PROPOSED REGULATIONS - ON SITE CONSUMPTION
Comments Received During Public Comment Period
July 13, 2016 through August 22, 2016

Date Received	Comment Submitted By	Organization	Section Addressed	Comment to be Considered	**Changes Made Based on Comment** (change made / no change)
8/1/2016	Kathryn McKee	Meadow Lakes	306.365	As a victim of secondhand cigarette smoke who recently was diagnosed with "mild emphysema" due to growing up with heavy smokers in my home, and also as someone who grew up around a lot of pot smoking as a teenager in the '70s, I believe it's very easy for innocent bystanders to be harmed by secondhand marijuana smoke -- even if they aren't in the same room as the smoker. It's my understanding that smoke can travel under doors, between walls through cracks, and through vents in buildings. So unless the retail outlet is not connected to another business, the store or restaurant or child care facility nearby could actually get some of that pot smoke and I'm guessing not everyone in those nearby spaces will appreciate that. This issue goes way beyond "personal freedom" for the smoker. We should be more concerned about the health and liberty to breathe clean air of those unwittingly exposed to the pot smoke. Whether it's just an uncomfortable "contact high" or something as serious as lung cancer or COPD, no one should have to put up with someone else's addiction or recreational use of marijuana. This also goes for the business' employees who do not smoke themselves. Why should they be subjected to a substance that could be harming them simply because they work there? Finally, when Ballot Measure 2 was passed, it clearly stated that public consumption of marijuana would not be permitted. Why is the Marijuana Control Board continuing to "re-interpret" those regulations after voters submitted their ballots in good faith? Please don't let the powerful pot lobby win this one with their multi-million dollar smoke and mirrors campaigns.	**oppose**
8/2/2016	Jennifer Brandt		306.365	My name is Jennifer Brandt, I am writing to you today as a concerned parent and citizen. I would like to respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana in licensed retail operations. I oppose the public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized for several reasons. I am particularly concerned with the aspect of second hand smoke from marijuana. The American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, & Air Conditioning Engineers stated in a 2010 position document "At present, the only means of effectively eliminating health risks associated with indoor exposure is to ban smoking activity". Even high quality ventilation systems will not prevent marijuana smoke or aerosol from moving from the consumption area to other parts of the retail store or the building they may be in. And second hand marijuana smoke contains many of the same cancer-causing substances and toxic chemicals as second hand tobacco smoke which could exacerbate health problems, including people with respiratory conditions like asthma, bronchitis or COPD. Everyone has the right to breath clean air! Ballot Measure 2 was CLEAR, the public consumption of marijuana was intended to remain illegal. Thank yo for your consideration on this matter! Regards, Jennifer Brandt	**oppose**
8/2/2016	Diana Redwood		306.365	Dear Mr. Samaniego, I would like to submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I am a lifelong Alaskan who voted yes for Alaska's new marijuana law. However, I am opposed to the public consumption of smoked marijuana. This would erode our wonderful smokefree indoor air law in Anchorage, which protects the health of workers in shops and other customers. Not all people buying marijuana will want to smell like it when they leave the store, plus many of our businesses are in strip malls, which means that other stores would be also affected. Please craft these regulations so that onsite smoking of marijuana is NOT allowed. Sincerely, Diana Redwood Anchorage, AK 99508	**oppose**
8/2/2016	Nancy Tarnai		306.365	I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for on-site consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. To protect Alaskans from secondhand smoke emitted by people smoking or vaping marijuana, I strongly encourage our state to ban on-site consumption. No other state allows it, for good reason! Workers, customers and neighbors need this protection and I encourage you to help us achieve a smokefree work environment for all Alaskans, especially marijuana! If you open that door who knows where it's going to lead? Thank you. -- Nancy Tarnai 907-460-9812 907-456-4296 Fairbanks, Alaska	**oppose**
8/3/2016	Jessica Golden		300.365	Dear Mr. Samaniego: I'm writing to you today as a lifelong Alaskan and mother of two small children. I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I oppose the public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana because of the significant health risks to users and non-users. Secondhand smoke exposure it known to dramatically increase health risks. Secondhand marijuana smoke can exacerbate health problems in people with respiratory conditions like asthma, bronchitis, or COPD, as well as contribute to heart disease and stroke. Like Colorado and Washington, we should protect our small businesses from the potential loss of revenue that could come from exposing non-smoking patrons and employees to secondhand marijuana smoke. Furthermore, the language in Ballot Measure 2 clearly called for the consumption of marijuana to remain illegal in public. Permitting public use of marijuana could damage Alaska's reputation as a senior-citizen-friendly tourist destination. Thank you for your consideration in supporting worker and public health. Sincerely, Jessica Golden Anchorage, Alaska	**oppose**
8/4/2016	Justin Roland			I believe with a public consumption model we will be the most responsible state yet to implement legal cannabis this model completes the industry and allows locals and tourists to be safe and not in the view of the public. I have been outta state several times to Colorado, Washington and Oregon, people are smoking in there rental cars, hotel rooms and in the streets all places where you get charged a fee or fine for doing so. They basically legalized it and told people they cannot smoke so it might as well still be illegal, if we are truly making a legit legal cannbis market this model is a must have for a successful and safe cannbis industry. Thanks Justin R.	**favor**
8/2/2016	Anna Wong		365	My name is Anna Wong and writing to you not only as a fellow Alaskan but also as public service worker. I have worn many hats in the past, but have always focused my work with youth and children as a teacher, a coach, a camp counselor, mentor, and advocate. I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I oppose the public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana because of the significant health harms to users and non-users. Growing up, my parents owned their own business. This was prior to banning smoking in public restaurants, etc. As children growing up my siblings and I had to go to work with our parents after school since they had worked all day, every day, all year long. As we got older and were able to help out around the business, we worked every day after school, on the weekends and holidays. They were small business owners and they worked incredibly hard. They were, and both are still smokers. When we were younger, my parents, as did many other adults, had the freedom to smoke in their businesses, restaurant and bars. My brother, sister and I? We never had that choice. We grew up for almost a decade around second hand smoke and because of that, all three of us suffer from asthma. I am writing to you because of my concern for the younger generation. Perhaps the storeowners don't have daycare options and have to have their young ones at work with them as my parents had to. Maybe the young person behind the counter doesn't smoke, but can't find a job and is making his money working in a marijuana or vape shop. No type of ventilation system will protect workers and patrons from the effects of any type of secondhand smoke, vapor or aerosol. Everyone has the right to breathe clean air. Smoke free policies are designed to protect the public and all workers from exposure to the health hazards caused by secondhand smoke. The same should be true for marijuana smoke. Allowing secondhand marijuana smoke exposure in publically accessible places is not a good public health policy. Our legacy as adults in the position to make changes in the world is to leave it in a better state for the generations to come.. It is our duty as community leaders to protect the next generation and provide an environment for them to thrive and grow. To allow secondhand marijuana smoke exposure in publically accessible places is to send the message that one's right to breathe clean air does not matter. Thank you very much for your time in reading this letter and your consideration in supporting worker and public health in Alaska. Your actions will have a profound effect on Alaskans for decades to come. Please help support them for a brighter future.	**oppose**
