

Tobacco-Free Campus?

Posted comments as of Nov 3

The Questions

All members of the community were asked to share their thoughts on this topic. To provide a focus, these questions were posed:

1. What is your opinion of the current policy on smoking and vaping?
2. Why do you think it is a good/bad idea to ban smoking and vaping across the campus?
3. If a campus-wide ban is adopted, then are the cessation services rendered by [Cornell Health](#) and the [Wellness Program](#) adequate? If not, what do you recommend?

1. When I was a non-smoker, I never experienced any problems with smoking issues. Now that I am a smoker, I am considerate when I do so while at work. I would be VERY unhappy if the university adopted a smoke free policy. If there are concerns about smoking near buildings, place ashtrays and signage where it is suitable to smoke.
2. I'm not a smoker. I oppose a total ban. The University Assembly should seriously consider a resolution to move toward the reduction of meat consumption on campus. The consumption of animal products is directly related to the climate crisis. Such a move would do more good for more people than a campus ban on smoking. With time running out on the planet, shouldn't the Cornell community come to terms with its institutional support of an industrial farming system that's driving global heating? A thoughtful reduction in animal products would be consistent with the sustainable campus initiative. "Huge reductions in meat-eating are essential to avoid dangerous climate change, according to the most comprehensive analysis yet of the food system's impact on the environment. In western countries, beef consumption needs to fall by 90% and be replaced by five times more beans and pulses."
3. People die everyday for our right to freedom in America. If they want to smoke let them smoke.
4. This comment sums up my feelings on the matter entirely. The right we all share to clean and healthy spaces should not be compromised because somebody else has the desire, will, and means to compromise it for their own satisfaction. Having spent my childhood among smoking family members, their comfort taken, benefit received from smoking grew from a selfish escape to a needles addiction. I don't care that people choose to smoke. I care that my environment is impacted because of that addiction. I support a smoking ban.
5. Who will enforce? How much will that cost? Follow NYS law.
6. Yes, that is what we are all here for – regulating your adult body. Congratulations on the leap you made there in the end.
7. It would be darn near unenforceable to ban all smoking/vaping on campus. I have seen a few instance where smoking is still performed within 25' of a building/entrance. Enforce the rules we have.
8. As a nonsmoker, I would support banning smoking; however, that probably isn't very fair to those who smoke. I only wish that more people adhered to the 25 feet rule.
9. Someone mentioned keep smoking allowed on campus but "Make sure no one smokes too close to others?" As a nonsmoker walking on campus there are too many times to count being stuck behind someone blowing smoke right in my face. Or how about when you sit down to get some fresh air on a bench and someone sits down next to you and starts smoking? As a non smoker it is very unfair to have to deal with second hand smoke, especially when you are very sensitive to it. There should be smoking areas provided for the smokers on campus
10. I am currently a grad student – plus, a smoker – and, here's my two cents worth of thoughts on this subject: STOP looking for demons in the closet, where none exists! The 25 feet rule works absolutely

fine. Nobody smokes in front of university building entrances, or bus stops, or any such place where there's heavy general public usage. The overwhelming majority of smokers smoke their cigarettes – in peace – in the designated smoking spots. Stop trying to impose your (the university administration) “moral” wills/ virtues on responsible adults, who are free to make their own choices. Or is it the case that all this fancy talk of “tolerance”, “inclusiveness”, “diversity”, and “belonging” is just a charade, and only applies to people who are willing to blindly subscribe to your virtue signalling from ivory-laden towers, and gold-plated echo chambers, based on your narrow one-dimensional worldview?! Enough of this nonsense! Just because we don't shout from rooftops at every real and “perceived” injustice, doesn't mean you can keep taking advantage of our silence! All we request is that you subscribe to the same ethos that you seem to incessantly preach: that of “LIVE and LET LIVE”!

P.S.: Before you start peddling the endless virtues of all the so-called “smoking cessation programs” being available to smokers at campus, it may be worthwhile to go and check the quality, and veracity, of the “professional” advice being offered there at Cornell Health with regards to this. I remember going there for a one-on-one “smoking cessation” session with a behavioral specialist just a couple of months ago, and she was all too happy to tout the “benefits” of e-cigarettes as an effective tool to quit cigarettes. Well, from next time, how about doing some due diligence, and respect for “proven” scientific evidences, before giving willy-nilly advice?! Now, that so many doubts have arisen with regards the safety – even forgetting about the actual efficacy of e-cigarettes as a smoking cessation tool – what course of actions do you recommend that I take with regards to the frivolous – if not downright reckless – advice that was offered to me, as a smoker, at Cornell Health? Should I go and sue Cornell Health and/or Cornell University for offering quackery, instead of scientific medical advice?!

11. I too am a non-smoker and would be fine if there was a ban. But I also believe that people have that right being in the USA. Those who smoke just need to be more respectful of those who don't. As a non smoker/custodian I do object to having to clean up after those who do smoke. As cigarette butts are left on the ground, sidewalks, and cleaning out the nasty smelling, dirty, receptacles that hold the sand so smokers can put their butts in it. That should be their responsibility to clean up that stuff themselves. And when the smell goes into the buildings either via doors, windows, or the ventilation systems know that some are allergic and suffer with breathing when you don't stop to think about someone else.
12. The current 25 foot rule is not obeyed at all. People simply disregard it and pollute the areas with secondhand smoke. Ban it to save our lungs from those too selfish to think of others. If someone is caught smoking, they should be heavily fined.
13. I strongly support the effort to make Cornell a tobacco-free campus. While I know that some smokers are indeed considerate of others, far too many people smoke within 25 of the front door (particularly when it's raining), such that everyone entering the building must inhale their smoke. I'm also dismayed by the number of cigarette butts I see on the ground while walking around campus. There are plenty of bins to dispose of finished cigarettes, but they seem rarely used. Additionally, far too many people smoke while walking on the sidewalks, such that if you get caught behind them you'll be inhaling their fumes for the remainder of the walk. If indeed the tobacco-free initiative passes, Cornell will have to commit to strong enforcement of the measure.

14. I am a non-smoking undergraduate student. I never have been impeded from going as my day-to-day life from smokers. I may encounter a smoker once a month, and I'm usually walking, so they do not interfere with my "breathing space" for long. Hence I believe the second-hand smoking problem does not really pop up. There are not that many smokers at Cornell, they are usually International or of an older generation, so why create a rule that affects not so many people. Banning wouldn't be great, as what happens to the people who like taking a smoke for a break, would they have to leave campus, this is not a reasonable demand. Should they change their habits, this would take time and effort, more than that should be required to live a normal day-to-day life. I think the energy, money, and time that would take to implement this rule, should be allocated to something more useful. Modeling Cornell to the University of Pennsylvania does not make sense as Cornell is far away from major cities, while U of Penn is in Philadelphia an urban area, where there might be more smokers or the pollution is felt more. I am fine with the current policy on smoking/vaping on campus.
15. People shouldn't be ostracized for smoking – not allowing smoking inside buildings is sufficient. This rule change would disproportionately impact staff and would make the lives of those who smoke on their breaks needlessly more difficult.
16. For those relaying inaccuracies. Vaping is a cessation for former smokers and has been found to have zero second hand health hazards. It also very troubling for a former servicemen as myself to have committees deciding to infringe upon others decisions. If you don't smoke, congratulations to you... but certainly your mud puddle is not so shallow that you need to take it away from those that do enjoy cigarettes. Simply walk around or the other way.
17. I am not a smoker but I find this policy cruel, unrealistic and absurd. It is one thing to ban smoking on an urban campus, such as Columbia or UPenn. It is another to ban smoking on an isolated, rural campus on top of a hill. Many of your students and staff smoke for a number of reasons, often because they are dealing with overwhelming stressors. Perhaps it is the stress of providing underpaid, non-unionized labor; or perhaps the stress of surviving sexual assault; or maybe the stress of being the only person of color in their classes. Why don't you invest the money you would spend on a smoking ban into smoking cessation workshops for those who elect to quit? Even better, invest that money into mental health services, effective and compassionate Title IX adjudication, support for POC and first-generation students, and fair labor practices.
18. As a current graduate student at Cornell, I have not found that smoking/tobacco use on campus has been a major issue or nuisance. While I personally do not use tobacco, I do not think it is in the University's authority to impose such a ban. This would represent yet another infringement on personal freedoms by the university. I have observed that tobacco use tends to be infrequent as most current students do not smoke, and that there is a substantial stigma against it by the campus community as a whole, such that many who do smoke are discreet about it. I think this community-wide view on smoking is much more effective than an outright ban, which would require university resources to regulate and enforce. I would much rather the university focus its time and resources on improving Cornell Health, practicing environmental and economic sustainability, and securing funding for research.

19. Where do you draw the line for Cornell? Are you really going to enforce Weill Medical College in NY City. How about 130 E Seneca St? . East Hill Plaza? Ornathology? Cornell is far reaching, and it would be impossible to ban smoking. It would only create more hidey holes and people walking further down the road to smoke in dark alleys. You telling someone not to smoke, or the hazards of smoking will not make people stop. People will quit when/if they want to.
20. I don't agree with a ban on smoking or vaping on campus. There's a line that is crossed when rights are diminished. There are outside areas where smoking is allowed and I believe that should suffice. People who don't smoke or Vape just stay away from those areas... everyone's rights remain intact.
21. As a non-smoker, I concur with other comments that banning smoking altogether is impractical, as well as disrespectful to staff and students who smoke. A smoking ban would most heavily impact staff in service and maintenance positions, and their comfort in the workplace is essential.
22. I'm an employee. I understand that smoking is hard to quit, and most people go to an out of the way spot. Occasionally someone smokes near our workshop entrance – and if I had a serious breathing issue it would render me unable to enter/exit my workspace.
23. It is oppressive to have a total smoking ban. I am totally against a smoking ban, even if I am not a smoker. What is next? What is happening to freedom, even if all these rules are well meant. What happened to the motto: "live and let live". And where is the tolerance?
24. I personally do not like tobacco, I will never smoke or use tobacco products. However, I do not support an outright ban on tobacco. While it is certainly a health hazard to those who use it, it does not presently affect me or many others who do not use directly. I believe in making suggestions/recommendations towards individual to encourage reduced tobacco use, but if someone insists on and has a strong urge to use tobacco products, let them be.
25. Cornell shouldn't do anything to restrict the rights of students beyond what is required by law. The university should spend time on things that matter to students like the cost of tuition and access mental health services. As far as I can tell, few people smoke on campus as it. Encouraging the university to focus on something that isn't an issue ultimately hurts students.
26. Just because the university has other issues independent of this, doesn't lessen this issue any more. Saying but what about alcohol and what about the maintenance issues. Those are legitimate complaints, but this isn't a ranking of issues. The 25 foot rule needs to be enforced and thats about it. Enforcing this rule doesn't cost money like redoing an entire building does. It's a simple policy that is already supposed to be in effect. I dislike cigs and I dislike the smell and dislike that getting secondhand smoke has negative health effects for me, just because I'm walking by someone else. But I get that some people smoke. Out of sight out of mind, just give them a place to do it so it doesn't bother everyone else. Currently, thats not an option. Beyond the 25 foot rule, the real problem is the kids who vape inside, in the hallways and the libraries. Please do something about that, what you can do I have no idea.
27. I fully support a complete ban of smoking and vaping on campus. (Graduate student).

28. I am a student. We are members of a top university, we should act like one. Considering such a strong emphasis on research and Pre-Medical studies, it is shocking that we have not banned nicotine/tobacco products yet. We must strive to be progressive and join our counterparts in eliminating this drug use from our campus. The common argument is that smokers “have a right to smoke” but that does not mean that they have a right to spread second-hand smoke which is common on campus. Other nicotine products such as juuling and vaping also ought to be banned as they are also harmful. I also think we should work to enforce no marijuana on campus, it is not fair to other students to smell it and come into contact with it if they do not want to. We are a leader in science and medical studies, we should start acting like one.
29. Much as I, as a non-smoker sensitive to the stink of secondhand smoke, would like to see a complete ban of smoking on campus, I recognize that it would create a burdensome, perhaps even impossible, situation for those who are addicted. Rather, the simple answer (which does not require 2-3 years to implement!) is to create designated smoking stations around campus. These can include enclosed and ventilated structures that would allow smokers to smoke in fairly close proximity to non-smokers, without bothering them. And smokers might actually like not having to go out into the cold in winter. A compromise solution to this problem is fairly simple, and the cost of a 2-3 year study could be directed into designating areas and creating structures for smokers right now.
30. I agree with a smoke free ban on campus.
31. I’m a staff member and I think it would be unreasonable to try to establish us as a smoke-free institution with a campus size this large. What we need to do is better enforce the 25ft rule, and establish (if they aren’t already) sidewalks as no smoke zones. I truly hate walking around campus and ending up behind someone who decides to light up while walking on the sidewalk as well. Also, there have been many days when I get to work, and try to walk into my building and there is the same person standing directly in front of the door smoking. Without fail he does this, and then walks up and down the steps to the other doors while smoking. I shouldn’t have to go all the way around to the other side just to avoid the smoke cloud either. While I believe everyone has the right to smoke if they choose, I find it rather rude to smoke while walking around multiple entrances during a high traffic time, or to smoke while walking around on the sidewalk while others are around. Besides simply hating the smell of cigarette smoke, inhaling it has made me physically ill on multiple occasions due to my asthma. I’d be in favor of establishing smoking zones around campus that are far enough away from walking paths and doors to be easily avoidable by those of us who do not want to inhale secondhand smoke.
32. Ban nicotine and cigarettes on campus. I’ve never been a smoker, but I’m so sensitive to the smell of cigarettes and nicotine that even smelling it on someone’s clothes gives me a migraine. When the smell is particularly overwhelming, I’m prone to dizziness and fainting. It’s one thing for a person to negatively impact their own health, but I don’t think it’s ok to negatively impact another person’s health.
33. I agree with the fart-ban. The smell of farts is just disgusting. I smell people farting, and sometimes hear it, on campus. Why should I have to be subjected to carcinogenic air just because someone wants to

feel relieved? If people want to fart on campus, then I say we build a glass box and they can all go inside and fart there. I don't support that idea, but that would be a compromise.

