

## Comments Received on Proposed Tobacco Ban

Total comments received at [smokefree@clackamas.edu](mailto:smokefree@clackamas.edu) : 32

### Demographics:

Staff: 11

Faculty: 16

Student: 5

### Results

Those who support: 15

Oppose: 13

Concerns about enforcement: 2

Informational/other: 2

### Comments supporting proposed ban

I am in full support of a campus wide ban on smoking. There is miriad data indicating the risks of 2nd hand smoke, and even with signs to request that no one smokes within 25 feet of a door, the request is frequently not honored. The ban would solve that problem and if people choose to smoke in their own vehicle, then they have that option.

---

I think going smoke free is a great idea. I have taught stop-smoking classes for Willamette Falls Hospital in the past. I'd be happy to assist with any activities we decide to offer students in terms of smoking cessation.

---

I think we have reached the point in time to join on to the smoke free list of institutions, I base my opinion on the current financial costs related to the cleanup after smokers, construction of shelters and policing costs as well as all the attempts that have been made to deal with the issue over many years.

The Colleges current financial situation requires a focus on the allocation of funds to support fundamental priorities and smoking is not one of those priorities.

I think the effort to work with staff & students is fine but it should not delay making the final decision on this issue now.

---

Thank you very much for considering a smoke-free campus.

In addition to the serious hazards of heart and lung illness from second hand smoke, there are other health issues.

My mother died from smoking at age 49; I was 13. As a child, I suffered from frequent migraines from the second-hand smoke in our house, in our car, on our patio, etc. My headaches ceased when she died.

Now, in middle-age, I am starting to get those migraines again every time I am in the vicinity of smokers.

While I can usually avoid this because so few public places allow smoking, I run into it far too often as I make my way past the groups of smokers at the shelter placed near the Dye and Streeter entrances. If there are more than a few smokers, the groups spread out onto the walkways and nearby benches.

I hope that you will decide to eliminate smoking on campus, but if you don't might the shelters be placed in lower-traffic locations?

---

It's time for Clackamas to designate the campus smoke-free.

---

I am in favor of a smoke-free campus!

---

I think it makes good sense to eliminate smoking from an institution that is about health, change, education and sustainability.

---

Wow, this is the best idea! Second hand smoke is a known killer, and the cabanas are not being respected. What to do next about the spatters?

---

I am strongly in favor of a smoke-free campus. The sooner the better!

---

I fully support the decision to go smoke free!

---

I think it is a great idea to go smoke free! I think it will save us money in the long run, improve our environment, and help increase the health of both our student body and our faculty and staff, and perhaps lower our health insurance costs in the long run.

---

I tried to find a place the other day; a place on campus where I would not have to breathe in the poisonous stench of the cigarette addicts. But no matter how I tried to position myself upwind of the horrible poisons emanating from said addicts, either the wind would shift or another smoker would position themselves upwind from me. This occurs all over campus even though the college has created special smoking pods for these addicts to use. By using the designated smoking pods, this would be too much like showing respect for their fellow citizens. And even with the pods in place the smell is horrific within 50 feet or so of that area and the smokers throw cigarette butts down randomly, and spit everywhere in the vicinity of the smoking pods. The facility maintenance workers on campus have even had to tape off the smoking pod area around one of the nice iron sculptures because otherwise the smokers sit on the art, throw their butts all over on the art, and even spit up their tar and phlegm on this work of art.

Some of the aforementioned behavior can be found on most any college campus but is even more disheartening on our campus due to the complete lack of enforcement of the no smoking outside of the designated area rules. The no smoking enforcement is in fact nonexistent and the cigarette addicts roam the campus at will, lighting up where ever they damn well please. The campus has become a safe haven for the underage smokers from Oregon City High School, the GED Program, and as well any underage cigarette addict who knows that the de-facto policy of the college is non enforcement. This would not be an issue of concern but for the fact that secondhand smoke has deadly health consequences for those of us who are forced to breathe this poison against our will.

The current Surgeon General's Report concluded that scientific evidence indicates that there is no risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke. Short exposures to secondhand smoke can

cause blood platelets to become stickier, damage the lining of blood vessels, decrease coronary flow velocity reserves, and reduce heart rate variability, potentially increasing the risk of heart attack.

Thanks for hearing my concerns and have a great week,

---

I am a non-smoker, and I think cigarettes are nasty. I don't enjoy secondhand smoke, I disdain the butts littered across the ground, and as an advisor, I especially don't appreciate when students sit down with me after having smoked a cigarette and reek of chemicals and burnt plant matter.