8/4/2016	Patricia Patterson			Thank you this opportunity Please consider the implications of the proposed regulations. Its states: (f) The holder of a marijuana retail store onsite consumption endorsement may not (2) allow intoxicated or drunken persons to enter or to remain on premises; (3) sell, give or barter marijuana or marijuana product to an intoxicated or drunken person; It is impossible for anyone to instantly assess whether a person is legally intoxicated. Police officers have tools and are legally required to conduct tests to determine intoxication. Bartenders have the luxury of time to watch and evaluate the individual. Bartenders also receive education, and in most circumstances, simply count drinks. At marijuana store, if sobriety is in question, is a retailer expected to test patrons before they enter? This regulation is arbitrary and burdensome. This regulation will also set up an environment where people who have disabilities will be treated unfairly. People who have had a stroke or a head injury often talk or walk similar to a 'drunken person'. This regulation is also contradictory. If you plan on drinking alcohol and smoking cannabis, you need to smoke first then go to the bar because liquor establishments are not required to determine if you have been smoking marijuana. But marijuana stores will not allow you inside if you act like you have been drinking. Imagine trying to explain this without laughing to a tourist visiting Alaska next summer. This regulation also says… The State of Alaska is okay with serving a person who is obviously high on methamphetamines but that person who acts intoxicated cannot even enter the premise. One solution could be to require alcohol education to be included in marijuana business requirements, but this still does not address the real issue… serving chemically impaired persons. I believe the regulatory board should address serving obviously impaired customers in over-all general language. Better yet, include language that addresses the license holder's legal responsibility to provide the public a safe and secure environment. By doing this, there will be no need for this abstruse and short-sighted regulation.	**oppose**

8/8/2016	Kristin Cox	Tobacco Prevention an Control / Juneau Clean Air Coalition		Dear Joe Samaniego, July 27, 2016 I am writing on behalf of the Juneau Clean Air Coalition to state that we strongly oppose the "onsite consumption" endorsement in the proposed marijuana regulations. First, the marijuana legalization initiative stated clearly there would be no public consumption of marijuana. Retail establishments are public places. Allowing marijuana consumption goes against what was originally stated in the initiative. Second, the dangers of second-hand tobacco smoke have been well established. Peer-reviewed and published studies show that exposure to secondhand marijuana smoke has similar health and safety risks for the general public. Secondhand marijuana smoke contains many of the same cancer-causing substances and toxic chemicals as secondhand tobacco smoke, including significant levels of mercury, cadmium, nickel, lead, and chromium, as well as 20 times the amount of ammonia and 3-5 times more hydrogen cyanide1. Marijuana smoke also contains fine particulate matter, like tobacco smoke, which has been shown to immediately and adversely affect the cardiovascular system. Marijuana smoke exposure had a greater and longer-lasting effect on blood vessel function than exposure to secondhand tobacco smoke2. Secondhand marijuana smoke can cause lung irritation, asthma attacks, and respiratory infections and can exacerbate conditions like asthma, bronchitis, or COPD3. In addition, people exposed to secondhand marijuana smoke can have detectable levels of THC in their blood and urine4. Alaskan communities fought long and hard to pass local comprehensive clean indoor air laws. Allowing onsite marijuana consumption will greatly undermine the integrity of these initiatives passed to protect their citizens. Everyone has the right to breathe smokefree air. Smokefree policies are designed to protect the public and all workers from the health hazards of secondhand smoke. Scientific evidence shows the same should be true for secondhand marijuana smoke. In the interest of health for all Alaskans and long-term savings in healthcare costs, the use of combustible or aerosolized marijuana should be prohibited in public places. Respectfully submitted, Juneau Clean Air 1. Moir, D., et al., A comparison of mainstream and sidestream marijuana and tobacco cigarette smoke produced under two machine smoking conditions. Chem Res Toxicol 21: 494-502. (2008). http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18062674 2. Wang, X., et al., "Brief exposure to marijuana secondhand smoke impairs vascular endothelial function" (conference abstract). Circulation 2014; 130: A19538. http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/130/Suppl_2/A19538.abstract 3. "Air and Health: Particulate Matter." National Environmental Public Health Tracking Network, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. http://ephtracking.cdc.gov/showAirHealth.action#ParticulateMatter 4. Herrmann ES, et al., "Non-smoker exposure to secondhand cannabis smoke II: Effect of room ventilation on the physiological, subjective, and behavioral/cognitive effects." Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2015 Jun 1;151:194-202. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25957157	**oppose**
8/8/2016	Leah Canfield	Ketchikan Wellness Coalition		Dear Ms. Franklin, On behalf of the Ketchikan Wellness Coalition, we will be submitting our comments to the proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores, respectfully. Marijuana use recreationally, through consumption, smoked, through aerosol, is toxic to our bodies, brain and our respiratory system. Also, under federal laws, when anyone participates in the growing, possession, manufacturing, distribution, or sales of marijuana under state law or aids or facilitates or finances such actions is at risk of federal prosecution or liability. Therefore, we oppose the public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana because of the significant health harms to users and non-users. In Colorado, rates have risen in youth by tenfold, and it caused many health concerns. In concern to the potency of use has not been tested, and higher levels of THC are even higher than it has been. With these levels, poses a greater risk for addiction if users are exposed to these high doses. In Colorado, rates of motor accidents have tripled since marijuana has been sold in stores. Drivers with THC in their blood were twice as likely to be culpable for a fatal accident that drivers who had used drugs or alcohol. Studies have shown, according to the American Auto Association found that a percentage of drivers who are high on marijuana during fatal accidents in Washington State more than doubled between 2013 and 2014. This is both public health and safety issue. We encourage you to be informed about the proposed onsite consumption of marijuana retail stores and look at the raw data from other states who continue to have a serious problem with high marijuana use with teens. Products that are found in these retail stores, opens the door for products that are infused with marijuana such as cookies, cakes, candy. Some of these will inevitably make their way into the hands of children We support a drug-free community, as well in the State of Alaska and a lifelong commitment to research, that will continue to show the results of the health dangers of marijuana. We also support drug-free kids and healthy families. Thank you for your consideration in supporting a healthy and drug-free community and in the State of Alaska. Sincerely, Leah Canfield Kevin Gadsey Drug, Alcohol & Tobacco Executive Director Coordinator	**oppose**
8/15/2016	Edy Rodewald	Alaska Tobacco Control Alliance	365	On behalf of the Alaska Tobacco Control Alliance, we respectfully submit questions on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. 1. Has the Board been provided with the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) standards for ventilation and had the opportunity to discuss those standards? 2. How does the Board propose that licensees monitor onsite consumption for intoxication, use of outside marijuana or use of smoked tobacco (in communities where smoking is not permitted), alcohol or other drugs? 3. What education does the Board plan to conduct about implementation of onsite consumption at marijuana stores? 4. How may the marijuana products permitted for onsite consumption be consumed? 5. Will the Board provide the public with written documentation of the Department of Law's definition of private and/or public that has guided the Board in development of its onsite consumption regulations? 6. Will the Board provide the public with the systematic process it plans to use to review the written public comments submitted regarding onsite consumption? 7. Will the Board provide the opportunity for public testimony on the onsite regulations? 8. Will the Board consider extending the comment period to allow more public input on onsite regulations given the fact this is a major initiative and Alaska would be the only place in the U.S. or Canada to allow onsite consumption? 9. Will any regulatory amendments intended for introduction by a Board members be included with the agenda and public notice prior to the next meeting? 10. Will the Board provide the public with an analysis of how onsite consumption of marijuana compares or contrasts with alcohol regulation in Alaska especially regarding onsite consumption attached to retail environments? 11. Why is onsite consumption authorized as an endorsement for a retail license as opposed to a separate license? Thank you for your consideration of these questions.	**Questions**
8/15/2016	Melissa G Mudd			I am a 35 year resident of Alaska, a parent, grandparent and educator. I am passionate about passing a Smokefree Workplace Law in Alaska and I see no reason to exempt marijuana from this key piece of health legislation. I am terribly allergic to any kind of smoke and deserve to breathe indoor air free of tobacco as well as marijuana smoke. ALL Alaskans do, especially those without myriad choices for employment. Unfortunately, no type of smoke mitigation systems protect every business in a building and in order to eliminate the detrimental and cancer causing effects of smoke or aerosol a building has to be completely smokefree. Thank you for doing what is best for health for all Alaskans. Sincerely, Melissa G. Mudd	**oppose**