34. It would be too harsh and thus impossible to completely ban smoking on campus. People who are in need of a cigarette usually won't have time to go somewhere off-campus and will probably just ignore the ban anyways. I don't smoke regularly so I don't know how urgent it is when a regular smoker needs a cigarette. But for me, smoking is probably the fastest way to keep me away from emotional breakdowns during stressful times such as finals and it is usually very urgent. During such times I would probably just ignore the ban if there were really one, as I won't be smoking in the first place if I really have the 15 minutes to walk somewhere off-campus! So, instead of trying to ban something that is impossible to ban, it's way better to regulate and more importantly enforce regulations better. For example, better enforce the 25 feet rule and designate smoking spaces or rooms with ventilation.
35. While I think the current policy has worked pretty well so far, I am not against a ban of smoking as a whole on campus. I'm pretty privileged in that I don't have any breathing issues but I can imagine that, especially given the hilly walks to get around campus, those who aren't as fortunate (re: asthmatics) probably don't appreciate the few times they do have to deal with the smoke. So if we can reduce the number of those instances, that's a win in my book. I do think Cornell Health's cessation services need to be improved and marketed more for the ban to work properly. I do worry that having designated smoking areas on campus will be seen as Cornell not taking the matter seriously, resulting in people disobeying the rules and smoking as they currently do anyway. I don't want to trivialize this. I know that addiction, particularly nicotine addictions, are difficult to kick and it would suck that a ban would temporarily make the lives of smokers more inconvenient. But to that I question why we value the comfort of smokers so much over those third-parties that suffer a lot as a result of the smoke on campus.
36. Current policy insufficiently protects my health and safety. I am routinely exposed to second-hand smoke that is not in violation of current policy. I support the ban.
37. Cornell Health's resources on stress and mental health are tragically lacking, and many students/staff/faculty turn to nicotine products as a result of stress and mental health. A smoking free campus would be ideal, especially for those who suffer from asthma like myself. This would be a hard, but perhaps achievable goal. However, a nicotine free campus seems almost impossible. Vaping is discreet and many students vape without disturbing those around them. Vaping provides an outlet for those who have a nicotine problem, and it is less damaging for those around them, and should be allowed, but discouraged. No matter what the end goal is, mental health care, stress management and resources for quitting smoking and vaping need to be more widely advertised and made more available, both through faster access and reduction in cost of care.
38. "People smoke because they enjoy smoking and/or are addicted to smoking and need it to feel evened out. Having said this, walking by a minute amount of second-hand smoke will not hurt you." Well ... there are lots of things that people "enjoy" doing that are regulated because they are dangerous, unhealthy, or just annoying to other people. Many people "enjoy" playing music very loudly, but there are noise ordinances that regulate this because it annoys other people who reasonably feel that they have a right to a quiet personal space. Many people "enjoy" driving cars very fast, but speed

limits regulate this. Some Cornell professors no doubt would enjoy having “consensual” romantic relationships with students, but the university wisely prohibits such behavior, even though it is perfectly legal. I “enjoy” fresh air. The rights of a smoker end where my rights begin; I should not have to be subjected to annoying and unhealthy exhaust just because a smoker “enjoys” polluting the air that we share.

39. We cannot totally ban smoking on campus, just having limited “smoking areas” probably wouldn’t work, and would be unfair to those who are already addicted to nicotine. Unfortunately, the existing restrictions are not enforced (as far as I can see); I see people smoking right next to doorways all the time.
40. As someone who did his undergraduate at a tobacco free campus (UCSC) I can tell you that this policy is extremely foolish and ineffective. All this will do is increase pollution as smokers will continue to smoke, but in areas with no adequate ashtrays and dump butts on the ground. Who is going to enforce this policy? Will campus police patrol the streets tracking cigarette butts ? This is a complete waste of resources and time. Not to mention how absurd it is to think that the banning of a substance will prevent it from being used (marijuana, alcohol, etc.). If you want to decrease pollution then increase the number of ashtrays available on campus. We all know that this policy is truly about regulating the bodies of adults, and criminalizing otherwise legal behavior.
41. At my previous institution (university of Illinois) the only effect on a campus wide ban on smoking was that there were cigarette butts littered everywhere since the university got rid of the cigarette butt receptacles.
42. At the least, smoking/vaping should not be allowed on any walking paths or public spaces on campus. Areas should be set aside, away from common areas, for those who must smoke. Cessation programs or incentives should be used. Easy enough? Cornell should be a leader in public health. If not now, when? President Pollack, now is the time.
43. Smoking absolutely should be banned. It is an abhorrent public health issues that affects everyone. The 25ft law is not enforced and is summarily ignored by most participants, partially in poor weather. The only way to have a clear enforceable rule is a complete ban. Unfortunately I think that it is a bit unfair to vapers as there practice has little to no second hand risk. However, it would be unenforceable to draw an arbitrary line between the two and try to enforce two different rules for both.
44. I do not smoke, but I feel like the complete campus being smoke-free is a bit ridiculous. Campus is huge. Are we expecting everyone that smokes to quit smoking, or quit working here at Cornell? I believe they can enforce the proximity rule of 25 feet, much easier than they could regulate a non-smoking campus.
45. I am a non smoker/vapor and I agree that the current rules should be enforced more, not adding a ban. What I do see, as a worker, that smokers take longer/extra breaks so possibly monitoring them to smoke ONLY during their allowed breaks to make sure everyone gets equal time will help. I’ve seen through other work rules that they offer extra vacation days for those that are non smoker/vapors due to the fact that smokers/vapors “need” to take smoke breaks in between breaks. Just a thought.

46. I don't think it's good to allow smoking on campus!
47. I am a smoker and I try to be mindful of those who don't. I feel that Cornell and other places should not put the ash cans by the entrances where people have to walk. I wonder how smoking is handled in other schools in let's say Europe. We do have a lot of people abroad that visit. I feel that we are very large and smoking could be at the docks at campus buildings where fumes are already present from trucks and delivery vans.
48. I am not a smoker myself because I have a sensitivity to harsh smells, but I agree with a lot of the above- How could we implement this rule when the campus can't even keep building care from chain smoking behind the dumpsters all day, or people hovering under entrances smoking because it's cold or rainy? Although this law would be amazing for me and many like me, I don't see its practicality or how it would be enforced effectively. To me, this would be another ignored law that Cornell boasts about to help their PR but does not really care about.
49. (Student) While I am genuinely concerned for the health of tobacco-using individuals, when confined to the individual and not affecting the surrounding environment, I have no immediate problem with smoking and/or vaping. As soon as an individual's decision to smoke affects others, such as myself, like by smoking right in front of the building I go to everyday for class, I begin to take issue with the prevalence of smoking on campus.
50. Cornell is a big campus, so most of the time, I do not encounter smokers. This semester, I think I've only walked to class behind someone vaping twice. However, invariably, there are people smoking right outside of high traffic building entrances that, no matter how long I hold my breath for, always seem to catch up to me. I think the current policy on smoking and vaping, specifically the designated smoking areas, need to be revisited and revised. The 25 foot limit is not only not enforced at all, but the designated smoking areas, like the one right outside of Goldwin Smith on the Arts Quad, which is right next to general seating areas where numerous students do work throughout the day, subject beautiful, well-kept, open use spaces to smoke. Even today as I walked home, past the bus stop in front of Ho Plaza, someone was smoking right next to the waiting area that was filled with at least 10 people.
- Having seen their effects in friends/family, I find smoking and vaping both repulsive and scary and I am frustrated that I have little control over being subjected to someone's secondhand smoke. Thus, I think it is a good idea to ban smoking and vaping across campus. I understand, however, the pushback that will come from those who smoke. While I think that the ban is a good idea in theory, the implementation plan should gradually ease into an all out ban. I propose putting smoking booths/pods, like those in airports, in various buildings interspersed throughout campus and only allowing on-campus smoking in those booths. This would not only make smoking areas much more defined and easy to monitor, but would altogether prevent secondhand smoke exposure, careless discarding of cigarettes, and smokers' going into high traffic areas (that are also very cold in the winter) to smoke. I also think a much greater effort (or any effort at all really) should be put into resources to help people quit smoking/vaping. If almost no one on campus smoked/vaped after implementing such resources, there would be no need for the ban anyway.

51. I think that the main cause of cigarette smoking issues on campus is the staff. It honestly disgusts me to see so many of the staff smoke. I also think that vaping is a true issue here and should be addressed due to the possible unknowns that come from vaping (unknown health effects due to lack of research)
52. You have been fed lies. There is no possible way you are encountering enough second-hand smoke on this campus that you should have any concern for your health. That one puff of a smoke that you could smell as you walked by Uris? probably $1/16$th of a cigarette. Obviously it is unethical to subject little kids to dense second-hand smoke and things like that, but to say second-hand smoke kills in this context is absurd.
53. It is silly to believe that any rules banning smoking on campus will be adhered to by anyone who currently smokes. Perhaps more actions should be taken to designate smoking areas. All I really have to say other than this is that many people who are staunchly opposed to smoking seem to demonize smokers. No one smokes because they are some sort of tobacco-industry pawn that wants to infect your perfect lungs with their evil cigarette smoke. They are aware that it is unhealthy. People smoke because they enjoy smoking and/or are addicted to smoking and need it to feel evened out. Having said this, walking by a minute amount of second-hand smoke will not hurt you. Smoking for 10 years will most likely not hurt you. Tobacco smoke's potential to cause health problems upon chronic exposure is not grounds for being deathly afraid of it. In fact, I would reckon that living and breathing for a month in a large city would be worse for your respiratory/long-term health than a year of living in this clean Ithaca air and having to occasionally walk by one person smoking a cigarette outside a library.
54. I believe Cornell should be a smoke/vape/drug free campus. The effects of all of these substances are not good for people's health, or those that have to walk through or sit/stand near someone who is engaging in the activity which happens often enough. The other factor to consider is the time and cost to pick up cigarettes from the ground. I advocate for Cornell to be a leader in this area as timely as possible.
55. You are so short-sighted. Commanding folks to stop getting nicotine dependencies is so ridiculous. You think that is a choice? As many commenters have pointed out, nicotine dependency is not a choice, but something that comes with economic class and racial factors. Please, in a similar vein, for the next five years, only eat leafy greens and avoid all fast-food. Do not come close to TCAT buses, the exhaust of which may inadvertently influence your health. As research shows, nine hours of sleep each night is a far more influential upon your health than a whiff of cigarette smoke once a month. Please work exhaustibly for 15-hours every day and then go to sleep and repeat the process, just to ensure those nine hours and avoid any adverse side effects of overwork. I wish you the very best in your endeavor to attend a highly demanding academic university and avoid any adverse health effects. Please, if you have the secret to attending an ivy-league university founded on professionalism and constant work and publishing, while also eschewing any sort of stress-based ways of coping with the pressures of attending such an institution, then please share that secret with the rest of us. I know you are above any sort of dependency, including any sort of financial, institutional, class-based dependency, so please invite all of us degenerate nicotine-using plebs over for Thanksgiving dinner and a spot on the credit line. This would really help us cope. I love you, thank you so much.