That being said, when I initially learned that CCC was intending to ban smoking, I was mortified. This was, yet, another occasion for an institution of power to impinge its value system on to others. What business of the schools is it to mediate our vices? Yes, cigarettes are addictive and terribly unhealthy, but who doesn't entertain some form of detrimental addiction? Fried and processed foods? Hydrogenated oils? Coffee? Wine? Negative attitudes? All of these have a causal relationship to health problems and cost taxpayers millions every year to treat their resulting ailments.

Regarding the issue of secondhand smoke, since CCC constructed the smoking cabanas, or as I call them, *shame shacks*, I have yet to even walk through a cloud of smoke. The problem, in my observation, had been contained to a level of reasonable satisfaction for all parties.

This was fine and good, and I had my picket sign cocked and loaded, ready to advocate on behalf of the smokers as one who valued civil liberties over institutional holier-than-thou policy reform by those determined, so unassumingly, to protect us from ourselves.

All of this changed when I was playing a show in Boise, Idaho several months ago. The bar was filled with smoke, and I had to choke my way through three hours of music, two nights in a row, and then spend the day after with an inflamed respiratory system, scratchy eyes, and foul smelling clothes. Somewhere between the rolling papers and the tobacco, manufacturers found reasons to add nicotine, tar, carbon monoxide, along with some formaldehyde, ammonia, hydrogen cyanide, arsenic, and DDT for good measure. It was that morning I decided cigarettes, in their current 599 ingredient form, ought be banished from the face of the Earth, and any policy that concerns itself with making them more difficult to use would win my favor.

So, smokers... apologies, but I must withdraw my support for your cause on all fronts. No disrespect intended, and I still love ya, but I've expanded my scope of civil liberties to include protection for my personal health as a result of your emissions. It's clear to me now that until we globally demonize those little Freud sticks, no red state dive bar employee will be privy to their pursuit of happiness, and nor will the band. Please pardon me for aligning myself with the ranks of those who veto your lifestyle choice in the name of preserving their schema of your wellbeing.

---

I LOVE this idea! As a nurse who teaches one class a term out there, I see so many younger people smoking and I know what it does to their lungs as well as to others' as they breathe in the smoke. I also see all the cigarette butts nearby where smokers have been. I would welcome CCC becoming smoke-free with great cheers!!!!

---

I am an instructor on the Oregon City Campus with an office in the Pauling Science Center (PSC). There is a campus "Designated Smoking Area" approximately 50 feet from my office window. Before this "Area" was established and continuing on to today-- here is what happens. The faculty office complex of the PSC seems to maintain a negative pressure in its HVAC system. Therefore, when any window within the center is opened, air is drawn in from outside. I cannot open my window (even a small crack) without the smoke entering my office and the

building. I do not open the window during the "break time" for employees in the Roger Rook building, as the smoke filters across the walkway and into my office.

Bottom Line. I am in favor of making this college fully "SMOKE FREE".

Thanks and my vote is:

---



---

### **Comments opposing proposed ban**

First off-I am NOT a smoker, hate smoking, and the smoke can cause me to have mild asthma attack.

But despite that, I feel that smokers have rights. We have smoking cabanas now and they are working well for me. I know their locations and can avoid them, and thus avoid the smoke. The cabanas are located in out of the way sites which have not infringed on me at all. We have a number of employees and students who smoke. If you make a campus ban, they WILL continue by trying to find inconspicuous sites to smoke in, and then drop their butts there.

Let them have their cabanas. I am for it.

---

I don't smoke, never have. But the paranoia surrounding second hand smoke has far outpaced reality here, I believe. These folks are stationed out in shelters away from building entrances with tons of room to walk clear of. If someone thinks this situation still endangers non-smokers lives, get a grip, or better yet, a therapist! Now go out in your car, get real close to the car in front of you and realize that at least 70% of that vapor your air vent intakes are sucking up is super heated unburned, carcinogenic gasoline that these horribly inefficient engines don't even burn, and that the closer you get the more of that you breath. So if you really want to address CANCER, let's just abolish GASOLINE CARS. Good luck - it's only reality.

---

I personally feel that imposing this ban on all campus property is a violation of personal freedom. It will cost my department students if they are placed in a hardship because the college bans smoking. They will need longer breaks to go to their cars to smoke which essentially defeats the purpose of banning tobacco on campus. The faculty will not be enforcing this ban. Students that are in violation will have an addition hardship on them if they are cited. Why are you even considering this. Why must you control other people's lives. Leave them alone. It is sufficient to not allow smoking in or near buildings.