8/18/2016	Marge Stoneking	American Lung Association	365	To Whom it May Concern: American Lung Association is opposed to the currently proposed regulation allowing for inhaled consumption of marijuana in retail marijuana stores. Smoke is harmful to lung health. Whether from burning wood, tobacco, or marijuana, toxins and carcinogens are released from the combustion of materials. Smoke from marijuana combustion has been shown to contain many of the same toxins, irritants and carcinogens as tobacco smoke. Secondhand smoke from combusted marijuana contains fine particulate matter that can be breathed deeply into the lungs, which can cause lung irritation, asthma attacks, and makes users more vulnerable to respiratory infections. Smoke travels through buildings and the toxins and particles cannot be effectively removed by ventilating, filtering, or separating smoking areas from non, even if the smell can. This means that all of the workers and patrons in a given building, regardless of whether the smoke is being generated within their business, will be exposed. Exposure to fine particulate matter can exacerbate health problems, especially for people with respiratory conditions like asthma, bronchitis, or COPD. Secondhand smoke from marijuana has many of the same chemicals as smoke from tobacco, including those linked to lung cancer. Seventy-nine percent of Alaskans polled by American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network in 2016 support protecting Alaskans from secondhand marijuana smoke in workplaces and public places. The U.S. Surgeon General's Report, "The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke," (2006) concluded that there is no risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke; ventilation and other air cleaning technologies cannot eliminate exposure of nonsmokers to secondhand smoke; and that comprehensive smoke-free workplace policies are the only effective way to eliminate secondhand smoke exposure in the workplace. In summary, American Lung Association opposes allowing for inhaled consumption of marijuana onsite in retail marijuana stores because secondhand marijuana smoke, like secondhand tobacco smoke, is harmful to lung health, Alaskans want to be protected from it, and the only way to protect people from secondhand smoke is to eliminate it from the indoor environment. We are happy to provide additional information should you need it.	**oppose**
8/18/2016	Amanda Roberts	Partnership for a Tobacco Free Southeast		Dear Mr. Samaniego, The Partnership for a Tobacco-Free Southeast, a regional coalition dedicated to clean air where we live, work, and play, respectfully submits our opposition to the proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. We are concerned for the significant harms of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana to Alaskan users and non-users. Marijuana is a substance with "high potential for abuse." Exposure to the by-products of secondhand marijuana smoke - the carcinogens, reproductive toxins, and particulates in the air - can exacerbate respiratory health problems like asthma, bronchitis, or COPD, as well as heart disease and stroke. It is bad public policy to allow this risky behavior to expose others in an indoor workplace. Everyone has the right to breathe clean indoor air. The current smokefree workplace policies in many of our Southeast Alaskan communities and Tribes are designed to protect the public and all workers from exposure to the hazards of secondhand smoke. The same protection is needed from marijuana smoke exposure. There is no safe level of secondhand smoke for patrons or workers in businesses that allow indoor smoking or vaping. The American Society for Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineering (ASH RAE) determined there is no ventilation system that will completely remove the carcinogens and particulates from the air. Please preserve clean air in all of our indoor work environments and protect worker and public health. Thank you.	**oppose**
8/18/2016	Kristin Cox	Rainforest Naturopathic Medicine		I'm writing to urge the Marijuana Control Board to oppose the on-site endorsement. When I voted to approve marijuana legalization I did it with the understanding that this would legalize personal marijuana use as well as growing, buying and selling. The initiative specifically said NO Public use. My understanding is that public places are public use. Marijuana second hand smoke is just as dangerous as tobacco second hand smoke. It is not in the public's interest to be exposed to second hand marijuana or tobacco smoke or to give the public, including youth, the impression that it is somehow safer. Please don't prioritize profits over public health.	**oppose**

8/19/2016	Char Day	Americans for Nonsmokers Rights		Dear Members of the Marijuana Control Board, On behalf of our members in Alaska and visitors to your majestic state, Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights (ANR) encourages the Alaska Marijuana Control Board to prohibit public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped and aerosolized marijuana. We respectfully submit the following rationale for our position on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail sites. Everyone has the right to breathe smokefree air and this includes air free from marijuana secondhand smoke too. It is important to protect public health from exposure to marijuana secondhand smoke. Regardless of how one feels about marijuana use, no one should have to breathe marijuana secondhand smoke at their workplace or in public places. People who choose to smoke marijuana should not smoke in ways that harm other people including the general public or workers. Policies for smokefree public places and workplaces should include marijuana, whether it is smoked or aerosolized. Secondhand smoke from marijuana has many of the same chemicals as smoke from tobacco, including those linked to lung cancer. Marijuana secondhand smoke not only impairs blood vessel function but recent research demonstrates that as little as thirty minutes of exposure to secondhand marijuana smoke results in substantial impairment of blood vessel function. Even though research on marijuana smoke is in its infancy, it is abundantly clear that marijuana smoke exposure has an even greater and longer-lasting negative effect on blood vessel function than exposure to secondhand tobacco smoke. Public health and other notable authorities are making similar decisions about preventing public exposure to secondhand marijuana smoke. The American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning Engineering (ASHRAE), the organization that develops engineering standards for ventilation systems, bases its ventilation standard for acceptable indoor air quality on an environment that is completely free from secondhand tobacco smoke, secondhand marijuana smoke, and emissions from electronic smoking devices. Currently, there are approximately 157 municipalities and 5 states that explicitly restrict marijuana use in smokefree spaces in some manner. Regardless of the debate of possible benefits of individual use of marijuana products, there is simply no need to use them inside shared air spaces (such as workplaces and public places) where others are then subject to the hazardous secondhand smoke. Just like traditional cigarettes, marijuana should be used in ways that don't impact the health of others. Given these facts, Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights urges the Alaska Marijuana Control Board to prohibit public smoking or vaping of marijuana in all public places and workplaces, at all times, without exception. Thank you for your leadership and desire to make Alaska the best place to live, work, and visit. Please feel free to contact me at 510-841-3045 if you have any questions, comments, or feedback.	**oppose**
8/19/2016	Char Day	Americans for Nonsmokers Rights		"Smoke is smoke. Both tobacco and marijuana smoke impair blood vessel function similarly. People should avoid both, and governments who are protecting people against secondhand smoke exposure should include marijuana in those rules." -Matthew Springer, cardiovascular researcher and Associate Professor of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco Facts about secondhand marijuana smoke: ☐ Marijuana smoke is created by burning components of plants in the genus Cannabis. ☐Secondhand marijuana smoke is a complex chemical mixture of smoke emitted from combusted marijuana and the smoke that is exhaled by the user. ☐Secondhand marijuana smoke contains fine particulate matter that can be breathed deeply into the lungs. smoke include: acetaldehyde, ammonia arsenic, benzene, cadmium, chromium, formaldehyde, hydrogen cyanide, isoprene, lead, mercury, nickel, and quinoline.1 ☐ Marijuana smoke contains Health risks of exposure to secondhand marijuana smoke: Since marijuana is illegal under federal law, there have been a limited number of studies examining health risks associated with marijuana use and exposure in the United States. Health risks from primary and secondhand smoke exposure may also be difficult to determine as marijuana is often used in combination with tobacco. However, peer-reviewed and published studies do indicate that exposure to secondhand marijuana smoke may have health and safety risks for the general public, especially due to its similar composition to secondhand tobacco smoke. ☐ Se likely. Exposure to fine particulate matter can exacerbate health problems especially for people with respiratory conditions like asthma, bronchitis, or COPD.3 the amount of ammonia and 3-5 times more hydrogen cyanide in marijuana smoke than is in tobacco smoke.4 known as the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986. It reported that at least 33 individual constituents present in both marijuana smoke and tobacco smoke are Proposition 65 carcinogens. as smoke from tobacco, including those linked to lung cancer.7 ☐ Se substantial impairment of blood vessel function. Marijuana smoke exposure had a greater and longer-lasting effect on blood vessel function than exposure to secondhand tobacco smoke.8 health effects because of their similar chemical composition, including atherosclerosis (partially blocked arteries), heart attack, and stroke.9 can be contaminated with mold, insecticides or other chemicals that may be released in secondhand smoke.11 Including Marijuana Smoking in Smokefree Public Place and Workplace Laws: protect the public and all workers from exposure to the health hazards caused by exposure to secondhand tobacco smoke. The same should be true for secondhand marijuana smoke. 