56. This comment plumbs the depths of the completely absurd. I commend the commenter's abilities to traverse the completely irrational and incoherent depths of absurdity. This demonstration is unmatched. Do you really think that most people can smoke in their bathrooms? This warrants home-ownership. Do you think that most individuals who chose to use nicotine are home-owners? I implore you to step outside of your social context and consider what it would be like to deal with nicotine addiction. I implore you to step outside of your current academic context and consider what it would be like to be a early-career academic or a PhD student at an ivy-league institution whose livelihood depends on publishing multiple articles in very short spans of time. How many academic articles have you published this year? What if I told you that Cornell would abandon you, and any of your future job prospects, if you did not publish this year? What sort of stress would that add to your life? As someone who does not smoke cigarettes or vape, but does feel the pressures of academia, I can tell you that I fully sympathize with those who do chose to use nicotine to cope with these pressures. Do you own your own bathroom? Could you smoke there if you wanted to? If not, please reconsider what you are asking of our fellow Cornellians.
57. The "health of the entire Cornell community" is a problematic phrase for many reasons. The commenter is equating "health" with non-smoking. As many other commenters have pointed out, their therapists and doctors have advised against taking measures to quit smoking at this stage in their life. This will probably strike non-smokers as untenable and silly. This is because they do not smoke. However, for many members of our academic community, nicotine use is an important way of coping with the particular stresses of their academic life. Telling them that they must make a choice: 1) either quit or, 2) walk a mile everytime you desire to smoke, creates undue stress on nicotine users, both casual and addicted. Do commenters supporting the ban realize how far one must walk to escape Cornell's campus? I encourage you to walk from Olin library past Africana Library, where the boundaries of campus exist. That is the distance that you are asking your fellow Cornellians to walk in order to smoke. Rather than suggesting designated smoking areas or a more robust enforcement on the 25-foot rule, you would rather folks walk that far to smoke a cigarette? This strikes me as absurd. As a PhD student and someone who does not smoke cigarettes or vape, I do not support the ban on nicotine. I think that advocating for this ban under the guise of "health" is short-sighted and does not account for the burden that this ban will place on members of the Cornell academic community who do smoke
58. I support a complete ban on smoking and vaping on campus. Smokers often position themselves in walkways where others must pass close to get by. It is unnecessary to accommodate smoking, and it is a health hazard. I am asthmatic, and smokers are a threat to my health as well as their own. A smoking ban is a good incentive for them to quit smoking or use products that substitute for inhaled nicotine.
59. "terribly polluted" I would like to know what you are smoking. Yes, there are people who smoke within 25 feet, typically international, but it's never been a big issue with me and it's not like it's extremely prevalent across the campus. It'd be absolutely stupid for the university to totally ban use of vapes and tobacco products across the campus.
60. Yes, I have seen people smoke in the entrances of buildings, including Olin, on campus. Why is this so? Suppose you smoked, it is raining or snowing outside, where would you retreat to smoke? Can you think of a place on campus that is covered from rain or snow that would be a favorable place to

smoke? There are no covered areas on campus where a person may smoke. If there were more favorable smoking spaces on campus, then I think we would see a decrease in smoking under these areas.

61. The evolutionary line of argument here should deeply concern the author of this comment, as well as those reading the comments. It is short-sighted, racist, and classist—to say the least. As other commenters have pointed out, smoking has been linked to lower-income, non-white groups of people. This comment suggests that, in order to reach a higher level of evolution, Cornell should center higher-income, predominately white, modes of coping with daily life and the stresses of academia. Do you really think that the answer to a better society, and a more productive and interesting intellectual atmosphere, rests in degrading and criminalizing modes of coping with stress that are linked with impoverished and non-white groups of people? Additionally, what does this say about Cornell's commitment to addiction? This ban suggests that the easy way to cope with addiction is to discourage the presence of people on Cornell's campus that are coping with such addictions. In my tenure at Cornell, I have never once heard of any sort of outreach concerning nicotine addiction. Why do so many faculty and graduate students, as well as undergraduates, use nicotine as a means of coping with the stresses of academic life? Certainly, for the administrators and supporters of the ban, it is easier to extinguish the coping mechanisms that folks employ rather than addressing issues of class and fair-wage in order to “solve” some perceived problem. I am a PhD student at Cornell, who does not have a dependence on nicotine. Before you demonize those who do use nicotine, please step out of your insulated life and consider different perspectives. If you support this ban, please consider how you should live with the reality that you know nothing about addiction. Again, you know nothing about addiction, class, and the various dynamics that lead a person to take up nicotine.
62. Second-hand smoke kills people who have done no harm. It's as simple as that. To say our university is too large or too diverse is incomparable to other universities who have enacted similar policies including the other Ivies and the entirety of the SUNY system. Cornell is an Ivy and a part of the SUNY system through CALS, Human Ecology, and ILR and it is absurd that we have not passed any legislation within our community protecting those who chose to not take the chance of lung disease, cancer, and death. Cornell University in its entirety should establish a tobacco-free campus and protect the students, adults, and people of Ithaca who want to be educated without suffocating in a scientifically proven cloud of poison. All smoking and vaping should be banned and its policy should be heavily enforced, as it is the university's responsibility to protect all people on campus.
63. I think smoking should not be allowed on campus. Even with the current rule, I see many people smoking within 25 feet of the academic buildings.
64. This is a draconian proposal that enrages me. You cannot force someone to quit smoking, this is a paternalistic idea, and it's ridiculous to ask the entire community (where the majority do not smoke) and not the smokers themselves. Yes, us smokers would really love designated smoking areas that are covered so we would not smoke in the rain, which is the only reason we would smoke less than 25 feet away from buildings. Do that and the problem is solved. It's impossible to walk out off campus for a cigarette in between classes— the campus is huge. I'm a grad student and TA.

65. I think the survey has too many leading questions and should have had more ability to discuss the state of smoking by those on campus than 1 2-part multiple choice question which is not easy to use.
66. The survey is horrifically designed, and seems not worth even bothering to fill out. Second-hand smoke is a valid concern, but smokers who are considerate and follow the rules as they stand should not pose a problem for others on campus. Smokers who smoke right next to doorways or building air intakes, or who toss cigarette butts on the ground instead of in receptacles, should of course be stopped. Cornell would do well to encourage and support those who wish to stop smoking, but prohibiting any smoking on campus isn't going to stop those who don't prefer to quit. It'll drive smoking into the shadows and worsen the cigarette butt litter.
67. Enforce the 25ft policy AND the no vaping inside buildings. People sneak JUULs into libraries. They look like USBs so it's easy to do. I've had 2 asthma attacks because of this. Luckily my asthma is not severe, I just used my inhaler and left. This could easily happen to someone who does have severe asthma. I think that a ban on smoking is unnecessarily paternalistic. How does it help a smoker to suddenly force them to quit? Sure many will eventually get over the stress and withdrawal. But how many will not be able to endure it and quit their jobs, transfer, drop out, or take up secretly smoking in the library? Also, how many of those juuling in the library (and elsewhere) are people who are using nicotine vaping to quit cigarettes? So anyone who wants to quit now just has to use disgusting gum or expensive patches or medication? Cornell shouldn't inconvenience people like that for something that won't have any substantial or direct economic benefit for the campus.
68. Having just come from an institution that made the recent transition to a non-smoking campus, I can tell you that these bans are almost unenforceable. If the 25-foot rule is not being enforced, it is unreasonable to assume that a total ban would be. Furthermore, as others have noted, the smoking bans have mainly been implemented at institutions with urban campuses where it is easy to walk off campus for a smoke break. It is completely unreasonable to insist that smokers must walk great lengths for their smoke breaks, especially if they are staff with limited break times during the day. The added pressure on campus police and the added expense of implementing cessation programs (which most smokers would certainly not take advantage of) would result in this policy being a waste of campus resources. There are much bigger issues that are worth investing in than inconveniencing the small campus population that smokes. Enforce the 25-foot rule or create easily-accessible designated smoking areas. The introduction of new draconian policies will not get people to stop smoking and it is foolish to think these expensive measures would have any real impact on the quality of life on campus.
69. What is your opinion of the current policy on smoking and vaping? Smoking and vaping provide a somewhat legal way to damage your health and the health of others slowly but surely. The current policy, like any other in the future, won't change a thing unless means to enforce it are in place and then they are enforced consistently.
- Why do you think it is a good/bad idea to ban smoking and vaping across the campus?
It would provide cleaner air to breathe. Honestly, with the grip tobacco corporations have on the economy, I doubt it'll pass, and like someone else commented, smokers will just get creative and sneakier finding places to smoke.
- If a campus-wide ban is adopted, then are the cessation services rendered by Cornell Health and the Wellness Program adequate? If not, what do you recommend?

They are adequate but like any addiction there have to be more education about the damage caused by smoking, incentives programs, and support groups to get at least many to quit more willingly and painlessly.

70. I strongly support banning smoking and vaping across campus. It is detrimental to my health and the smell makes me allergic. I don't feel that I should be subjected to smoke on campus because of someone else's addiction. One possible compromise would be to create completely enclosed/glassed in smoking areas. I don't personally support this, but this would be an acceptable compromise for me. [Cornell former PhD student and Employee]
71. I strongly support banning smoking and vaping across campus. It is detrimental to my health and the smell makes me allergic. I don't feel that I should be subjected to smoke on campus because of someone else's addiction. One possible compromise would be to create completely enclosed/glassed in smoking areas. I don't personally support this, but this would be an acceptable compromise for me. [Cornell former PhD student and Employee]
72. I don't smoke; I have asthma; smoke is one of the triggers.. That said, I cannot support a smoke-free campus. People choose to smoke for a variety of reasons, and assumptions about those reasons are playing out in paternalistic, neo-liberal, classist, regionalist, and racist comments in this discussion. Genuine concern about long-term consequences of smoking should not be expressed is setting up small "smoking booths" which further stigmatizes those who choose to use them; it's in difficult conversations with colleagues, and in the realization that we [most likely] all maintain practices that could be considered unhealthy.
And, from a sheerly practical angle, who is the enforcer?
73. Considering that the popularity of smoking is heavily dependent on social class in America (more so than in Europe for instance) and that it is a "working class" drug, so to speak, I fear that a ban would further marginalize those that are already a minority at Cornell.
74. How about a ban on farting? Several gases which occur in flatulence are carcinogenic (e.g. methanethiol). I routinely am subject to malodorous emissions in libraries, eateries, and bus stops. There should be a 100% fart-free policy on campus, or at least flatulence exclusion zones 25 ft or more away from buildings.
75. Yes. Thank you very much.
76. You want a ban so you can feel superior to people? So you can talk down to people? I thought this comment was a joke at first.
77. Absolutely not. Smoking is cultural for certain groups that this unfairly targets. Grown adults should be allowed to make their own decisions. Just because some of you don't like smoke doesn't mean that legal adults should have to "quit" at least while on campus. Especially individuals who live on campus and would have to walk far away to be able to smoke. And the workers who need their smoke breaks. Implement smoking areas if you want but a campus ban is ridiculous. Especially as we are all either overpaying to attend this school or being underpaid to work at it. I'm an ex-smoker and would just ask

smokers to be more considerate of others. If you're walking and it's not busy, don't be a jerk and light up when someone's walking right behind you. Stop, let them pass you and then smoke. It's not that hard guys.

I'd be very disappointed in the university if they choose to implement this, as a person who pays to go to this school, a grown adult should be allowed to smoke.

78. I think a tobacco-free campus is an abuse of power and is absolutely ridiculous. What are they going to do next? Not allow us to drink soda in dining halls? Oh right, they already did that.

Cornell has consistently abused their power as an institution and has used that power to seize the liberties of the undergraduate community and staff. I understand smoking causes secondhand smoke which can be caught by passers nearby, but the solution is just being courteous and actually having enforcement of our CURRENT policy.

If we're investigating a tobacco-free campus, how effective will it be if it's being enforced on the same level that it is now? I think a scarecrow at all entrances would be more effective than the current amount of enforcement we have now.

We are an institution of adults, like an earlier comment said. I'm not a smoker, but I respect that everyone has the freedom to smoke even if I don't like the smell/smoke that comes from it. As long as they are mindful of their surroundings that's all that matters.

79. I am not a smoker and do not enjoy the smell of smoke. I would be in support of designated smoking areas.

80. As a nonsmoker, I rarely experience issues with unwanted smoke produced by smokers/vapers. When it happens, it's annoying, but—as I said—it happens rarely, so that a campus-wide ban seems out of proportion to the health or annoyance issues involved. What Cornell really should do is ban football: this sport creates real damage both to the athletes who participate, and to the priorities of the University.

81. My undergrad had a tobacco-free campus and it worked out really well. Whenever people tried to smoke on the quad, it was very satisfying to be like, "excuse me, this is a smoke-free campus. You can't do that here." I think yelling at people who make poor life choices helped to relieve our pent-up frustrations from classes and whatnot. Perhaps, to help manage people's addictions, we could install those small glass boxes that people can stand inside to smoke, like what they have in airports and Europe. Overall, I think that it will be beneficial to make it more difficult or embarrassing for people to smoke because it will encourage people to quit.

82. Employee in facilities: I do not know how someone can be pro choice or pro life and think a smoking ban is not appropriate. If you want people to have the right to choose what kills them, you should ban smoking on university premises. Let employees smoke in their cars on their private property. If you want to chose for people that they can not hurt each other on campus, make an inclusive environment for all, you would ban smoking on premises. People can smoke on their own private properties. They have gum and patches for those that waste their hard earned money on nicotine carcinogens. If you want to decrease insurance costs for staff and medical expenses in one particular way, and increase employee productivity, you would ban smoking. It should be a no brainer for anyone with a brain

A campus-wide tobacco ban is clearly nonsensical. As other commenters have noted, such a step would be unenforceable, not to mention a gross infringement of individual rights. The 25-foot rule is working fine; there is no 'second-hand smoke crisis' at Cornell.