---

As a non-smoker who is married to an ex-smoker, I know how difficult quitting is. Quitting puts a huge strain on the one trying to quit and on those associated with that one. I oppose the ban because students who smoke are under particular stress already; the ban will only add to their stress. It seems to me that the present compromise--restricting smoking to the designated areas--is more helpful, since it responds to the concerns of non-smokers while not making things terribly strenuous to smokers.

As an instructor, I want my students ready for class, and focused, and participating. And some of my best students are smokers. Because smoking is a chemical addiction, their brains, when they haven't had a smoke, aren't in the best of condition. Another reason I don't support a smoking ban is that the intellectual environment of the classroom will be reduced, even if only by a small amount.

I told this to a dean (not my division's), and I think he thought I was joking. I'm not. I can think right off the bat of one student who had a magnificent insight into Shakespeare's OTHELLO, an insight that I still teach to this day to other students. Would he have been able to have that insight if he hadn't had his fix at the break? Obviously I don't know for sure, but I have had experience with what a smoker goes through when either trying to quit or when deprived of the fix. And that smoker can't focus as well.

I don't see that the danger from secondhand smoke is so great (when that smoke is confined to the smoking areas) that it's worth further alienating a significant student and employee population. We're all aware of the need to enhance student retention and to make students feel welcome and connected to the college, but a smoking ban sends an opposing message: "what you do is so dangerous to us that we don't want you here." There's no question that smoking IS dangerous enough to warrant a degree of segregation. But a complete ban is more segregation than is needed, and it alienates people. I want those people here, contributing to my classes and college.

---

What a crock of \$%!T The college spends taxpayers' dollars putting up all these new designated smoking areas and now we are just going to come along a few years later and remove them??? We are stewards of the taxpayers monies and should not be wasting any which I believe this proposed action would demonstrate...

---

The ability to smoke is a significant personal freedom for those addicted to tobacco (a product that is legal to purchase and use in Oregon). As personally detrimental and obnoxious as smoking may be, the college should have tangible reason to believe that our current restrictions on smoking are inadequate to protect the health of non-smokers before a blanket ban is put in place.

---

Seems an unnecessary cruelty to me. We already have them out back behind the buildings, with a minimal shelter against the elements! Good heavens. Any second hand smoke is dissipated before it reaches another set of lungs.

Talk about treating people as second-class citizens!

---

As a smoker I'm barely allowed to smoke at all, yet i pay out higher level of the tax. Isn't the smoking area designated outside enough restriction. At least stand out in the rain and elements s better than being banned in your car where all the smoke is trapped do the poor ventilation in the car - harming the very people are trying to "protect" or inspire to quit.

Smokers aren't allowed in bars restaurants, buildings', outside of building with proximity of a structure.....do we really have to go farther....after all most non-smokers wont stand anywhere near a smoker any way...treating us more like second class citizens is plenty.

---

I do not support a smoke free campus - though I will abide by it. I know the mess some smokers leave behind is atrocious: spit, trash in the ash trays and butts on the ground are a pain to remove. I did hear that the Rook smoking area is not a good location as the smell gets into the building. So if we remain with the kiosks that should be removed.

---

In the beggining I was in support of going smoke free. I feel like having designated smoking areas has helped the campus environment tremendously, but being smoke free would be even better.

My one concern has changed my mind, however. I fear that this ban will increase smoking in the parking lots, and non smokers will have to go back to walking through the second hand smoke, where as now they can choose to avoid the designated smoking areas and thereby avoid the second hand smoke.

How much patrolling and enforcement would happen in the parking lots? My assumption is, not a lot. Not by fault of anyone, but the resources just don't exist.

I feel that the smoking situation on campus is far better for nonsmokers then it was before the designated smoking areas came to be, and if it remains the way it is now, I will remain happy.