2001-2002 and 2012-2013,12 which may also indicate an increase in exposure to secondhand marijuana smoke. ventilation systems. ASHRAE now bases its ventilation standard for acceptable indoor air quality on an environment that is completely free from secondhand tobacco smoke, secondhand marijuana smoke, and emissions from electronic smoking devices.13 ☐ In public health, improve consistency, and aid enforcement, smokefree laws for public places and workplaces should include tobacco as well as marijuana, whether it is smoked or aerosolized. Allowing marijuana smoking in places where smoking is now prohibited could undermine laws that protect the public from exposure to secondhand smoke. The Tobacco Control Legal Consortium issued an informative brief on Lessons from Tobacco Control for Marijuana Regulation. 14 behavior, and are particularly effective among youth and young adults who are vulnerable to visual cues and social norms of smoking. It is likely that smokefree policies for marijuana will have a similar effect. explicitly restrict marijuana use in smokefree spaces in some manner. In the interest of public health, the use of combustible or aerosolized marijuana should be prohibited wherever tobacco smoking is prohibited. ANR's Position on Exposure to Secondhand Marijuana Smoke: Marijuana smoke is a form of indoor air pollution. Therefore, ANR includes marijuana within our definition of smoking, and all of our model laws and policies include a prohibition on smoking marijuana wherever smoking of tobacco products is not allowed. ANR does not have a position on whether marijuana should be legalized; however ANR is against smoking in ways that harm other people. In states where marijuana is legalized, marijuana use should be prohibited in all smokefree spaces. Nobody should have to breathe secondhand marijuana smoke at work, in public, or where they live. If we want healthy, smokefree air for workers and the public, then products like marijuana and electronic smoking devices (which can be used to "vape" a wide range of substances, including marijuana and hash oil) must not be used in smokefree environments where others are forced to breathe the secondhand emissions.	**oppose**
8/19/2016	Char Day	Americans for Nonsmokers Rights		See attached map of US	**oppose**
8/19/2016	Sue Nowland			Thank you for giving me the opportunity to make public comment regarding AAC 306.367 On- Site consumption. AAC 306.367 (D) states one of the requirements is to "containing a separate ventilation system" How would the examiners as well as the board members be qualified to determine an establishments mechanical air handling system? There are very sophisticated large air handling systems that are integrated with other systems that would adequately meet the overall goal which is to reduce odors. There are also portable standalone systems for a small area that do an excellent job of elimination marijuana odors. Our common goal is to reduce the odor of the Marijuana product overall. I don't believe the board or the examiners have the expertise to size up ventilation systems for buildings. Possible suggest for language might be: "maintain a ventilation system that directs air through a filtration system to adequately reduce odor in the onsite consumption area. Regarding AAC 306.367 (f) The holder of a marijuana retail store onsite consumption endorsement may not: (6) deliver marijuana or marijuana product to a person already possessing marijuana or marijuana product that was purchased for consumption on the premises. This statement does not make any sense.	**favor**
8/19/2016	Ashley Peltier		365	Dear Mr. Samaniego: My name is Ashley Peltier and I'm writing as a concerned citizen. I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I do not believe that public consumption of marijuana should be allowed for many reasons. Ballot Measure 2 clearly stated that the public consumption of marijuana would not be allowed. That is what the people voted for and that is what should be followed. Allowing public consumption of marijuana would essentially take away the right of the people to breathe clean air. If someone wishes to smoke, dab or vape marijuana they should be required to do it in their own homes in order to protect the health of those that do not wish to be exposed to the drug. Smoke-free policies and ordinances have been in place in many Mat-Su establishments for some time. Allowing public consumption of marijuana will essentially undo the work that has already been done to protect people from the health consequences of secondhand smoke. It is not good public health policy to allow marijuana consumption in publically accessible places. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.	**oppose**
8/19/2016	Amanda Lenhard	Breathe Free Anchorage	365	Hello, my name is Amanda Lenhard and I am the Chair of the Breathe Free Anchorage Coalition. I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I oppose the public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana because of the significant health harms to users and non-users. We know that secondhand marijuana smoke is harmful to those exposed. The smoke contains many of the same cancer-causing substances and toxic chemicals as secondhand tobacco smoke. Some of the known carcinogens or toxins present in marijuana smoke include: acetaldehyde, ammonia arsenic, benzene, cadmium, chromium, formaldehyde, hydrogen cyanide, isoprene, lead, mercury, nickel, and quinolone. Considerable levels of mercury, cadmium, nickel, lead, and chromium are found in marijuana smoke, as well as 20 times the amount of ammonia and 3-5 times more hydrogen cyanide in marijuana smoke than is in tobacco smoke. Everyone has the right to breathe clean air. Smokefree policies are designed to protect the public and all workers from exposure to the health hazards caused by secondhand tobacco smoke. The same should be true for marijuana smoke. Thank you for your consideration in supporting worker and public health.	**oppose**
8/19/2016	Noel Crowley- Bell	Breathe Free MatSu	365	My Name is Noel Crowley Bell. On behalf of the Breathe Free Mat-Su Coalition, in line with our vision and mission statements; to promote a healthier Mat-Su community through clean air and empowering community members to advocate for clean air, we respectfully submit again our written opposition on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365. Our opposition to secondhand marijuana smoke is based on the following facts: Secondhand marijuana smoke can exacerbate health problems, including people with respiratory conditions like asthma, bronchitis, or COPD, as well as heart disease and stroke. Additionally, Ballot Measure 2 was clear, the public consumption of marijuana was intended to remain illegal. . We support the rights of workers and non-smoking patrons to breathe clean air. Smoke-free policies are designed to protect the public and all workers from exposure to the health hazards caused by secondhand tobacco smoke. The same needs to be true for marijuana smoke. Secondhand smoke is secondhand smoke whether from tobacco or marijuana. Based on the available science, we recommend the Board not allow smoked, dabbed, vaporized or aerosolized marijuana consumption where workers are present. Thank you for your consideration in supporting worker health and prohibiting the consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana in workplaces.	**oppose**
8/19/2016	Emily Nenon		365	I am writing as an individual with grave concern over the potential for significantly increased exposure to secondhand smoke and the resultant health harms that would be allowed in the on-site marijuana consumption regulations currently under consideration. I understand the allowance for private consumption, as allowed in the original ballot measure language. However, the regulations before the Marijuana Control Board would allow for marijuana smoking restaurants, a far cry from the prohibition on public consumption outlined and fined in the ballot measure. Additionally, I have traffic safety concerns regarding the potential for consuming an edible product on site, and then having the effects of that product register once someone is driving down the highway, or through my neighborhood streets. Given the long-term and far-reaching effects this regulation will have on the health of Alaskans for many years to come, I urge a delay in the implementation of the on-site regulations until there is time for a more thorough study and vetting of these regulations and their impact on our population. Additionally, I request a more open public process than merely written comments which are not discussed by the board during their meetings.	**oppose**