Thus, I'm curious – why is this step even being considered?

Smoking is a class issue in America today. The primary users of tobacco products on campus are workers, international students (notably from developing countries and/or the global south), and (under)graduate students in the social sciences and humanities. That is: a particularly precarious and disenfranchised subsection of our community.

Of course, the typical Cornell alumnus – let's say the average member of the university's donor pool – comes from an entirely different population. A population of smug neoliberal paternalism (i.e. "we must protect poor people from themselves"); a population that might consider giving an extra dollar or sending their privileged children to a university that took such a 'courageous' step (see question #7 of Cornell's survey); a population that believes working-class habits have no place on their pristine Ivy-League campus (indeed, inchoate disdain for the poor animates quite a few of the comments left by the sons and daughters of the donor class in this very forum).

It sadly comes as no surprise that Cornell would consider a measure that, while harshly punitive towards the first group, might 'read well' and 'help their brand' with the second. This is just another instance where Cornell proves itself to be an institution deeply committed to diversity, inclusion, and difference – as long as you're wealthy.

83. I've already commented above, but just wanted to add that the (positive and negative) class bias apparent in some of these comments confuses the main point.
84. Having a smoke-free campus means that the smokers will find places to smoke on campus far away from others (so that they won't "be caught"). It seems like this might indirectly serve the purpose of enforcing the 25 foot rule, in the absence of additional monitoring of entryways.
85. I am a graduate student non-smoker. I don't have any problem with the existing 25-ft rule. I do have a question: as Cornell buildings are very widely dispersed (not only in Ithaca and beyond), and the university owns property where non-Cornell businesses are located (such as East Hill Plaza), how would this ban impact and/or be applied to the businesses in these areas, and how would it apply to off-campus dorms such as Maplewood Park? Would these areas be non-smoking as well? A full ban extending to these areas as well seems inconsiderate of those who do smoke and who may have complicated journeys to quitting and on whom a full smoking ban might place undue stress or strain and/or negatively impact mental health. As it stands, I would continue to be in favor of the existing 25ft rule.
86. Smoking should not be banned completely, people have the right to make their own decisions, and the campus is large enough that secondhand smoke doesn't affect others. If it's really a concern, provide smoking areas, but otherwise don't deprive people of their choices. A ban on vaping will also encourage people living on-campus to simply be more discrete, and potentially encourage more smoking in dorms where people feel like they can get away with it.

87. I went through great struggle to quit smoking and now that I have I don't think I deserve to be subjected to second hand smoke on my schools campus if there can be a ban made. This is an opportunity we don't have in public spaces and we should exercise our right to ask for a clean environment.
88. This is ridiculous. I am a non-smoker. Nevertheless, how much more do we want to cut into the personal freedom of individuals using the greater good as a lame excuse? If smoking around buildings is an issue, strictly forbid it and create airport like smoking zones.
89. Smoking is not illegal and should not be treated as such. People find it their job to police the lives of others and that a bad trend our country is heading. Smokers should enjoy the rights of non-smokers and be left alone, if not breaking any rules.
90. Smoking harms more than those who just partake in it. It is rude to smoke so close to other people. This happens all around campus. Making Cornell a smoke free campus would greatly benefit it's students and staff.
91. I am a staff member and I believe that the current policy is adequate. I am a smoker, but in order not to offend anyone, I only smoke when I am off-campus. Other smokers may not have that luxury. People who smoke are well aware of the potential health effects associated with smoking, yet they continue to smoke because it is an addiction. Banning smoking is not going to cure the addiction. Resources offered by the University and the State and Federal governments to help people quit work for some but not for others. I agree that the 25 foot rule could be enforced...I'd also suggest designating smoking areas to further signify where it is acceptable to smoke and where it is not.
92. I am a non-smoking staff member. I do think current rules should be enforced— I've heard a few faculty members whose office windows are on the ag quad say that smoke is blowing into their offices— but I don't support a ban. I think it's intrusive and unfair; quitting smoking seems like a difficult and very personal choice that people should be free to make for themselves. I sometimes pass people smoking on walkways, etc. but not often enough for it to seem like a problem. I didn't leave my name because I thought it seemed ironic to enter for a chance to win free ice cream in return for filling out a survey in which I'm opining about whether our employer should make such a big decision about our health choices; seems like we should win a coupon for Cornell Orchards or something instead. Many folks have given reasons for not banning smoking on campus, which I happen to agree with. Regardless of what the University ends up doing, please DO NOT get rid of the cigarette butt receptacles! Campus is already littered with cigarette butts. Shaming those who litter into disposing of their trash appropriately will be much less effective if they can simply respond, "there's no where to dispose of it, what do you expect me to do?"
93. I don't smoke, but I think its dumb to put forth a campus wide ban. You have so many students from different cultures where smoking cigarettes maybe common. So, I think its kind of dumb to enforce a kind of ban like that when a good chunk of kids participate in this activity.

94. I believe an effective solution to this issue is to have several easily-discernible and strategically-placed smoking areas. This would allow people that enjoy and use tobacco/nicotine responsibly easy and convenient means to continue to do so. Banning smoking anywhere outside of these smoking areas I believe would make it easier for both smokers and non-smokers to know 1) when a smoker is obviously in violation of the tobacco policy and 2) where non-smokers should avoid if they wish to steer clear of smoking/vaping.
95. I strongly support making Cornell a smoking-, vaping-, tobacco-, nicotine-free campus. I am sick of having to cover my mouth and nose to avoid breathing in cigarette smoke as I walk around campus. The 25 foot rule is not adequately followed (especially by faculty and construction crews). Along with making Cornell smoking-, vaping-, tobacco-, nicotine-free, applicants and new faculty should be required to sign an acknowledgement that these activities are against campus policy and that they accept any consequences of not following such policies WHEN THEY APPLY (for admission or for a job, respectively). This way, applicants that are addicted know what they are getting into (and maybe it will deter addicted applicants from applying, resulting in fewer students and faculty motivated to try and get away with using these products).
With this is the need for actual consequences of not following such policies. As far as I understand (someone please point me to where such consequences are actually listed if they exist, because I could not find them in the link for Policy 8.7) there are essentially no consequences other than being asked to stop. Without consequences, there will be limited improvement of the situation with the ban.
96. From my fairly complete reading of all previous 159 comments, it looks to me as though there is near unanimity on the need to step up the enforcement of the 25-foot ban.
Both those who want a complete ban, and those who resist a complete ban, agree that smoking should be banned within 25 feet of buildings, and that this ban needs to be more consistently enforced.
So much for agreement: now to disagreement. About one-third of the comments have favored a total ban, and about two-thirds have argued against a total ban. And both sides are very vehement about it. I do not see any prospect of agreement between those who want a total ban, and those who want to allow for some smoking on campus.
Would the following do something to make room for agreement? What if we were to consider expanding the zone of prohibition from 25 feet to 50 feet, or even 100 feet? This would not force smokers to leave campus, or to walk any further than 50 (or 100) feet from a building. But it would keep the entrances much less smokey. It would significantly reduce the chances that non-smokers will have to breathe poisonous fumes.
Any zone of prohibition — whether an expanded one or the current 25-foot zone — needs to be rigorously, consistently, reliably enforced. That we can all agree on.
But since a total ban is probably not politically feasible, perhaps an expansion of the smoke-free zones would help the non-smokers, while not making the lives of smokers impossible.
97. I'm a student. The 25 foot rule definitely doesn't work. Something that visitors comment on when they come to see me at Cornell is that it seems like you cannot go anywhere without smelling cigarettes, especially from maintenance workers. Maybe a 25 foot ban on vapes but full ban on cigarettes/cigars would be more appropriate.

98. For reference, a cigarette has never touched my lips, and I detest the smell of cigarette smoke. That being said, this proposal is ridiculous... Exposure to particulates via sources such as vehicles and construction impacts far more people day-to-day on campus, so if improving health is the goal, we should ban internal combustion engine vehicles as well.

More importantly, there appear to be quite a number of comments espousing the educated elite opinion that smoking is a bane upon society and attacking individuals who choose to smoke. Such a policy will clearly impact underrepresented and/or economically disadvantaged groups disproportionately meaning that passing such a policy goes directly against the stated mission of the university.

99. I agree with a ban on smoking. I am a Cornell employee and do not appreciate having to be around smokers, many are very inconsiderate.. Not to mention the butts that are literally everywhere. I believe it is long over due and about time Cornell gets on board with a smoke free campus.

100. Clearly, Cornell's 25-foot rule isn't working. If a no-smoking ban across campus (both inside and outside—anywhere on University property) isn't realistic, Brown's policy may be an alternative: BROWN: "Employees are permitted to smoke outside, at a distance of at least 35 feet [not 25 feet] from the entrance to any University building, provided that there will be no migration of smoke into a University building or property including vehicles. If smoke is still able to migrate into University buildings or vehicles, employees must smoke at a further distance."

Well said, Brown. Even if smokers are 25 feet from Barnes Hall, smoke infiltrates throughout the entire building. Barnes has numerous windows on the main floor, plus three entrances, one of which includes a major air intake vent, plus the loading dock of Cornell Store where vehicles are seen parking alongside the building with their occupants (mainly maintenance personnel) leisurely lighting up with their windows open. As if that weren't enough, we have the occasional smoker sitting on the curb across from the building whose smoke, depending on which way the wind blows, hits a person's face as they exit the facility. We've had staff who've had to go home, ill, because of the infestation. If there's not a smoking cessation program at Cornell Health, there should be. No expense should be spared on improving outreach and education to help and support those staff, faculty, and students who are trying to quit.

101. Rarely does one who wishes not to be affected by others' smoke become affected. In 3 years at Cornell, I've caught perhaps a couple whiffs of another's smoke, while I walked past a cig stand.

102. I think that an increase in the number of cig stands (and trash cans for that matter) would be a better route than banning, as that will, in all likely hood, not discourage many from smoking. Not that, as I touched on above, it's a particular problem at the moment from my vantage point. A MUCH larger problem, in my opinion (based off the countless times I've encountered it), is vaping indoors. Few try to secretly rip boges inside, but I know kids from all stratum that take hits off their _____ (insert hip electronic doming device here) while indoors, particularly in the libraries. How you would go about policing such a thing without being a bother to other patrons, I couldn't tell you. But that's certainly a bigger problem, IMO, than adults ripping boges outdoors.

103. Smoking bans are a form of discrimination against the working class.

“The attack on cigarette smoking does not improve the lives of those it claims to protect, be they the “self-destructive” workers who smoke or the moralizing professionals who complain about having to smell them. Anti-smoking legislation is, and always has been, about social control. It is about ratcheting up worker productivity and fostering class hatred, to keep us looking for the enemy in each other instead of in those who are making a killing off cigarettes and anti-smoking campaigns alike. It legitimates the privatization of public space, limits popular assembly, and forces the working class out of political life into private isolation via the social technology of shame. It whitewashes the violence exacted on the poor by the rich to make it all seem like the worker’s own doing. It is, in short, class war by another name.”

Thunderstorm, June. “Off Our Butts: How smoking bans extinguish solidarity.” *The Baffler* 33 (2016): 102-107.

104. Leave the 25’ ban in place and if it’s not working, then enforce it.

There’s nothing like getting slapped with a fine to made someone take a walk further away from the building entrance to smoke. NFN, I have NEVER seen anyone smoking at or near an entrance to a Cornell Building.

105. I agree with all the comments about actually enforcing the 25 foot limit. There is someone who works in my building who loves to smoke outside my window (which is also 25 feet from an entrance). The first time I complained, I was scolded for having my window open. Now this guy smokes on the stairs next to the other entrance of the building. It’s also 25 feet from an entrance. Scandal! Banning smoking altogether seems like a bit of a nanny state option though.

106. Well stated.

107. I have never smoked. It is unquestionably a dangerous habit. However, we are all presumably adults and can make the decision for ourselves, subject to the current 25-foot ban. How many of us have truly been harmed by lack of enforcement of the ban? Is the answer to all harmful or potentially harmful behaviors to legislate against them? Mostly, I am concerned about staff, who are far disproportionately among smokers on campus. A campus-wide ban would, legitimately, be perceived as a classist policy. Leave well enough alone. If there is truly a problem, do more to enforce the current policy.

108. Vaping, and all other forms of nicotine intake that do not infringe upon the right to fresh air should be supported, but ignited cigarettes, pipes and all other forms combusted tobacco should be banned. Smoke from ignited cigarettes can not be contained, and goes where the wind takes it, including into the lungs of community members who deserve the right to fresh air, who deserve the right to breathe. There is no acceptable minimum distance rule. 25 feet or 1000 feet, there is no controlling the wind or weather, and thus no way to prevent infringement on the right to breathe clean, fresh air. The range of alternatives for nicotine intake are ever expanding, provide better health outcomes, and most importantly do not infringe on the rights of your fellow community members.

