



City of
Placerville

Carl Cahill <ccahill@cityofplacerville.org>

tabacco increase

debra mahnke <debramahnke@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 20, 2025 at 9:57 AM

To: "pv.planning@gmail.com" <pv.planning@gmail.com>

I am truly upset about the rising prices that are purposed to go up please note this is not ok



City of
Placerville

Carl Cahill <ccahill@cityofplacerville.org>

Tabacco increase

charles mahnke <mahnkecr@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 20, 2025 at 10:02 AM

To: "pv.planning@gmail.com" <pv.planning@gmail.com>

I am truly upset with the proposal of tobacco increase I smoke and feel that its my right and not the cities to determine how much the cost



City of
Placerville

Carl Cahill <ccahill@cityofplacerville.org>

Tabacco Increase

Boo Mahnke <boolynmahnke@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 20, 2025 at 10:04 AM

To: "pv.planning@gmail.com" <pv.planning@gmail.com>

The proposal to increase the tobacco is not what i think should be done

From: Ashley Freitas <Ashley.F@strauchco.com>

Date: Thu, Mar 20, 2025 at 4:24 PM

Subject: Letter to Placerville City Council - Proposed Tobacco Retailers Ordinance

To: pv.planning@gmail.com <pv.planning@gmail.com>

Dear Members of the Placerville City Council,

My name is Ashley Freitas. I am a Risk and Compliance Manager that manages the ID Compliance Program for our store in the city of Placerville as well as a number of other stores in Northern California. Unfortunately, I am not able to attend this meeting in person, so I am writing to you today to express my concerns regarding the proposed ordinance to regulate tobacco products and retailers in Placerville.

As a local business, I want to start by emphasizing that our stores already take the responsibility of preventing underage tobacco use very seriously. We have implemented a stringent ID verification process that includes monthly employee training, continuous monitoring through our BARS program audits, and monthly video reviews to ensure compliance. We also continue to pass all government stings for both alcohol and tobacco products. These measures reflect our ongoing commitment to ensuring tobacco products are not sold to minors, and I believe these efforts demonstrate our dedication to responsible retailing.

While I recognize the importance of addressing youth tobacco and nicotine use, I believe that the proposed measures—including minimum pricing, packaging requirements, and restrictions on the transferability of tobacco licenses—will ultimately have negative consequences for the city and its residents, without effectively curbing tobacco use.

By implementing a minimum pricing structure, you risk pushing businesses out of the city, which could result in the loss of local jobs, decreased tax revenue, and a shift in the tobacco market to neighboring cities or counties. This could lead to businesses moving just outside the city limits, effectively undermining the purpose of the ordinance while doing nothing to reduce the demand for tobacco products. Instead of solving the problem within our city, it simply shifts the issue to other areas, potentially resulting in even fewer safeguards for our residents.

Similarly, the proposed packaging requirements create unnecessary barriers for local businesses. These measures will only add administrative burdens and financial stress on retailers, especially small business owners who are already operating with thin margins. As these businesses are pushed out of Placerville, the city risks losing valuable economic activity and community support.

The proposed prohibition on the transferability of tobacco licenses also presents additional challenges, particularly for business owners who may wish to sell their establishments in the future. Many local small businesses rely on the ability to transfer their licenses when ownership changes, whether for retirement, succession planning, or selling to new entrepreneurs. By making these licenses non-transferable—except for specific exceptions—the city is effectively devaluing these businesses, making them less attractive to potential buyers. This will harm business owners who rely on the sale of their

company as a key part of their retirement plan or financial future and may even discourage investment in Placerville's business community as a whole.

Furthermore, while the stated intent of the ordinance is to protect the health and safety of our youth, the reality is that it may not achieve its goals. Tobacco use is a deeply ingrained societal issue, and pricing regulations, packaging rules, or prohibiting tobacco license transfers will not stop the use of these products. In fact, all the proposed measures are likely to drive people to purchase tobacco products in areas where regulations are less stringent, thus not addressing the core issue but simply relocating it elsewhere.

I encourage the City Council to reconsider these measures and explore alternative strategies that focus on education, cessation programs, and community outreach. These initiatives are proven to be more effective in addressing the root causes of tobacco use and can help protect our youth without harming local businesses or driving commerce away from Placerville.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I trust you will take these concerns seriously and find solutions that balance public health with the well-being of our community.

Sincerely,
Ashley Freitas



Ashley Freitas
Risk & Compliance Manager

Office: [\(916\) 294-9752 Ext 108](tel:(916)294-9752) **Fax:** [\(916\) 294-9753](tel:(916)294-9753)
Google Voice: [\(916\) 850-0192](tel:(916)850-0192) **Email:** ashley.f@strauchco.com

Safety · Respect · Teamwork · Quality of Work

IMPORTANT: The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.



No to E Cigarette Ban

1 message

Royce Hoffman <royce_hoffman@yahoo.com>

Fri, Mar 21, 2025 at 4:45 PM

To: "pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org" <pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org>

This is Royce - Placerville resident,

The new tobacco ordinance should not be passed. The state has already banned flavored e cigarettes but this law is also going to ban tobacco flavored single use e cigarettes which I use.