8/20/2016	Thea Bemben		365	I am a lifelong resident of Anchorage who is raising a family here and the owner of a business that employs 20 Alaskans in professional employment. I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I am writing to urge you not to allow any onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores, which would result in exemptions to the smoke-free ordinance we enjoy in Anchorage and in other communities around the state. I would also urge you to clarify that e-cigarette vapor also be included under that regulation and any aerosolized use of marijuana. I give you two examples of why clean indoor air must be protected: my business leases an office space in a downtown building that is now located over a restaurant. While we all love bacon and pizza as much as anyone, the smell of the cooking from below has greatly impacted our work space. Even with extensive efforts from the building owner that cost him $40,000, there is no way to prevent the smells from coming up into our workplace. If marijuana smoking is allowed indoors, we could be subject to something much more harmful to our work environment than bacon and pizza fumes. Example #2: my son goes to guitar lessons in a basic office building in south Anchorage. A "vaping" store opened in the downstairs space and now the entire building is filled with sickly, toxic, cherry scented fumes. Being there for 30 minutes a week gives me a headache. If I had rented an office space in that building for business operations, I would be suing the owner for allowing the fumes to make the business space uninhabitable. This is an off-site impact that must be regulated by the State of Alaska to protect people who have leases in commercial spaces where the air is a commonly used resource. Indoor smoking is NOT compatible with thriving public spaces in our community. Marijuana smoke is smoke. E-cigarettes spew the same chemicals as tobacco smoke, minus the carbon monoxide and tar. Everyone has the right to breathe clean air. Smokefree policies are designed to protect the public and all workers from exposure to the health hazards caused by secondhand tobacco smoke. The same should be true for marijuana smoke. Thank you for your consideration in supporting worker and public health.	**oppose**
8/20/2016	Will Bemben		365	I am a lifelong Anchorage resident and a family physician. I am writing to you regarding the proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I strongly oppose the public consumption of marijuana which has been rendered airborne, i.e. smoked, dabbed, vaped, or aerosolized forms, because of the significant risks to health for both users and non-users. As a physician who works frequently in the emergency room, I see on a daily basis the effects that first and second hand smoke of any form has on patients with COPD, asthma, or bronchitis. I also see regularly the detrimental effects of intoxicants on the public health. There is no type of ventilation system which can protect workers, or patrons of other portions of a building, from the detrimental effects listed above. My children currently take music lessons in a studio above a vape shop. During their lessons we constantly smell the different vaping solutions that are being used by the patrons below, in spite of the shop ventilation system. This would be similar with marijuana consumption, and the second hand smoke would also be an intoxicant. This is unacceptable. My children have the right to breathe clean air. Please do whatever is in your power to ensure that the public's right to clean air is protected.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Karen Perdue		365	My name is Karen Perdue. I reside in Fairbanks Alaska. I have 25 years of experience in State government, including 14 years as a Deputy Commissioner and Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services. I have been involved in the development and adoption of numerous statutes and subsequent regulatory projects. I have served on various State boards that developed regulations including AHFC, the Denali Commission, the Suicide Prevention Council, and the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority (ex officio). I am providing comment on draft regulations 3 AAC 306.365 onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores Draft 2. There has been virtually no or limited public dialogue and input on the concept and legal underpinnings of onsite consumption- and The definition of public has been changed in regulation in apparent conflict with the statute to accomplish onsite consumption. There has been limited or no opportunity for the public to verbally address the Board or the State on the concept of onsite consumption. Ballot Measure 2 and subsequently AS 17.38.040 clearly does not allow for public consumption of marijuana and includes a fine for such activity. It is my understanding that the first regulations adopted by the MCB Board in February 2015 to define "public" supported the restriction of consuming marijuana in businesses or other public places. Subsequently the draft regulations that were adopted in November of 2015 were changed to allow onsite consumption after public comment to the Board was closed and with a 3-2 vote. This is a major change in public policy. See below.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Karen Perdue		365	There was limited public notice given and since then there has never been an opportunity to verbally address the Board on this very significant concept. The regulatory process has restricted the ability for the public to comment verbally to the Board or understand the Board direction on this very significant new direction that appears to many Alaskans to lie outside statutory authority. Since the time the regulations were out for comment there has been no opportunity for Board members to hear testimony from divergent views in the public regarding onsite consumption. In addition, the significant issues of lack of input and the use of regulations to change the definition of public and thus allow onsite consumption were raised numerous times in written public comment to the Board. Unfortunately, the Board failed to consider these written concerns at the July meeting. In fact, despite encouragement from the chair, the Board failed to systematically consider public comments on the regulations. As importantly, it is vital for citizens to understand from the State's legal reasoning used to change the definition of public using regulatory authority. The definition of public is essential for regulation of many public health activities including but not limited to marijuana and as such is of great interest to citizens. Does a written Attorney's General opinion or guidance exist that can help citizens understand what authority the MCB has to define public in such a manner in regulation? Does this definition of public differ from other generally accepted uses of public in other portions of state statute? In my opinion it would be very important for the State to transparently explain this guidance to citizens prior to adopting these regulations. Unfortunately, the limited ability to address the Board verbally and the MCB's decision not to systematically discuss most of the written comments provided on onsite consumption leave me believing the goal is to ram onsite consumption rules through without careful consideration of real concerns raised by members of the public. Onsite consumption should be a separate licensure category rather than an endorsement for a retail marijuana store. In my experience endorsements have been used by the Department of Revenue for purposes of tracking and collecting revenue. Endorsements do not have the teeth of licenses and I do not believe have been used by the State of Alaska to regulate consumed products for the purposes of public health, public notice, zoning or public safety. I understand endorsements will now be used to provide some tools in alcohol licensing. However, the very idea of an endorsement is to provide an ancillary activity to the core business line. For instance if a brew pub does not get an endorsement to serve food, they can still operate as their main business- a brew pub. There will be some marijuana retail licensees that depend greatly on an attached marijuana bar to sell their product. Onsite consumption or dispensing is a licensure category. It would be a grave mistake to append onsite consumption establishments on the to retail license especially since no other jurisdiction in the United States currently allows this. Endorsement is wholly inadequate for the category of commerce that will likely not be a small revenue source to a retail licensee. It is my understanding that the Board does not have the authority to issue onsite consumption licenses for marijuana bars or cafes. It should therefore not issue endorsements for this activity and wait for guidance on this from the Legislature. What happens if a significant portion or majority of the retail licensee's revenue is derived from the existence of onsite consumption? The board is setting a regulatory framework for decades to come.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Karen Perdue		365	Apparently retail stores already have regulatory authority in 3AAC 306.305 (a) (3) to allow onsite consumption in the retail setting--presumably to try samples of products. To expand this authority to a separately doored area implies that patrons are expected to consume over a longer period of time much like a bar. Some members of the MCB articulated they believe that patrons will use the separately doored onsite consumption area to very briefly sample a product and then leave the premises and that the onsite consumption area will be very small as compared to the retail operation. Since this onsite consumption does not legally exist anywhere in the US, how it would develop is speculative. However, it would be easy to see that onsite consumption may account for a majority of the square footage and the majority or a significant portion of the revenue of a retail operation. Consider the following which will make patrons want to extend their time similar to a bar or cafe: • Hours of operation may extend from 8am to 5am • One gram of flower or bud to any one person in a single transaction, but individuals may share products or serially purchase up to a daily limit of one ounce each(serial purchases would only occur as a product of having a place to sit) • Food and nonalcoholic beverages may be served-Including a fully operational restaurant license. • Marketing to tourists who want to make the visit to a marijuana bar or café a destination visit. Retail operations with an attached marijuana bar could easily be located in densely populated tourist areas with little parking making them unattractive for use by locals except as a consumption destination. • Onsite consumption sites could group up as alcohol sites do to encourage bar hopping. Before adopting onsite consumption the MCB should request the staff conduct a study of how onsite consumption is conducted and regulated in other jurisdictions where it is legally permitted. Obviously these jurisdictions will be outside of the United States but the review of lessons learned seem vital to building a quality statutory and regulatory environment. How common is it to combine retail "package" sales with a marijuana bar? How are they regulated in terms of amounts purchased?. What are the enforcement penalities? Use of the endorsement versus the license gives municipalities and the public less say in how onsite consumption operations are conducted. The regulation of onsite consumption outlined in the regulations is vague and inadequate. It is wholly inadequate as compared to alcohol beverage licensing.