109. Even though I appreciate the way this issue is addressed (via a public and anonymous forum), I find the possibility of banning tobacco on campus appalling. It is a restrictive and punitive measure targeting Cornell’s staff/workers. Ultimately – and clearly, given a problematic comment I read at the

beginning of this thread – this is a discussion about class. Let us enforce the 25ft rule, in an atmosphere of mutual respect and inclusivity. If we wish to start a conversation about “banning” certain harmful activities and spaces on campus, perhaps we should focus on more urgent issues, such as sexual assault, the shame of fraternity culture, and the rise of toxic masculinities (fostered by those same fraternities) among our student body.

110. Of all tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It would be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron’s cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end for they do so with the approval of their own conscience. They may be more likely to go to Heaven yet at the same time likelier to make a Hell of earth. This very kindness stings with intolerable insult. To be “cured” against one’s will and cured of states which we may not regard as disease is to be put on a level of those who have not yet reached the age of reason or those who never will; to be classed with infants, imbeciles, and domestic animals.”

– C. S. Lewis

111. I do not smoke or vape, and I feel that the health consequences of both habits are both costly and personally devastating to the individuals who suffer them, in some cases. Nonetheless, I do not feel that the level of nicotine use on campus or around our buildings is a problem at present. Further, it seems to me that a ban might be harsh for staff or contract employees like construction workers, who would effectively be banned from campus and denied a way to earn their livelihood. So while I myself do not wish to be exposed to smoke, I would oppose a ban on nicotine. Instead, I would survey the smokers to learn more about situations in which they feel that our 25’ rule is unreasonably harsh, or impractical, and explore ways to be more flexible for people with nicotine habits.

As a related remark, we should keep in mind that many Cornell employees have minimal wages and benefits, and might not have access to medical help to break a nicotine habit. If you demand that such a person stop smoking, you might be firing them — because that person may be physically unable to stop, due to the addictive nature of the drug. If we were to extend medical help at the same time as we ask them to stop, that would be a different matter. But of course it is much easier for us as non-smokers to physically ban the habit than to dig deep into our pockets to help cover the potentially significant costs of patches and other medical help. But it would be disturbing to ban smoke because it “bothers” the non-smokers (who nonetheless are not being exposed to it now), in such a way that these very marginalized workers (grounds workers, construction workers, temps...) are simply shoved off campus and denied a livelihood. I do worry that we could adopt such a rule, and it would bother me very deeply.

112. I don’t know how it would be enforced, but I do think that at least the 25ft rule should be. I honestly don’t care too much, but I dislike smelling smoke, and I don’t want to be exposed to extra carcinogens. It’s not analogous to sugary beverages just because you drinking that near me doesn’t expose me to unhealthy sugar, but smoking near me does hurt me. That’s the issue.

113. Asthmatic non-smoker here. Please strictly enforce the 25 foot rule, including from air intakes, and windows. Please do NOT put a blanket ban on. It would be way worse for someone like me to have people secretly smoking indoors than it is for them to follow the current rules.
114. Make designated smoking areas
115. Smoke free campuses lead people to leave butts on the ground because there are no ashtrays
116. I don't smoke but the smokers don't bother me outside in the open air. I think a smoke-free campus is over the top and we should be mindful when restricting people's freedoms. Outside and 25 ft from the door seems sufficient.
117. 100% agree. Enforce the 25ft rule and no smoking within buildings and consequences should be laid out for those who do. I'm tired of having people in class blow smoke into my face and rooms like Uris computer lab filled with vape smoke. I think smoking should be permanently banned from all areas of campus because it's dangerous for everyone's health. Second hand smoke is the leading cause of Asthma in Children and young adults and can have lasting implications including cancer. The people that smoke on the campus do not follow the rules about being away from the building and often when they do smoke outside if someone is walking by they have to breathe in the unpleasant fumes as well as all of that poison.
118. I feel strongly that smoking should be banned on campus. I am pregnant and frequently in the mornings walking in from the garage I get stuck behind this woman puffing on a cigarette. It stinks, I can feel the second hand smoke in my lungs, I begin coughing....it is disgusting, it is unhealthy, it is not necessary! I can smell and taste the smoke from more than 25 feet away and I cannot get away from it. Smokers...quit inflicting your habit on others who choose to live a healthier life style.
119. I don't think being a smoke free campus is feasible at Cornell. As some previous commenters have said, our campus is rather large. To ask people to walk off campus for a smoke break is a big ask. While a smoke free campus is a good motivator to quit, I also don't think it is the University's right to force people into quitting. I also agree with some previous commenters, though, that the 25 feet rule is not being enforced. I am a staff member who works around some of the residence halls. I have seen professional staff, mainly building care workers, completely disregard the 25 feet rule. Some of them stand right under student's room windows. Some of them stand on loading docks of buildings to smoke. The 25 feet rule needs to be more strictly enforced.
As someone who smokes I try to be as courteous as possible when smoking. I adhere to the 25 feet rule, and I try to go to a wide open space where I won't bother people. But the problem I'm seeing as far as centralizing smokers to specific locations is there aren't many smoker's outposts on campus to throw cigarette butts in. If there are more of those around campus people will congregate around them. And they can be placed in spots where people who don't smoke won't be bothered. At one of my previous institutions there was smoking gazebos on campus. Students/faculty/and staff were only allowed to smoke in these gazebos. Maybe the school could invest in something like that?
120. I am a current student at Cornell and I don't think that the model of UPenn is one that can scale to accommodate Cornell, as the campus is so huge. I don't smoke myself but I have friends who are

students and friends who are staff here that do, and imagine how much productivity they would lose if they had to walk 10 minutes in any direction (there and back) just to smoke? Multiple times a day? It's honestly kind of disrespectful to the people who may not be able to quit, and could seriously affect their mental health. As for quitting, there is no way that the program at Cornell Health is adequate to support the sheer volume of people who would be forced to enter (if I had to guess, disproportionately the employees). Cornell should just enforce the 25 ft rule better. I see CUPD drive by me at least 5 times a day and I'm rarely even outside so I don't understand why there's a problem. I also don't see much of a smoking culture walking around campus anyway. As a smoker it is something I look out for when I first come to a new institution. I don't really see students smoking, mostly staff or faculty. I don't even really see e-devices on campus, though I know they are popular with this age group.

121. Smoking, and its younger cousin vaping, is a horrible addiction. It shortens lifespans, affects non-smokers, and has a genuine cost to society. When I started working at Cornell the other two people in the shared office smoked at their desks just a few feet away. That said I do not support a ban. Addicted individuals who cannot quit should not have to choose between violating rules or quitting their job. Many of the service workers cannot leave campus due to transportation limitations. During my morning commute I pass workers from Cayuga Ridge nursing home sitting or standing along Route smoking while traffic speeds by. At Cayuga Medical Center they sit in their cars smoking in my neighborhood. In both cases it is because these much smaller campuses have banned smoking. Help people quit, discourage the addiction, but make it possible for people who can't quit to smoke on their own time and out of the way of others. ,
122. I think that a tobacco-free campus is respectful to those who choose not to smoke/vape. It hasn't been infrequent that I have been walking to a side-entrance of my on-campus housing and found someone smoking near the entrance. Students with respiratory issues get placed in my building, so smoking so near the building and entrance is a problem.
123. I would prefer a campus that is completely tobacco and vape free. Thanks.
124. I don't think this ban is a good idea. I'm a student who has been on a campus that is smoke free before coming to Cornell and the result of banning cigarettes has done nothing but have people upset and have more littering (since they got rid of cigarette receptacles. We at Cornell are all adults. Legally it is our decision to smoke and banning it would be the ultimate slap in the face to those who rely on nicotine.
Besides, I'd be fairly disgruntled to not be able to vape but smell weed everywhere I go.
125. Can we extend that to cannabis and weed smoke ban too? I'm sick and tired of weed smokers spreading their nasty smoke and odor everywhere. This needs to stop.
126. Really it seems like enforcement of the 25 foot rule/ proper disposal of tobacco products is where efforts should be going rather than a complete ban. How would you go about that? I really don't have an answer on that one.
127. The current policy in which neither smoking nor vaping is permitted within 25 feet of building entrances or within the buildings themselves should be maintained and enforced. While the

destructive effects of nicotine products are known, people should have the choice to be able to use these products at their own risk in environments that will not bother other students and faculty. The current regulations, if better enforced, ensure that smoking and vaping do not occur where others will be bothered.

128. Or stop funding sports (such as football) that have incredibly high risks of injury and provide little to no objective benefit.
129. stop controlling lives
130. I am a non-smoker but I don't support a ban. I do support better enforcement of the 25' rule. I also support a communications effort to encourage proper disposal of cigarette butts (i.e., don't throw them on the ground).
131. [Graduate/Professional Student] Like most, I do not smoke and find breathing in smoke when entering or leaving a building, or while walking in my daily commute, to be really unpleasant. I personally start to feel sick when I smell tobacco smoke, which is really unpleasant. I'd support banning smoking on sidewalks, to not have to walk behind someone whose ash is being swept by the wind into my face. However, our campus, unlike UPenn's, isn't intertwined with the surrounding city or properties, and so I have to imagine a campus-wide ban would effectively force staff members to either quit smoking, find a way to take very long smoke-breaks in order to leave campus, or to quit or otherwise risk their jobs' by breaking the rules. My guess is that most people would support limiting smoking to a limited number of explicitly-defined, sequestered smoking areas, but I'm personally less sure about a campus-wide ban, which as far as I can tell would be a full-on war on smoking that could force staff members to choose between their jobs and their [unpleasant for others] personal habits. And yea, it's annoying when smokers act like "what's the big deal?", "like one sniff is going to kill you". Can I blow an air horn at you when I walk by? I'm sure I'm not the only person who gets nauseous at smoke, and I've never worked somewhere where at least one person didn't have asthma.
132. For me, smoking is an issue of rights. People have a right to choose to smoke—it is not illegal. However, there is no "right" to pollute someone else's lungs with toxic fumes. To the contrary, I feel that I have the right to breathe fresh air wherever I am—indoors or outdoors. Cigarette smoke is unpleasant and unhealthful; I do not choose to experience it, but it is imposed on me by others. Cigarette smoke reduces my quality of life; to be walking in one of Cornell's lovely gardens on a beautiful day and suddenly find the air polluted with cigarette smoke is annoying. And it is simply wrong—fresh air is the default condition; smokers selfishly take that away from others who are doing nothing to alter the environment. Unlike sick buildings and automobiles (which have been mentioned by other commenters), smoking though highly addictive is entirely discretionary, and controllable by banning it from all or some public spaces. I do not wish to regulate the personal health decisions of other adults: I only ask that smokers indulge in their addiction in a way that does not impact my experience of life. Whether that is by using a patch, or finding a way to ensure that all of the vile-smelling, carcinogen-laden vapor goes exclusively into their bodies is up to them. As for Cornell's responsibilities, in theory I would argue that continuing implicitly to side with an unhealthy addiction and to enable smoking seems wrong-headed. Moreover, the majority of people on campus are non-smokers; why should a minority be favored? There certainly are challenges to enforcing rules, and one

can reasonably ask what responsibilities Cornell has to its nicotine-addicted community members, but the answer shouldn't be to continue the status quo. With that attitude we would all still be subjected to what were optimistically termed "non-smoking" rows on airplanes that filled up with smoke as soon as cruising altitude was reached! Speaking of air travel, some airports have arrived at the solution of having smoking rooms, with good ventilation systems that evacuate the fumes so that the only offensive smell is from the clothing of those who use the rooms. Why not provide such rooms in buildings on campus?

133. 25 feet distance doesn't really work. For the health of the entire community I do not think smoking on campus should be allowed.
134. As an avid long time tobacco user, I find the potential for a smoking ban extremely scary and offensive. Addiction to Tabacco is not a choice, and although I would eventually like to quit, and all out ban will do more harm than good for smokers and cause extreme stress and anxiety for those who are addicted and not ready to quit. Another issue that arises from this potential ban is the future of chopping. Chopping is a classic part of the college experience. When I first visited a frat and took a chop out of a beautiful, milky illy it was one of the best days of my life. I felt on top of the world. Without tobacco on this campus, chops would not be possible, which would also force kids to smoke more marijuana as their bowls cannot be half filled with T. As someone who wants others to live through the beauty of their first chop at college, I am extremely worried about the future of chopping due to the tobacco ban. Many people I know, including myself, are avid supporters of the "cigs inside" movement. Cigs inside would benefit cornell because if the smoke is inside, th there would be less of it outside, a clear solution to the 25 foot rule. Furthermore, students academic performance would increase as they would be able to light up a Boge while working in their room and not have to take the time to go outside. Cigs inside is the only way to guarantee the safety of chop culture in the near future, and help cornellians reach their full potential.
135. I see Cornell has already jumped on the bandwagon of persecuting vape as equivalent to smoking. It is not. And as long as the 25 foot signs are not updated I will not observe them – second hand vape is insignificant and should not need any regulation. Though I am just as bothered by smoke as someone who does not smoke or vape, I would never support a campus-wide ban of either. It signals complete disregard for students/faculty who smoke or vape and an overbearing and heavy-handed approach to a pseudo-problem. If Cornell is committed to the "vape = nicotine = bad" stance, it should at least update it's language in such policies and door signs. I think time will tell that the view is absurdly unscientific and has much to do with lobbying by the tobacco industry.
136. I think 'smoke-free campuses' are initiatives that are short-sighted, impossible to implement effectively, and counterproductive.
137. I don't believe in it ethically – smoking tobacco is not illegal and therefore should not be banned in public spaces (at least in the sense outside of the 25 (or whatever) feet from a main entrance or indoors).
138. I have studied previously at a university that banned smoking on the entire campus and it did not work. For one, I was a smoker at that time and I continued to smoke where ever on campus, I didn't

feel that having to walk 15-20 minutes to get off campus to smoke was realistic or fair. Most smokers acted the same way as me – there was widespread smoking on campus, and there were certain spots (that were somewhat ‘hidden’) where smoking was especially prevalent and actually led to more cigarette waste on the ground because there were no garbage cans or ashtrays to accommodate them. I also felt ‘criminalized’ where certain individuals would strike up arguments with me about whether I should be smoking or not – or the ‘campus smoke police’ would harass you even though they couldn’t enforce the ban in any real way. It was a giant waste of money where they put up dozens and dozens of signs and hired multiple people to enforce the policy (despite no real penalties) that were effectively useless positions.