---

I'm a straight A student with perfect attendance. I've got spectacularly white teeth. I'm a healthy twenty something. I have no debt. I've got no drug or alcohol problems. And I'm a smoker. Quite frankly I've got a huge problem with a completely smoke free campus. I'm well aware of the health issues that come along with smoking tobacco. I'm not stupid. I'm also an adult who is perfectly capable of making my own decisions. I'm tired of people trying to make them for me using the tired old "smoking kills" excuse. So does car exhaust and McDonalds, but I'm not seeing anyone making such a big hubub over them, let alone having them banned. If you don't like it, avoid it, duh! That's why you've already got us tucked into back corners. I can no longer walk down the street, sit in a park, go to my HOLE IN THE WALL SKEEZY TRUCKER DIVE BAR and smoke. I can't even smoke in my own home. And now you want to take my less than 3 by 4 foot taped off square away too? When will this discrimination stop? We smokers are already taxed up the wazzoo and forced into what few smoking corners we have left and constantly bitched at for our life styles. I'm sick of people trying to force their views onto me. Offering to "help me quit"? NEWS FLASH! Some of us don't want to quit and have no intentions to do so, and trying to shame us into it isn't going to change that. So please step out side of your own personal ideals and consider our side for a change, almost like we're human beings of something. Thanks for at least reading what I have to say before immediately deleting this . . . if you even got this far.

---

I'm definitely a non-smoker and I can't abide the smell of smoke. However, I am concerned for the students who are deeply addicted, and I feel they will suffer during the day. People who need a smoke can't concentrate well on their studies, and this will affect how well they do in their studies. It is a small percentage of the population who needs to smoke, and it's not fair to them to have the majority dictate. With nowhere at all to go on campus, it's true that a few will manage to quit. Others, however, may resort to Copenhagen or other kinds of snoose, which is even more addictive than cigarettes. I witnessed this when I was teaching at a high school. Furthermore, snoose is really nasty when you lean over to take a drink and find it in the drinking fountains.

Leave the poor folks alone. They're already outside in the cold.

---

Please don't do this. Please,

---

### **Other**

While I prefer and laud the idea of a smoke-free campus, how will enforcement be handled? I can't imagine this will be an easy task.

---

I thought I should weigh in on this topic after an experience I had last night at the November Far Southwest Portland Neighborhood Association meeting (Far Southwest is the neighborhood around PCC Sylvania). I regularly attend this meeting as I live in the neighborhood and my wife is an officer in the Neighborhood Association (NA).

It is two months into the PCC 100% ban on smoking on campus. About a dozen neighbors had contacted the NA since the last meeting asking for a hearing because they were concerned about the scores of students who were milling about the campus entrances and gates, and overflowing into the neighborhood, to smoke. Neighbors felt the college had pushed the problem of smoking off of campus and into the neighborhood; they were very upset and felt that PCC actions were threatening the health and safety of residents and livability of the neighborhood. The neighbors reported, and public safety officials confirmed, increases of littering, property theft, car prowls, and drug dealing within the neighborhood nearby the college and, since PCC charges for parking on campus, there has also been an increase in parking violations as smokers have "discovered" nearby neighborhoods are also a convenient place to park for free.

One neighborhood man, who lives next to the campus, summed up the problem this way. A smoker has three choices: stop smoking, and if unable to do this, to smoke on campus or smoke off campus. Since the college was enforcing its smoking ban on campus, and since Oregon has banned smoking in bars and restaurants, those smokers who cannot quit, have to leave campus to smoke; thus forcing the smokers to smoke on this neighbor's cul-de-sac. He reported upwards of 50 smokers at a time puffing away on the street outside his home, and an increase in litter and suspicious (probably drug-related) activity. He supported the aims of the college in promoting a healthy environment, but still, wisely I think, advocated against the 100% ban, saying it is too stringent, forces smokers to move into areas where they are not welcomed (but are legally allowed), and asked for a repeal of the 100% ban. He supported creating a designated smoking area on campus away from common traffic areas and for strict enforcement to corral smokers into this area; all of the neighbors supported his plan. The neighbors strongly advocated for a solution which respects the needs of addicted smokers and of the neighborhood. The PCC official who was at the meeting took notes of the recommendation and plans to present it to the smoking task force at PCC.

If PCC wants to maintain a positive relationship with the neighbors, and I believe it does, I think PCC will have to acknowledge that a 100% ban has created a significant problem in the neighborhood. If it hopes to appease the neighbors, PCC will have to move to less than a 100% ban. This is a good lesson for CCC to pay attention to; a 100% ban here at CCC will create problems with smoking in the neighborhood around CCC and will create conflict between the college and the community.

---

I have noticed smokers smoking under the overhang at the back of the Bookstore, by the Niemeyer entrance across from the back entrance of the Bookstore, and along the parking lot

side of the Niemeyer building. How is a smoking ban going to work if we still have smokers smoking in undesignated places?

---