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Karen Perdue		365	Many cannabis advocates have said marijuana should be regulated similar to alcohol. There are at least 14 types of licenses to dispense alcohol in Alaska. These license types offer the public a clear understanding of the types of products sold, and the consumption allowed. For instance to possess a restaurant or eating place alcohol license REPL , the licensee must prove through receipts that no less than 50 percent of the gross receipts are from food sales. Breweries are allowed to sell to individuals and provide small free samples but have restrictions on seating at a bar (to discourage consumption onsite presumably) and hours 9am- 8pm. Similarly distilleries have the same restrictions. Title 4 does not allow package liquor stores to have onsite consumption of liquor. So do the rules that the MCB have issued most closely approximate- a brewery or distillery handing out samples(if so why have hours til 5am?) , an REPL, or a package liquor store(dispensing not allowed). None of that clarity is outlined in the State's draft regulations on onsite consumption of marijuana. In my opinion the State should not commence with any type of onsite consumption of marijuana until there is much more clarity on its legal status, how it would be regulated, especially since we will be first state to allow this activity , probably the first jurisdiction in North America and one of a handful in the Western world. In addition, alcohol laws are evolving through a rewrite of Title 4.This process has not concluded. It will take time for the public to understand these changes and how they impact consumption at the community level. Because there are new pending rules for alcohol it seems important that the MCB take the time to understand these rules and provide that information to the public in a way that puts marijuana laws and rules in context. A cross walk prepared by the expert staff the Board has would be helpful. In my involvement in local government testimony, there is a lot of misunderstanding about alcohol rules and the comparison with marijuana- in relation to onsite consumption. Some may argue that alcohol regulation should not be taken into account in regulating marijuana but alcohol laws represent more than 60 years of public input and careful consulation with communities and industry. Sections of the regulations are unenforceable, difficult to enforce or inadequate to protect public health We can expect a significant portion of marijuana consumption to be by smoking. It would be interesting to know what the expected ratio of edibles versus smoking will be based on the experience of other jurisdictions. Washington, Colorado and Oregon all have statewide no smoking laws on the books so if they consider marijuana bars that is an important factor for us to consider. The draft regulations require the licensee to "maintain a ventilation system that directs air from the onsite consumption area to the outside of the building through a filtration system adequate to reduce odor."	**oppose**

8/21/2016	Karen Perdue		365	What does that mean, reduce odor by 10%, by half? so a bystander cannot smell it? It will be very difficult for an investigator or enforcement officer to determine a standard. What is the fine or remedy if ventilation or separation are not maintained? Of course toxins in the combustible products also pose not only a public nuisance but a substantial health risk to workers in the establishments and to bystanders. Retail shops and marijuana bars or cafes in buildings with common ventilation systems will likely find it very difficult to prevent particulates from getting into the common air system. The only way to prevent secondhand exposure is to contain these establishments in stand-alone buildings with vented systems to the outside. Many jurisdictions have smoke-free ordinances that regulate smoking in a broad array of public places including bars, restaurants and stores. Some of these ordinances specifically apply to all kinds of smoking, including e cigarettes, tobacco and marijuana. Some do not. A vast majority of businesses who are not in regulated municipalities have voluntarily gone smoke free. The major focus of this public health initiative has been to "take it outside". This of course will not be permitted with marijuana smoking since it is not legal to consume marijuana in public. This will likely incent people to smoke indoors-- both marijuana and tobacco, either mixed or separately. The harms from second hand smoke are real and detrimental to public health. Onsite consumption of smoked products will incent advocates to weaken local municipal nonsmoking ordinances and voluntary efforts by businesses. It will turn back the clock on indoor air efforts. In summary: • The public process needs to be more robust regarding onsite consumption with written guidance available to the public on the legal underpinnings for the Board to define public using regulatory means, particularly since the initiative and statute prohibit consumption in public. • The MCB failed to systematically review the majority of public comments that were submitted on Draft 1 of the regulations. • The endorsement is inadequate to govern an area of commerce that should be licensed. • The public needs more clarity to understand how marijuana bars would be regulated, particularly in relation to alcohol. This is fundamental to helping communities understand what community norms to expect. The MCB should ask the staff who are experts in both to prepare an analysis of how onsite consumption of marijuana bars would compare to alcohol licensing categories. • Since these regulations would be the most permissive consumption regulations in the United States, North America and even perhaps in parts of Europe including the Netherlands, the MCB needs to request an impartial analysis of how jurisdictions who allow these businesses or who are contemplating these businesses are addressing issues of second hand smoke, tobacco smoke, public safety and the combination of retail and consumption sites.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Karen Perdue		365	• Due to the constraints of the regulatory process /exparte communication, there has been limited opportunity to understand the thinking of the Board on onsite consumption and no opportunity for exchange of expertise or examination of lessons learned in other jurisdictions. • These regulations should be suspended until these issues are addressed. • If onsite consumption of marijuana is a reasonable idea it will stand up to reasonable examination and considered public discourse over a period of time. End of comments	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Bill Ross		365	My name is Bill Ross, a Viet Nam Combat Veteran, a 36 year Cancer Survivor, a Veteran's and Military Family's Health Resources, Support and Advocate and a Concerned Citizen. I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. As a former member of a special operations group (SOG) we were usually deployed in the jungle and most of the guys used pot to escape the reality of their jobs. The reaction to pot was different with each one of them and you never knew how long the effect would last. Some were happy, paranoid, zombies, and some didn't care about anything but more pot, but most of all, they were unpredictable and you didn't want to die because your buddy freaked out! As for us non-smokers or non-pot users we often felt lightheaded from exposure to second hand smoke, and our handlers just looked the other way. Now, many of us suffer from breathing problems, cancer and emotional problems linked to pot use and second hand smoke. I have survived cancer and I suffer from chronic combat PTSD, major depressive disorder, sleep apnea, and night terrors! I oppose public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana because of possible health and safety issues to users and non-users! I am also concerned about on-site consumption (first step to Pot Bars and Clubs) and the high probability of increased DUI's on our streets thus putting others in harm's way and increasing the already overworked Department of Public Safety. We all have rights and I know it's a really tough job trying to please everyone! However, The Needs Of The Many Outweigh The Needs (Wants) Of The Few! Everyone has the right to breathe clean air and we have Smoke free policies that are designed to protect the public (especially our children and seniors) and all workers from exposure to the health and safety hazards caused by second hand tobacco smoke. The same should be true for marijuana smoke. Thank you for your consideration in supporting worker and public health.