And what exactly, at the end does this goal seek to achieve? Does having a ‘smoke-free campus’ (which, will never actually exist) deter people from smoking? No. People will continue to smoke regardless – whether on campus or not. This is coming from a former smoker, who supports initiatives to decrease smoking in the public generally – but banning smoking in certain public spaces doesn’t achieve any tangible results.

139. As someone with asthma I cannot express how frustrating it is to walk near a smoke cloud and not be able to breathe. I don’t care about people smoking but it should not come at the expense of the health of others. Cornell should be a smoke free campus because our ability to walk through campus and breathe ought to be prioritized over non-life threatening concerns. My grandpa smokes and really struggles to control the habit; I sympathize with the fact that quitting is difficult and won’t be an option for some – but I really like breathing.
140. We should ban all tobacco products on campus since it not only poisons those who use them, it also affects those students around who don’t. As tobacco is a known carcinogen, the health of the students should be placed first and foremost. As for the 25 ft rule, neither students NOR STAFF, obey this rule. Especially outside of Baker Lab, where smoking could be more dangerous than in most other places. If a tobacco free campus does not happen, the existing rules should be enforced much more strictly. It is imperative that people know and follow the rules.
141. I have more of an issue with the extra time off many smokers get than whether or not they smoke at all. Splitting your 15 minute breaks into 5 minute breaks means twice that time in reality when you factor in walking in and out of your office any away from a building. It’s stealing time when you claim it as being worked.
142. I am a graduate student. I am a nonsmoker and prefer not to be around people while they are smoking but I haven’t experienced any issues with the current policy. I feel that people who smoke often have addictions which they cannot easily quit, so enforcing a completely smoke and vape-free campus might be a hardship for them.
143. I’m a grad student, and I don’t think a “tobacco-free campus” policy is a good idea because of how enormous Cornell’s campus is. I don’t smoke, and secondhand smoke bothers me, but I think there are many places in the vast expanse of land that Cornell owns where people could smoke without hurting anybody but themselves. I would appreciate some reduction in the smoking that occurs right outside Cornell buildings, especially right next to buildings with open windows (which currently isn’t even

against the rules, as long as it's not near the entrance), but a blanket ban across campus isn't the way to do this.

144. I fully support a tobacco-free campus. I agree that the 25 ft rule is not followed. I think a tobacco-free campus would model anti-smoking behavior that I think we should promote. I do not know enough about the current smoking-cessation services to comment.
145. I've never smoked and never will. I agree with reasonable rules and restrictions to limit areas of smoking and protecting the rights of others. Banning it outright seems inappropriate given that it is a legal activity, even if most people choose not to engage in it. I don't think we should be in the business of policing activities that can be done in a way that doesn't hurt others. There would also be practical ramifications for those who smoke that would likely impact their performance at their work (e.g. having to travel long distances to find a place to smoke, getting in trouble for trying to find a place to smoke on campus). It seems unfair to single out one group for this treatment if other options are available to allow them to still participate in the university's activities.
146. Currently, you are not allowed to smoke within 25 feet of the entrance to any Cornell building. Most smokers violate this law.
147. Smoking is very bad. Don't smoke.
148. We should distinguish between what is "unsightly" (e.g. seeing other people smoke or smirk in a disgusting manner or whatever) and what affects a person's health (e.g. smoking outside just doesn't do that). If we start banning the former, then a lot of things would be vulnerable (e.g. grossly overweight cats or Trump t-shirts). If we restrict our oppression to the latter, smoking under the current limits should be permitted.
149. I am a faculty member and a non-smoker. I encounter cigarette smoke and vape "smoke" regularly and in allowed and non-allowed spaces on campus. It is unhealthy for me, unhealthy for whomever is smoking, and unhealthy for others (including, for pregnant women, who are not visibly pregnant to others for much of their pregnancies, very bad for their fetuses). It is shocking to me that on a campus that takes in millions of dollars of money for cancer research and where we all should recognize the terrible effects of cigarette and vape smoke that we would not follow the one guideline that has prevented more cancer-related deaths than any other: encouraging people to stop smoking and discouraging others from starting to smoke. We should be leaders, not followers, on this issue, and while we are late to the campus-wide ban party, we can and should still join it as soon as possible.
150. As an avid long time tobacco user, I find the potential for a smoking ban extremely scary and offensive. Addiction to Tabacco is not a choice, and although I would eventually like to quit, and all out ban will do more harm than good for smokers and cause extreme stress and anxiety for those who are addicted and not ready to quit.
151. Another issue that arises from this potential ban is the future of chopping. Chopping is a classic part of the college experience. When I first visited a frat and took a chop out of a beautiful, milky illy it was one of the best days of my life. I felt on top of the world. Without tobacco on this campus, chops

would not be possible, which would also force kids to smoke more marijuana as their bowls cannot be half filled with T. As someone who wants others to live through the beauty of their first chop at college, I am extremely worried about the future of chopping due to the tobacco ban. Many people I know, including myself, are avid supporters of the “cigs inside” movement. Cigs inside would benefit Cornell because if the smoke is inside, there would be less of it outside, a clear solution to the 25 foot rule. Furthermore, students academic performance would increase as they would be able to light up a Boge while working in their room and not have to take the time to go outside. Cigs inside is the only way to guarantee the safety of chop culture in the near future, and help Cornellians reach their full potential.

152. Enforce the 25’ rule by creating a designated spot that has a sign stating smoking permitted here with a smokers outpost that can only be moved maintenance when it needs to be cleaned or replaced.
153. I am a non-smoker. I encounter cigarette smoke and vape “smoke” regularly and in allowed and non-allowed spaces on campus. It is unhealthy for me, unhealthy for whomever is smoking, and unhealthy for others (including, for pregnant women, who are not visibly pregnant to others for much of their pregnancies, very bad for their fetuses). It is shocking to me that on a campus that takes in millions of dollars of money for cancer research and where we all should recognize the terrible effects of cigarette and vape smoke that we would not follow the one guideline that has prevented more cancer-related deaths than any other: encouraging people to stop smoking and discouraging others from starting to smoke. We should be leaders, not followers, on this issue, and while we are late to the campus-wide ban party, we can and should still join it as soon as possible.
154. Student. I would very much love to see Cornell become a tobacco-free campus. Smoke from cigarettes (traditional or electronic) is a nuisance, and disrupts my ability to fully enjoy our gorgeous campus. This is probably going to be an unpopular choice to a segment of the population, but Cornell is a leader and should take this opportunity to continue to be a leader. I think it will be necessary to offer free cessation help once the ban is in place.
155. Let’s start by enforcing the 25 ft smoking ban. Has anyone ever received a ticket for this? I’ve never heard of anyone who was ticketed by authorities for smoking close to a building, and I’ve been here 35 years. If our current policy – with enforcement – remains problematic, then we can look at other measures. But as a first step, let’s get the smoke away from the buildings and actually enforce the rule.
156. I’m not a big fan of smoking. In a perfect world, you wouldn’t need to have a ban. However...I would prefer better enforcement of the current ban (25 ft). Smoking is an expensive disease that is difficult to quit for many. A complete ban will adversely affect a fair amount of staff and faculty. Large group behavior modification at this level strikes me as a dicey proposition at best.
157. I support banning smoking and vaping on campus. No one obeys the 25 ft rule and smokers litter way more than non smokers.
158. Second hand smoking has been proven to be just as if not more harmful than smoking. The message we give to students is equally important. I believe smoking should not be permitted on campus.

159. Smoke travels even at 25ft and even then most people do not follow the rule especially during the hard of winter. We should ban all smoking within campus or instead of having them smokers in the open air we should stick all of them in one air-tight closed room at the edge of campus. Tar gets into everything, cloth, walls and the smell never really goes away. Ban all smoking.
160. This logic is not sound. Doritos and bar-s hot dogs also cause cancer. Should we ban those? Overwork causes health problems. Should we shut the campus down for 12 hours each day, allowing for no more than 12 hours of daily work? Sometimes I stub my toe on the edge of a bench that I have in my apartment. Should I burn that bench cause it hurts my tootsie? We shouldn't demonize everything.
161. Are you seriously suggesting that smokers should be in the middle of moving traffic? So they can maybe get hit by cars? That's pretty malevolent, just sayin'.
162. I am fine with people smoking on campus as long as they obey the existing rules. I used to smoke a long time ago, so I get it, but please obey the rules. Thanks
163. I am a longtime employee and a non-smoker who has suffered from asthma in recent years. I believe the "25 feet" rule is reasonable, and I support its enforcement. In my experience, the smokers in our building do comply with the rule, even in bad weather when it might be tempting not to do so. I strongly oppose a tobacco-free campus. To adopt such a ban on tobacco would be excessive and completely unrealistic. Even on a much smaller campus in a climate free from wintry conditions, it would be impractical to force all smokers to leave the campus to have a smoke; it would be especially difficult for hourly employees who might only have ten or fifteen minutes for a break. I dislike tobacco smoke, but I find that our building entrances and the outdoor areas I travel through are usually free of smoke—the situation has greatly improved from past years. Although I dislike smoke and am lucky to have never taken up smoking, I do believe that adults have the right to smoke if they choose to do so. I also believe that quitting something as addictive as tobacco is only effective long term if the person who quits wants to do so, not because they are shamed or forced into complying. Do we non-smokers really want to create the additional problem of an unhappy, anxious population of fellow colleagues and students suddenly forced to quit? Please do not choose the inflexible option of creating a campus-wide ban on smoking and vaping.
164. Prohibitionism is a pervasive and destructive practice. Dictating to a tiny minority of Cornell employees and students what substances they are "allowed" to put into their own bodies is both a waste of time and counter to basic notions of personal autonomy rights. I do not smoke tobacco personally, but I have no desire to enforce my values onto others that are simply minding their own business. I have only rarely encountered instances of people smoking in close proximity to large groups, so the problem is largely exaggerated. If you don't like tobacco smoke, then don't stand in the presence of tobacco smokers. This is a 740 acre campus! There is plenty of healthy breathing room for ALL of us..
165. Academic staff disagreeing with a proposal that smacks of paternalistic over-reach. Enforce/re-enforce the 25' rule, with better-placed "smoking areas" that include proper shelter from the weather — a rare amenity currently. This proposal certainly affects the working Cornellian that tends to

smoke/vape, and also may not be able to respond to this since they do not use a computer for their work.

