Main Street is smoke-free outdoors and e-cigarette smoking is also prohibited.

- Other Colorado cities with smoke-free outdoor downtown area laws include Golden and Fort Collins.

- 85% of Arapahoe County adults do not smoke (CDC).

- Other Colorado cities that include electronic smoking devices in smoke-free

laws are Greeley, Brighton, Thornton, Lakewood, Arvada, and Golden.

- Electronic smoking devices emit toxic chemicals and are not regulated for safety.

- Electronic smoking devices can conceal public use of marijuana and other drugs.

- The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported in April 2015 that use of e-cigarettes by middle-school and high school students tripled from 2013 to 2014, the largest increase in use since tracking began in 2011.

- Let's help prevent youth from becoming smokers and e-cigarette users by including electronic cigarettes in Littleton's existing smoke-free law.

For additional information about secondhand aerosols from elect ronic smoking devices and to provide an e-mail for future alerts visit gaspforair.org

Pete Bialick, President

GASP of Colorado

(Group to Alleviate Smoking Pollution)

2400 Central Avenue Suite A3
Boulder CO 80301-2843

303-444-9799

Donations to GASP of Colorado are very important and support our programs and activities. Credit card donations can be made at http://www.gaspforair.org/gasp/order/donate.php

Visit GASP's Great Web Sites

gaspforair.org

mysmokefreehousing.org

mysmokefreehousing.com

denversmokefreeliving.org

breathcolorado.org

Littleton

Colleen Norton <cnorton@littletongov.org>

Fw: Temp move and Smoking Ordinance

1 message

Peggy Cole [redacted] Mon, Nov 2, 2015 at 1:00 PM
To: cccn@littletongov.org

Hi Colleen,

Please include this message for the public hearing on the smoking ordinance tomorrow night.

Peggy

----- Original Message -----
From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, November 01, 2015 10:40 PM
Subject: Temp move and Smoking Ordinance

Hi Peggy,

[personal comments deleted].
Do think it has been wise to get further input and am standing by hoping there will be a most favorable response in favor of ordinance! Let us pray ...
In meantime, plan on being at Thurs eve's alumni mt at this point. It's way out yonder here unlike being right across from City so we'll see just the same.

[personal comments deleted]

Mary E. Manley
Aging Services Specialist
[redacted]