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Beverly K Wooley		365	I live in Anchorage and have worked in public health in Alaska for over 30 years. As a public health professional, I have seen firsthand the devastating consequences of secondhand smoke. I have worked diligently throughout my career to assure the right of all citizens to breathe clean air by supporting passage of smoke-free laws for businesses and public places. Currently proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365, allowing for onsite marijuana consumption, will greatly undermine the hard work Alaskan communities have accomplished to protect the health of residents through passage of local comprehensive clean indoor air laws. I strongly oppose all sections of the currently proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores that would allow for inhaled consumption of marijuana in retail marijuana stores. I voted in favor of Ballot Measure 2 which did not allow for public consumption and included a $100 fine for this activity, in part, because I believed legalizing edible marijuana would provide a healthier alternative to smoking marijuana. The amendment passed during a board meeting to allow public consumption and onsite consumption at retail stores occurred only after public comment was closed. This is a significant change from the original intent of Ballot Measure 2 and was done without adequate opportunity for public comment at the appropriate time. Science has repeatedly documented the health damage and costs of secondhand smoke from tobacco. Recent studies have demonstrated that secondhand marijuana smoke contains many of the same cancer-causing substances and toxic chemicals found in secondhand tobacco smoke. Ventilation system may work to remove the smell of smoke, but even high-quality ventilation systems have proven ineffective in keeping the hazardous toxins in smoke from traveling throughout a building. A building must be completely smoke-free to eliminate the health effects caused by smoke. Prohibiting onsite inhaled consumption of marijuana in retail marijuana stores in needed to protect employees, patrons and visitors from the negative health effects caused by secondhand smoke. No person should have to choose between their health and a good job. In summary, I oppose allowing inhaled consumption of marijuana in retail marijuana stores because of the devastating effects of secondhand smoke, the inability of ventilation systems to effectively remove the hazardous toxins and particles from the smoke, and the right of all people to breathe clean air. Please, protect the health of all Alaskans – ensure their right to smoke-free businesses – don't allow onsite inhaled consumption of marijuana in retail marijuana stores. Thank you for your consideration in supporting clean air for workers and public health.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Edy Rodewald & Sharon Wolkoff	Alaska Tobacco Control Alliance	365	On behalf of the Alaska Tobacco Control Alliance, we respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. We are concerned for Alaskans' health with the proposed regulations. We oppose the public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana because of the significant health harms to users and non-users. Ballot Measure 2 was clear, the public consumption of marijuana was intended to remain illegal. The language in the ballot measure, voted on by the public and now enacted in AS 17.38.040, does not allow for public consumption of marijuana and includes a $100 fine for this activity. The first regulations adopted by the Board in February 2015 to define "public" supports this restriction. The draft regulations released for public comment in fall 2015 specifically prohibited public consumption and onsite consumption at retail stores, and were only changed with an amendment during a Board meeting, after public comment was closed. We believe that the decision of whether to allow public consumption of marijuana did not provide sufficient opportunity for public input at the appropriate time. No type of ventilation system will protect workers and patrons from the effects of secondhand smoke, vapor or aerosol. The licensee would be required to provide a ventilation plan to address byproducts of using marijuana onsite. Ventilation may reduce odors, but will not protect workers' health from marijuana smoke: store. A building must be completely smokefree to eliminate the health effects caused by smoke or aerosol. for building ventilation systems. In a 2010 position paper, ASHRAE has concluded that the only acceptable industry standard is completely free from secondhand smoke: "At present, the only means of effectively eliminating health risk associated with indoor exposure is to ban smoking activity." Ventilation will not completely remove the carcinogens and particulates from the air. respiratory conditions like asthma, bronchitis, or COPD, as well as heart disease and stroke. Allowing secondhand marijuana smoke exposure in publically accessible places is not good public health policy. In 2006 the Surgeon General concluded that there is no safe level of secondhand tobacco smoke. While studies of the health risks associated with marijuana use and exposure are limited to date, due to its being illegal under U.S. federal law, marijuana smoke is similar in composition to secondhand tobacco smoke, with the potential for similar health and safety risks to the public. Preventing secondhand smoke exposure to forestall costly health issues makes good policy sense given current evidence: Secondhand marijuana smoke contains many of the same cancer-causing substances and toxic chemicals as secondhand smoke. Some of the known carcinogens or toxins present in marijuana smoke include: acetaldehyde, ammonia, arsenic, benzene, cadmium, chromium, formaldehyde, hydrogen cyanide, isoprene, lead, mercury, nickel, and quinolone (Moir, et al, 2008). Moir, et al. also found significant amounts of mercury, cadmium, nickel, lead, and chromium in marijuana smoke. Comparing it to tobacco smoke, there was 20 times the amount of ammonia and 3-5 times more hydrogen cyanide in marijuana smoke. Health Hazard Assessment added marijuana smoke to its Proposition 65 list of carcinogens and reproductive toxins. smoke at levels comparable to those found in restaurants that allow cigarette smoking led to substantial impairment of blood vessel function. Marijuana smoke exposure had a greater and longer lasting effect on blood vessel function that exposure to secondhand tobacco smoke. In study after study, we know that the heart attack and stroke rates drop when communities and states go smokefree. Once an individual quits smoking, their risk of heart attack and stroke drop 50% in a year. Everyone has the right to breathe clean air. Smokefree policies are designed to protect the public and all workers from exposure to the health hazards caused by secondhand tobacco smoke. The same should be true for marijuana smoke. Based on the available science, we recommend the Board not allow smoked, dabbed, vaporized or aerosolized marijuana consumption where workers are present. Thank you for your consideration in supporting worker and public health.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Erika McConnell	Municipality of Anchorage	365	Dear Members of the Marijuana Control Board: On July 7, you discussed the first draft of the regulations for onsite consumption. While many of the issues raised in public comments were briefly mentioned, you only made one amendment before releasing a second draft for comment. Your amendment allows patrons to take unconsumed marijuana off-premises. Here is a list of important issues raised in public comments that you did not address: • Second hand smoke exposure to employees • Serving limits- no limit on number of transactions • Lack of clarity regarding access- can the onsite consumption area have an outside entrance? • Vague standards o requirements "to the board's satisfaction"-- 3 AAC 306.365 (b) (2) o odor must be "reduced" o no definition of"overconsumption" • Confusing language (3 AAC 306.365 (l) (6)) I urge you to review the public comments you received on the first draft, discuss the significant issues raised in those comments, and make further amendments to the proposal before adoption. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Alaskans are depending on the Marijuana Control Board to give serious consideration to all comments provided and revise the proposed regulations to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of all Alaskans. Sincerely,	**oppose**

8/21/2016	Leah Neff Warner			Dear Mr. Samaniego, My name is Leah Neff Warner, and I am a young adult who moved to Juneau from Seattle last year. Since then, I consider myself an active member of the local community, social scene, and am a proud Alaskan resident. I respectfully submit my comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I oppose the public consumption of smoked, aerosolized, vaped, or dabbed marijuana because of concerns for significant health risks to users and non-users. I supported the initiative to legalize marijuana in Washington as a Seattle resident, and I support the initiative in Alaska now. However, the consideration of public consumption of marijuana blatantly ignores the health risks of secondhand smoke and could push Alaska many steps backward in health policy and social norms. First, there is now evidence that shows exposure to marijuana smoke exacerbates health problems, including respiratory conditions like asthma, bronchitis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disorder, and increases risk for heart disease and stroke—the leading causes of death in Alaska. Just like tobacco smoke, there are no existing ventilation systems that eliminate the harmful substances in secondhand marijuana smoke and protect employees, users, and non-users from exposure. At this point, it is bad public policy to ignore these limitations and allow public consumption. Second, allowing smoked or vaped marijuana in public facilities can re-normalize the concept of smoking in general (e.i. tobacco) and send unintentional messages to youth that smoking is a non-issue. The current US youth smoking rate is at a historical low, but public consumption of marijuana could make smoking trendy and cool again—undoing over 50 years of efforts in preventing more youth from initiating tobacco use. As a young adult and supporter of legalized marijuana, I would avoid all marijuana businesses that permit public consumption. Everyone has a right to breathe clean air. We have a chance to do this right and still protect Alaskan's health. I urge you to remain loyal to the Ballot Measure 2 intentions of keeping public marijuana consumption illegal. This is the only option for a sustainable Alaskan marijuana industry that considers current and long-term health of patrons, employees, visitors, youth, and the overall reputation of our state. Thank you.