166. Ban all types of smoking on/around campus, please. It is harmful to all.
167. Soooo many campuses have a no smoking policy (including my undergrad). Plus, amusement parks, zoos etc. there is a way to implement this on any scale. Granted I could see this being harder w such a large campus, but I was honestly shocked coming here to see people smoking so openly. Also, it doesn't really matter what the policy is if there is no plan to enforce it. In some ways I would rather Cornell investing in changing the culture around smoking on campus (like suggested before) offering lots of resources to people trying to quit, having campaigns about smoking prevention and respectful smoking, broadly advertise where smoking is permitted etc.
168. This proposition seems to be driven by a zealous hatred for tobacco consumers, not sound logic. Instead of providing a multitude of arguments why it should not be prohibited to be yourself on campus, I'll just ask: what are you planning to achieve? The most it'll do is get the smokers' negative reactions.
169. As a smoker, I don't particularly want to feel like a criminal for a legal drug. While the health impacts I can't defend, for many it is a stress reliever- a way to step away from everything and refocus oneself. I do my very best to not smoke around others, and I always dispose of the butts in the landfill waste containers- a sign of respect. Many smokers do this, but are overshadowed by those who do not. As one who watched the transition of the University of Massachusetts Amherst to tobacco free during 2009-2014, I can tell you that it increased the amount of cigarette waste around campus... and turned the tobacco-free branding into a joke. With the removal of smoker's poles, cigarette butts were now tossed everywhere. Not just hidden corners of buildings, but the streets and sidewalks more than ever before. It never stopped anyone from smoking as there's no way to really enforce it. In my opinion, the best way to manage tobacco use on campuses is to designate smoking areas around campus, and provide an effective means of disposing of the waste. Most staff and students I think would be amenable to that, as long as they can get to an area in a reasonable amount of walking time. At Umass, all the problems got worse. And I have friends at other schools who say the same. I sincerely believe that treating smokers and non-smokers alike with respect, while supporting a more robust educational campaign/providing free smoking cessation products through Cornell Health, is the best way to go about this. I would likely actually quit if Cornell Health insurance provided no-cost or very low-cost nicotine patches. But I assure you, I will not stop smoking because of a tobacco ban- Umass couldn't stop me and neither will you. I'm pretty sure most smokers will continue as I- and Cornell will be left with a policy that makes them look noble on paper, but hypocritical in person. Just like the others. Hit the problem at the source- addiction. Don't demonize those who made a wrong decision and have to live with it.
170. 1) I support the current policy that people are not allowed to vape or smoke inside buildings. I do think that it is a personal choice, but that then means that nobody in school buildings should be exposed to it, as then that impacts their personal choice. And not allowing it in buildings is a good thing as hopefully, it will make people use these products less. 2) I think it is a good idea because I don't think Cornell should support smoking and vaping, and the best way to voice distaste and non-

support is to ban it. additionally it is just not good for students and not good for health. I am someone who vaped for 2 months, and I was not addicted and I did not do it very long or often before I stopped, but I still genuinely think that it negatively impacted my health and I regret it, and I think it is a good thing that Cornell wants to ban it to protect their students. Additionally, this doesn't un hinge on students rights as they can still participate off-campus, however, it is good if the school is not allowing it on campus. 3. Cornell health should definitely still have cessation services because quitting an addiction is not easy and there will be a curve in this starting the ban. Additionally, as I said, even if vaping is not allowed on campus, it doesn't mean it won't still impact students living off-campus, and so these services need to still remain.

171. I do not use any tobacco product. I am in complete agreement with comment #4 above – we should work to make sure the 25 feet rule is strictly being obeyed but should not completely ban tobacco from campus. I think this is the best compromise.

172. Being so literal does not help the issue at hand. The reality, and what the original comment meant, is that many people do not follow the rule to the point where it becomes purely gratuitous and still harms the overall public. I also think designated smoking areas are a good idea.

173. I support a total ban on smoking., a voluntary habit that mutates into an addiction which regularly affects innocent second and third parties (negatively). The comparisons being made in this thread among smoking, sugary drinks and vehicle exhaust are easily recognizable strawman arguments. Additionally, whataboutism (pointing to other campus health hazards) has no impact on this addressable issue. I request a cleaner space to 'be', and this is one actionable item in fulfilling that request.

174. Don't be meddlesome nannies. We're all sick and tired of busybodies policing our language and telling us what to think. A tobacco ban will be another cave to the mob. Barring a few precocious children attending college, everyone here is an ADULT. Adults make free choices, including harming themselves after they have been informed of the risks of making a bad choice, whether it's smoking, binge drinking, riding motorcycles, or base jumping. As long as they don't harm others, adults should be free to smoke or vape or chew tobacco. If anyone is ignoring the 25 ft rule or any other smoking laws, they need to be handed the consequences for violating them. Just because I don't smoke or vape doesn't mean that I get to impose my personal viewpoint on others. To quote C. S. Lewis: "Of all tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It would be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end for they do so with the approval of their own conscience. They may be more likely to go to Heaven yet at the same time likelier to make a Hell of earth. This very kindness stings with intolerable insult. To be "cured" against one's will and cured of states which we may not regard as disease is to be put on a level of those who have not yet reached the age of reason or those who never will; to be classed with infants, imbeciles, and domestic animals." Sincerely, A Non-Smoker and Non-Vaper who thinks we should all mind our own business more often.

175. If the current rule is not enforced, why should think that a campus ban would be enforced? I don't know that I've ever seen someone smoke on Cornell's campus, although I regularly see people vaping just outside of Sage hall. For air quality, the TCAT buses have a much worse impact on my air quality than people smoking.
176. It is not Cornell's jobs to regulate our addictions. Being that campus serves as living and a workplace for so many ADULT students, staff, and faculty, banning something that is for all purposes legal is a huge overreach. It shouldn't be a requirement to be a non-smoker in order to be affiliated with Cornell.
177. I am a student. A ban on smoking across campus is insensitive and discriminatory. People who smoke do not do it to spite others and I'm sure that the vast majority of them would love to stop smoking immediately. Many have a nicotine addiction that requires time and patience to overcome. Also, given that the majority of people who still smoke in Ithaca are part of the working class and perform the work that is underappreciated, yet indispensable to daily functions of our campus, I think it would be a serious injustice to create this huge inconvenience for them. Cornell should work harder to enforce the current rules on smoking in public.
178. I am against a campus-wide ban of smoking, because I think the outcomes of a ban would include some bad things that would outweigh benefits: Making smokers have to waste time getting off campus to light up, making smokers (staff, students, faculty, and visitors alike) feel unwelcome/over-policed, giving cops and other authority types yet another thing to hold over people they want to push around (poorer workers, black people, outsiders), and creating higher concentrations of smoking at the edges of campus and in on-campus hiding places. Yes, making smokers uncomfortable/unwelcome in public DOES lead to more people quitting smoking, research shows. But I think the ultimate goal/bottom line should be something even more important than a reduction of overall smoking rates: A spirit of democracy and freedom, sense of welcome and friendliness and equality. Have rules that help non-smokers avoid smoke, rather than ones that force smokers to be criminals or people fleeing campus.
179. A ban on smoking is absurd. Forcing people to leave campus will result in students consistently being late to class. It will increase traffic to and from campus. Assuming the penalty for smoking on campus would be some sort of fine, then where would that money go? Who would receive that? The university? Alarming. What are the perceived benefits of such a ban? Do these benefits outweigh the extraordinary amount of undue stress that this ban will place on faculty and staff? Leaving campus this winter in order to smoke would be such a nightmare.
180. Smoking is gross. Full support for this policy.
181. I think we should just add a requirement that smoking/vaping is permitted only when wearing an inflatable flamingo costume, and smokers/vapers must dab whenever someone says "Go Red" or "Pneumonitis."
182. The 25 foot rule doesn't work. People smoke right underneath the awnings in front of my building. When I was pregnant and had to walk by these people, I would run right into the bathrooms and get sick to my stomach. I have no idea how we would enforce the 25 foot rule-have guards? That is a silly

thought. anonymously report? yea ok. I think the only reasonable idea would be to ban smoking, vaping, etc. The people choosing to do this to themselves shouldn't harm others who are just trying to go to work in the process.

183. I am a student who uses nicotine in all forms (cigarettes, chewing tobacco, and vapor products like JUUL) infrequently. Banning nicotine will NOT deter students from using such products. If people want to smoke, dip, etc. on campus, why should the university be allowed to take that freedom away from us? I've never heard anyone complain about tobacco use on campus. Leave it to the Cornell administration to do everything they can to make campus less welcoming.
184. If the UA does end up going the route of tobacco-free (should also include chewing tobacco as others have noted), then cessation programs (especially for staff) need to be generously supported. Students who smoke/vape/chew would need more consistent discipline than the spotty policing that's going on now.
185. Reformed smoker here. Bottom line is that the policy is NOT adhered to nor is there discipline for those that don't follow it! There are 20 cigarettes in each pack. If an employee (remember i used to smoke) only smokes 10 a day on campus, remembering that 2 breaks and lunch could account for 4 smokes, than that means 6 smokes a day occurred while on the clock. I don't get those extra breaks? nor do i want to smell it and walk through it to get where I'm going. Please make this a smoke free campus and save us all!
186. I think a campus ban will only increase anxiety of those who smoke. As a former smoker nicotine was one of the hardest things I have ever had to quit. It is a powerful addiction. Is it bad for non-smokers to breathe in, yes it is, so how about a compromise of some sort. I am not sure what that would look like but I am sure someone will have an out of the box thought and come up with something. Until then, simply enforce the current rule you already have in place.
187. I am a staff member and former smoker. For some smokers, quitting does not feel like a viable option, so is the plan to fire smokers who can't quit or hope they'll simply look for employment elsewhere? I may not appreciate the smoky odor that follows some of our custodians around, but I think an all-out ban is discriminatory. The current policy is a good effort to protect non-smokers. If the university wants to offer more and free support to employees who want to quit voluntarily, then I'm all for it. But an all-out ban forcing employees to either quit smoking or quit their job – because a hard-core smoker can't go all day without a cigarette and can't walk off campus during the day to smoke – isn't right.
188. Nobody should have to deal with the smell of tobacco smoke on campus. Therefore, special smoking facilities should be created that isolate smoke; the 25 foot rule is not good enough. Some accomodation should be made for the addicts, like, for example, what is done in airports. On the other hand, I have never smelled or been disturbed by vaping. I think its poison, and people shouldn't do it. But so long as it's legal and doesn't bother other people, it should be allowed. It is intrusive on personal rights to ban vaping. It would be like banning legal pills that we think are harmful.

189. I don't think banning smoking completely on campus would actually be beneficial for many members of our community. But I do believe the 25 feet rule should be strongly enforced.
190. Trying to create a smoke-free campus would be totally misguided. What makes the most sense is to spend the time, money, and effort enforcing (and maybe enhance) the existing no-smoking policy, which, if enforced, will pretty much eliminate the problem of second-hand smoke. Look at the comments above—people don't like the second-hand smoke, but in all cases it's where the current policy is inadequate or not being followed.
191. I'm going to start with a quote to make a point. "In 1986, secondhand smoke was first recognized to be a possible health risk by the Surgeon General of the United States. Just 4 years later, in 1990, San Luis Obispo, California became the first city in the world to completely ban smoking in all public places. In 1993, secondhand smoke was officially labeled as a deadly carcinogen by the EPA."
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tobacco-Free_College_Campuses2019 is almost ending, the sad part is that this is still being discussed because you might "offend" someone's feelings by not offering them a place to smoke. It's very simple either you choose to lead or not. It's been almost 27 years since secondhand smoke was deemed carcinogenic, yet we still struggle to face reality. Leadership takes boldness and making tough choices not to please people or not, but rather because it's the right thing to do overall. "Many colleges have also chosen to restrict the use of electronic smoking devices, such as e-cigarettes. As of July 1, 2019 there are now at least 2,375 100% smoke-free campus sites. Of these, 2,009 are 100% tobacco-free and 1,986 prohibit e-cigarette use. These policies are part of the tobacco control movement to reduce cigarette smoking among college students and to protect people on campus from secondhand smoke." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tobacco-Free_College_Campuses
192. I think tobacco products should be allowed, but cigarettes and e-cigarettes (and any other smoking) should be confined to designated areas well away from buildings. People can make a personal decision to use these products reasonably, but I don't want to be inhaling smoke when walking/running. Cigarette and marijuana smoke also often blows into my dorm room from outside.
193. Cornell should be a smoke-free campus to increase work productivity among staff and students. It has caused major littering on campus due to the lack of plastic containers they should be thrown in. It will also have positive health affects on staff who are insured from the University, which should save money in the long-term. The approach for Cornell should be living and learning in a clean, healthy environment. Secondhand smoke kills. Period.
194. -Banning smoking would create contention where none currently exists. -Banning smoking would result either in laws that are outright disobeyed, or are flaunted with greater severity than the current 25 foot rule. -The campus is too large for those with addiction to leave for a smoke during the work/study day, providing an extraordinary inconvenience for those who cannot quit the habit. - Smoking is an insignificantly smaller issue than the myriad of other health problems on campus. - Banning smoking would erode freedom and the principle of self-determination: this is not a university of small children. The decision to smoke should ultimately rest with the individual. -Banning smoking and offering to provide help to "quit" would have high costs in labor, finances, and time to the point where it is not a practical solution for a campus of this size. Conclusion: If smoking really is causing some problems to some people it would be far better to enforce existing rules rather than ban smoking and deal with the myriad of repercussions and trying to come up with a larger law to replace

what is not even being enforced as a small law. If you cannot enforce the current rule what makes you think you will be able to enforce a new one? Do not ban smoking. Enforce the law that already exists as if it were actually worth taking seriously!