How is this going to help the people when you are removing all alternatives from the market except for traditional cigarettes which are proven to be more addictive and dangerous than e cigarettes.



City of
Placerville

City Council Public Comment <pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org>

Tobacco Ordinance NO SINGLE USE E CIGARETTE BAN PLEASE

1 message

Victoria Moore <victoriamore8221@gmail.com>
To: pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org

Fri, Mar 21, 2025 at 5:26 PM

I urge the city council to vote no on this ordinance. I am particularly against the single use e cigarette ban. This ordinance keeps coming up again and again and the residents of the city have made it clear that we do not support most of the parts of this ordinance.

It makes no sense to ban single use e cigarettes because then people will just use traditional cigarettes, so this won't have any benefit for the health of the people but will instead make them switch to something worse. I don't think any other locality except for our county has such a ban either.

Listen to the will of the people who voted for you please.

Sincerely
Victoria Moore



Gas Station Manager - Tobacco Ordinance Comment

1 message

Zoey Cooper <zoeycooper829@gmail.com>
To: pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org

Sat, Mar 22, 2025 at 8:16 AM

I manage a local gas station and would like to request a review of the current penalty structure, where the first violation results in a temporary license suspension and the second violation leads to permanent suspension.

In our industry, with high employee turnover, unintentional mistakes like underage sales can happen. The current penalties are too harsh and could be devastating for our business and I don't think any other industry faces such harsh penalties for the first violation.

State law has more balanced penalties where the first violation is a financial penalty. We ask for a more reasonable approach that encourages compliance without such severe consequences.

Thank you for your consideration.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Richard Hutchinson** <hutchman58@att.net>

Date: Mon, Mar 24, 2025 at 8:39 AM

Subject: Tobacco ordinance

To: <pv.planning@gmail.com>

I support to maintain the limitations on 5 pack cigars and clear Vape (non-flavored) only. Also support the transfer of licenses if/when a business is sold or transferred. Furthermore would support maintaining or reducing cigarette costs.

Sent from my iPhone



Carl Cahill <ccahill@cityofplacerville.org>

Proposed Tobacco Retailers Ordinance

Kathie Thayer <ksnkate@att.net>

Mon, Mar 24, 2025 at 10:28 AM

To: "pv.planning@gmail.com" <pv.planning@gmail.com>

In regards to the above subject, I would like to (1) Keep 5 pack cigar and "clear" vape and (2) The tobacco license should be transferred to the new business owner when the business is sold, if new owner is qualified.

Thank you

Tena Thayer



No Single Use E Cig Ban

1 message

Brian Ramirez <ramirezbrian606@yahoo.com>

Mon, Mar 24, 2025 at 10:55 AM

To: "pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org" <pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org>

I urge you to reject the proposed ban on single use e-cigarettes. Not even the state has such restrictive rules about this. I understand the intent to promote better health, but this ban would remove a safer alternative to cigarettes—yet cigarettes themselves would remain available. Research clearly shows that e-cigarettes are a much better option for smokers looking to reduce harm. The state has already banned flavored e-cigarettes, and banning even tobacco/unflavored ones makes no sense. This restriction would leave consumers, including myself, with fewer choices and could push many back to traditional cigarettes.

I understand that refillable would still be allowed, but for people my age, learning to replace parts and operate them properly is difficult. Many of my friends face the same challenge. Single use e-cigarettes provide a simple, accessible option that refillable devices do not.

Additionally, Mayor John Clerici previously stated that this ban is meant to reduce litter. However, I have not personally seen any single use e-cigarettes being littered at all. If environmental concerns are the reason, why are marijuana single use e-cigarettes exempt, despite having the same disposable design?

I urge you to reconsider this ordinance and take a more balanced approach.

Sincerely,
Brian



Gas Station Manager - Tobacco Ordinance Comment

Zoey Cooper <zoeycooper829@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 25, 2025 at 6:33 AM

To: City Council Public Comment <pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org>

Hi, I just wanted to add onto my previous comments.

Councilmember Carter mentioned that the state had already passed legislation that banned single use e cigarettes so the language in this ordinance banning single use e cigarettes would make no difference, but that is NOT true, the legislation was stalled and it never became law.

Just wanted to remind the council members that they will in fact be removing a product that is legal across the state of California.

[Quoted text hidden]

Comments on tobacco regulation

1 message

Ayman <aymantahan674@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 25, 2025 at 10:34 AM

To: "pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org" <pv.citycouncil@cityofplacerville.org>

This is Ayman. I am the owner of one of the stores in town that sells tobacco products, and I would like to express my concerns regarding the regulation on minimum packing sizes for cigars and cigarillos.

Currently, approximately 95% of these products are sold either individually or in packs of two or three. However, the new regulation requires that they can only be sold in packs of six or more. This creates a significant challenge for retailers like myself, as most manufacturers do not produce cigars or cigarillos in packs of six. Since we are retailers, not manufacturers, it is impossible for us to comply with this requirement without eliminating nearly all of our inventory for these products.

Forcing customers to purchase larger quantities will not encourage them to quit smoking. Instead, it will likely have the opposite effect—since they will be buying more at once, they will have easier access to these products and may end up smoking more.