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Riley Neff Warner		365	Dear Mr. Samaniego, My name is Riley Neff Warner, and I am a young adult who moved to Juneau this past January. Since then, I consider myself an active member of the local community, social scene, and am a proud Alaskan resident. I respectfully submit my comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I oppose the public consumption of smoked, aerosolized, vaped, or dabbed marijuana because of concerns for significant health risks to users and non-users. While marijuana legalization is in many ways a positive development for the State, I view the public consumption of marijuana to be a significant issue and believe that permitting it will have negative consequences for our communities. Marijuana consumption should be an issue that is up to each individual, and when we allow public consumption of marijuana, we take that decision away from citizens as they are exposed to harmful secondhand smoke. The decision to partake in the consumption of marijuana is not a green light to expose others in the community to your choices. This is exacerbated for employees who become subjected to continuous secondhand smoke. The chance to be employed and provide for one's family should not come with it the requirement of decreased health. Making families choose between good health or money in their pocket is something that should not be done, and something that we as a community should stand up and denounce. I believe that marijuana legalization is a positive thing, and that the private consumption of a private citizen is something that the government should have no say in. I also believe that it is the right of a community to not be subjected to negative health outcomes based on the choices of others. A right for one person should not mean the suppression of rights for another. Keeping public consumption illegal does not take away a citizen's ability to use marijuana if they so choose. From an economic standpoint, public consumption will have a net negative impact on the Alaskan business community; as with tobacco, studies have shown across the nation that businesses have faired better on average when they become smoke-free operations. Maintaining a level of accessibility for all people should be of paramount importance to Alaska's businesses and communities. I do not wish to be dramatic or have a doomsday tone about public consumption of marijuana. I simply believe that Alaskan communities will be better socially, economically, and from a general health standpoint if we keep public consumption illegal, and allow people to enjoy marijuana in the privacy of their domain. Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Larry Taylor		365	I am a retired air quality engineer from the Anchorage Air Pollution Control Agency. I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I am against allowing smoking of any sort inside business establishments. Despite clear language prohibiting public use of marijuana contained in Ballot Measure 2 when it passed in 2014, the Marijuana Control Board continues to re-interpret regulations and statutes in a way that would allow for on-site consumption in marijuana businesses. That means that while a community might have a local or borough-wide smoke-free ordinance for tobacco smoke or e-cigarettes would not be able to protect employees within their jurisdiction from secondhand marijuana smoke at work. This not only threatens the health of the employees who work at these businesses, it also threatens the effectiveness of the local smoke-free ordinances and years of progress in creating smoke-free communities across the state. Everyone has the right to breath clean air. After passage of the Anchorage Smoke Free Workplace Ordinance employees at businesses where smoking had been discontinued were grateful for the protection of their health provided by this law. Why ruin their faith in government by circumventing all of the efforts we went to affording them this benefit? The argument that employees can get a job someplace else may mean just that, moving to another town. How would you feel about having to do that yourself? Hard to do, right? So they either have to stop working or suffer the consequences. THAT is cruel and unusual and should be a choice employees do not have to make. Everyone deserves to breath clean air. Thank you for your consideration in supporting worker and public health.	**oppose**
8/21/2016	Julie Hasquet			I realize my comments are a few minutes late, but I thought we had until 6 pm. Please accept these comments as part of your public process on the public/onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I am adamantly opposed to allowing onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores for a variety of reasons. When Ballot Measure 2 was originally passed, language prohibiting public use was in the law. So, I start out confused as to why this is even up for consideration. Be that as it may, if you were to allow public/onsite consumption of marijuana in the retail stores, it would be the same as allowing people to open their beer or wine in a liquor store and sample it; or allowing somebody to light up a cigarette in the store and start smoking tobacco. Not only are there health hazards for the user and anybody standing nearby (workers included) who would be exposed to second-hand smoke, but this flies in the face of our smokefree laws we have passed in Anchorage and other places around Alaska. You can't prohibit smoking of tobacco in public places where laws have passed, but allow marijuana sampling in retail stores. It is unfair and unhealthful, and would really undermine the laws we already have in place regarding smokefree. If people want to smoke marijuana, smoke tobacco, or drink alcohol, there are places to do so legally. To allow it in the store where it is sold, defies common sense and creates a whole new area of health concerns that we have already addressed in many areas with smokefree laws. I don't want to be exposed to secondhand smoke of any kind, and I believe workers should be protected on the job. Secondhand marijuana smoke contains many of the same cancer-causing and toxic chemicals as secondhand tobacco smoke. And the voters were clear with the language in Ballot Measure 2, public consumption of marijuana is supposed to remain illegal. Let's not take a step backward in our public health policies. Let's keep on the progressive and public-minded path we have been on in many communities. Thank you for your time and consideration.	**oppose**
8/22/2016	Heather Aronno		365	Dear Mr. Samaniego: As an Anchorage resident of over 10 years, I am proud to live in a community with a strong smoke-free workplace ordinance. I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I oppose the public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana because of the significant health harms to users and non-users. I have many friends who work in the customer service industry in and outside of Anchorage. Judging from some of their experiences, working in a restaurant that allowed smoking was, at best, tolerable, and at worst, an experience that triggered asthma attacks. Places like Anchorage and Palmer have passed local smoke-free ordinances to protect workers from exposure to secondhand smoke in the workplace, which has had a beneficial effect of healthier work environments and a more welcoming atmosphere for those who don't smoke. The proposed regulation that would allow on-site consumption of marijuana by smoking it puts the health of employees in those shops at risk. No type of ventilation system will protect workers and patrons from the effects of secondhand smoke, vapor or aerosol. Secondhand marijuana smoke can exacerbate health problems, including people with respiratory conditions like asthma, bronchitis, or COPD, as well as heart disease and stroke. Everyone has the right to breathe clean air. Smokefree policies are designed to protect the public and all workers from exposure to the health hazards caused by secondhand tobacco smoke. The same should be true for marijuana smoke. Thank you for your consideration in supporting worker and public health.	**oppose**
8/22/2016	Jennifer Olendorff		365	I am Jenny Olendorff, a life-long Alaskan and community health advocate. I respectfully submit comments on proposed regulation 3 AAC 306.365 for onsite consumption of marijuana at licensed retail stores. I strongly oppose the public consumption of smoked, dabbed, vaped or aerosolized marijuana. We have finally as a country and a state recognized that it is WRONG to subject non-users of marijuana, tobacco or any other substance to the potential ill effects of the secondhand smoke and/or aerosol emitted from these products. I work in a strip mall where we share walls and ventilation systems. It is absolutely uncalled for that I would be exposed to secondhand marijuana smoke in my workplace, as it is proven that ventilation systems DO NOT protect against exposure to the toxins in secondhand cigarette or marijuana smoke. It is my understanding that Ballot Measure 2 ensured that public consumption of marijuana was to remain illegal. I implore you to consider the long-term public health implications when regulating this product. There is the potential to take a major step backwards if workers are not protected in their workplace and the public is not protected in all public places from marijuana emissions.	**oppose**