195. I don't think banning smoking completely on campus would actually be beneficial for many members of our community. But I do believe the 25 foot rule should be strongly enforced. A campus-wide ban is inappropriate and will prove disruptive and possibly costly. This feels like nothing more than a misguided attempt to infringe on individual's liberty for purposes of virtue signaling. Forcing smokers outdoors seems like a reasonable compromise. The campus is too large to assume smokers can simply walk off campus to smoke. Assuming that a thirty-plus year addict will just up and quit overnight to conform to someone else's idea of appropriate behavior is a flawed notion; instead you'll have people smoking secretively in inappropriate locations.
196. I agree with some of the above comments that say that we are adults and have the right to smoke or not to smoke. As adults, we can comply with smoking regs requiring a 25 ft buffer between the smoker and a building. As adults, we can choose to stay away from these smoking areas if they are offensive or bothersome. We can choose to rent a living space on campus where the air quality is acceptable. Campus buses, idling sports busses from other campuses, delivery vehicles, and repair vehicles contribute much hazardous fumes, often directly to buildings in close proximity. These pollution sources are not controlled and seem to me to be more problematic than second hand smoke. I am not sure why Cornell needs to spend so many hours and people resources to ponder over this topic. My guess is that human health is not the primary concern, but the opportunity for a unique marketing tool for the campus.
197. Why not have smoking locations? It seems that limiting people's freedom to smoke if they choose to do so seems just as extreme. Why not give the option to smoke in designated areas? each building can have an ashtray in a marked location. People who smoke can go there, people who don't can avoid it.
198. I am Cornell faculty. I support better enforcement of the existing 25-foot rule. I very strongly oppose creation of a new rule banning all smoking on campus. My reasons: The 25-foot rule serves some kind of valid purpose in a society of adults. The 100% campus-wide ban has no place in a free, adult society. It will not be reasonably or easily enforceable; it will not be consistently followed; to the degree it affects anybody, its effects are likely to fall hardest on people with the lowest social status at Cornell (working-stiff staff); and pursuing it will take time and energy away from more constructive efforts.
199. I am a student. I think that following the rules of the law should be adequate for the intelligence level of Cornell students. The law should probably be the standard and I think that completely banning nicotine is a bad idea as the issues it will cause for those already addicted and it might be a large issue for student morale. I think the smoking within 25ft of a building should be enforced more as I do often see it happening, but in general smoking and vaping have not been an issue for me on campus.
200. Tolerance is a matter of philosophy, as is intolerance. Doing what other universities do is virtue signalling. Is the intent to do what other universities do? Is the intent to ban one statistically dangerous activity from campus? If so, what other statistically dangerous activities should be banned? Driving? Other than to defend the momentary discomfort of non smokers such as myself, what aims

are sought through this act? If the argument is based on the putative safety risk posed by momentary exposure to tobacco sourced toxins in a ventilated environment, there is no evidentiary substantiation for that position. If the basis for the proposed course of action is to preserve the desire for a life experience that is unmarred by unpleasantness, evinced by a small yet vocal demagogue-graphy, then I submit Cornell cannot act equably, either to deliver us from evil, or do to so in a way that does not diminish the rights of some without reciprocity among participants in the social experiment.

201. I'm a non-smoking staff member and feel that the 25' rule should be enforced. I don't like smelling smoke but to ban smoking from campus would cause issues for those that do smoke. There are many good thinking/talking points mentioned in these comments that need to be considered.
202. Glad to see that Cornell is continuing to explore the implementation of more and more fascist policies.
203. What about establishing designated smoking zones? Rather than an outright ban (personally I don't smoke, nor care for it, but I believe people should be allowed to make their own decisions) would it not be better to ensure that people who still choose to smoke do so in an area that has been measured as satisfying the 25ft rule, while at the same time non-smokers who might have health risks would know how to better avoid secondhand smoke?
204. I believe that a tobacco free campus (vaping included) should be a long term goal but should be approached in increments. First we need enforcement of the existing rules (which no one wants to do) and a clear understanding of areas where individuals can smoke. The University should lay out a timeline of 2-4 years when total ban on smoking will occur and remind students and employees periodically that it is coming. Cornell may decide to facilitate their smoking cessation in some way but it should be limited in it's extent. We have to remember that the goal of this is to provide a campus where nonsmokers do not have to inhale secondhand smoke. There are many places these days that do not allow tobacco use and there is no reason that the Cornell campus can't be one of them.
205. No ban on tobacco. It is a human right to choose ones own lifestyle. Smokers do so out of doors willingly and understandingly. Stop attacking them. Maybe cell phone use in public areas or while walking should be banned in heavy foot traffic areas as well, as this could be unhealthy to those who get trampled or pushed into oncoming traffic by someone oblivious to society because the phone glued to their eyes. Tread carefully. No ban. Non smoker, employee.
206. I support a campus ban. As someone with severe smoke allergies, being anywhere near people who smoke (many of whom decide to smoke in places they aren't supposed to) triggers an attack. It's difficult to police the 25 foot rule, and a ban would be most effective. However, the university should provide better medical help to students and staff who have a nicotine addiction and have more resources to accomodate them.
207. I think a campus-wide ban is excessive; I have no problem with people smoking where it won't bother others. Unfortunately people often smoke immediately in front of building entrances, which does sometimes bother others, and the existing rules against this seem to have little effect.

208. If smoking is a stress relief for some students faculty and staff then keep the current rules and go farther to add smoking areas. Such as a few well placed gazebos. I know many students and workers that smoke and they all say the same thing. It gets them out of the building and break. Mentally helps them. Smoking is also legal. Pretty sure under nys law you can not harass anyone over a legal substance.
209. Tobacco and nicotine products are a cause for significant public health concern. Not only would a tobacco and nicotine free campus reduce second hand inhalation, but it will also promote public health by making it harder for people to smoke or vape. Although people who use these products may be frustrated by the fact that they would need to go off campus to smoke or vape, this is further incentive to quit. If Cornell cares about the health of its students, faculty, staff and other community members (which I believe it does), it will follow through with this ban.
210. I don't smoke but there is no need for the University to seek such control over people's lives by imposing such a ban. Also, for the people who are probably agitating for a ban, there is no plausible second-hand smoke damage taking place. Sure, I find the smell unpleasant but lots of people do unpleasant things--time to be more accepting. Additionally, my guess is that such a policy would primarily punish staff, which is exactly the opposite of what the University should do.
211. Smoking is one decision. Smoking such that it's harmful to others is a separate decision. Putting a sign up is one decision. Enforcing what that sign reads is another decision. Right now, we have people who choose to smoke and choose to keep it from being obnoxious or harmful to others, and people who choose to smoke and chose to allow it to be obnoxious or harmful to others. On the other hand, we have a million signs that say "no smoking within x feet of the building" and absolutely zero people ensuring that that rule is enforced. Everyone is aware of this. I use a vaporizer, and most of my friends don't even know that because I don't do it in front of other people. I assure you, that if you ban smoking, it won't do anything to me personally except making me feel like you people are trying to make me more miserable. I don't pay more money than I have to come to school here for you to tell me how to destress. As a final note, I know some people who went and picked up a cessation package and were utterly disappointed at its ineffectiveness.
212. I am a staff member at Cornell. I believe the current policy is adequate. Communications and Reminders may help increase compliance. I don't believe it is a good idea to BAN smoking./vaping across campus. It is too restrictive. I do believe it is good to continue discouraging the habits; and offering healthier choices. Bottom line: important to give Cornell community opportunity and freedom to make good choices.
213. Ban all smoking of all types on/around campus.
214. I support a tobacco free campus. Enforce the current rules about smoking. Assign designated smoking areas at buildings/areas.. Post signs so non-smokers can avoid the areas. I am a former smoker. Good luck with the free smoking cessation programs.. They are not especially helpful for quitting. If a campus wide ban on tobacco is enforced, then please institute a campus wide ban on perfumes, and other products with over-powering scents. They can be just as ugly for people with respiratory difficulties.

215. Staff here. Whatever policy gets written needs to include vaping of all kinds, whether explicitly “e-cigs” or not. Because standing at the bus stop in a cloud of candy-scented nicotine steam is almost as gross as being stuck there with a smoker. While we’re at it, that’s one problem with the current policy. Many places that are more than 25 feet from a building entrance are places where smoking becomes a problem. Bus shelters. Outdoor food service areas. Courtyards under large windows. In general, I think the societal trend towards not smoking indoors is a good one and has worked well. I don’t know that we need to ban it from all of campus (as others have said, there’s kind of noplacel else to go), but more clarity on what a building is would be helpful.
216. I agree with the first comment, no one obeys the 25 ft rule, especially in bad weather or when it is raining people stand right by the doors and smoke. It is disgusting, makes me cough, and follows me into the building. If people do not follow this rule and abuse it, then they should not be allowed to smoke.
217. The 25 foot rule need to be enforced! a campus wide ban will alienate and infuriate the general work staff... you will have a mutiny and see an rise in staff smoking in campus owned vehicles. As a non-smoker it always perplexed me how/why management would put up with someone taking multiple unscheduled breaks throughout the day... one of my first jobs working summers in highschool, my work-mate would take a smoke break it seemed like every hour. His production was severely lacking in comparison to non-smokers. So to bring attention to this issue I started to take a break and just stand with him every time he “needed” a cigarette(more non-smokers followed suit)... once management saw the drop in production, smoking was limited to one break in the morning, one in the afternoon and of course lunchtime.
218. Many of our peer institutions and other universities have smoke-free campuses. Furthermore, many of these campuses are even bigger than the Cornell campus. So I see no reason to have any smoking on campus.
219. I would not support a measure to ban smoking and vaping on campus. I would support greater enforcement of the 25ft rule, as others have suggested, but an outright ban would more likely lead to secretive indoor smoking and vaping, which is concerning both for campus facilities and student health. Cessation services are no panacea, but it’s better than acting like the problem can simply be swept elsewhere and Cornell will become a clean air utopia overnight. My main objection to this however is on the basis of class. The CDC reports that cigarette usage, which is the primary target in a ban like this, is notable higher among those of lower socioeconomic status. At Cornell, this encompasses some of our most valuable and hardworking staff: dining services, custodial, facilities. But it is these same workers who are continually shafted by a privileged student body that doesn’t value their work and an out of touch administration that values appearance over the people in the community. This is just another way for a privileged institution to pat itself on the back for being progressive, with no regard for how it continues to alienate those of lower SES.
220. On the residential parts of campus I would support a full ban of all smoking/vaping. As mentioned in a previous comment, it is quite annoying when you’re in your dorm and smoke finds its way through your window into your room. On the main academic part of campus I would support a full ban on

vaping. I don't mind the smell of actual cigarettes, and I believe them to be less worse for your health than vapes. I do not smoke or vape.

221. While I don't smoke, I don't think this policy will be effective. Most people smoke because they are addicted; banning smoking on campus will not erase this addiction. People who are addicted to smoking will continue to smoke, especially if they live on campus, as it is inconvenient to attempt to follow a complete smoking ban. Even with the negative effects on health, smoking is a personal choice and people should be allowed to smoke outdoors away from classes if they choose to do so. A better solution would be to enforce the no smoking rule 25 ft. away from buildings and in buildings. Those who break this rule should face consequences if reported. Furthermore, Cornell should increase the number of cigarette receptacles 25ft away from buildings so smokers will dispose of their cigarettes here. I think vaping is much harder to curtail as it is more discreet and can be done indoors.
222. Not a tobacco user at all. But if you do a ban you are still going to need some designated smoking areas/gazebos/something as well as allowing it in ones own vehicle. Otherwise you will just have more sneaky users, littering, etc. These spaces will need to be proximate to housing and work areas. As it is too many folks don't consider their break time to start until they light up. Also it would be helpful if the UA was clear how broad they plan to enact this. Are we just talking about second hand smoke? or all tobacco? Personally I am not a fan of walking into a cloud of any substance regardless of ban or legal status.....
223. Leave the current policy unchanged please.
224. I have been on many university campuses that are smoke-free. It is a pleasure working and collaborating with students and faculty on those campuses. Furthermore, we all see and enjoy the health benefits of a smoke-free environment. I see no reason to allow smoking anywhere on the Cornell campus.
225. Smoking kills no matter how you look at it, what form or shape it's being consumed. I loss my father when I was very young, and he died of cancer from smoking his whole life.
226. Although I think smoking should be banned I do not think it is possible. However, we need to enforce the 25 foot rule. Walk through the Law School Courtyard sometime. On a lovely day at 4:30 p.m. it is packed with smokers ... standing next to a half dozen doors. The courtyard is below ground level and the air quality is awful because the smoke hangs there. I should not have to walk through that on my way to my car that I have to park a ridiculous distance from my building. It is even better on rainy days when they stand under the covered walkways. That is really special. I used to have a faculty member that stood on the steps below my window (immediately outside of a door) and smoke.
227. Ban vaping but not cigarette smoking so that the Satanic Panic of our time can reach its full ascendancy.
228. Not only would a ban fuel the growing reaction from the right that progressive movements are all about restricting rights, but bans have historically never worked. It also situates the university as a kind of prohibitive parent figure, not one that allows students to make choices as full adults, whether these

choices are for better or worse. Additionally, smoking is often a (bad) coping mechanism; force someone to quit or hide it, and you'll worsen the campus's already rampant problems with depression, anxiety, and other mental health struggles. Why doesn't the campus start to enforce its existing (and NEVER enforced policy) that requires smokers to stay away from buildings and not smoke/vape inside? Also, I can't imagine the surrounding community will appreciate those smokers who obey the ban concentrating all of their activity and cigarette butt disposal in those areas.

229. I see both sides to this but in reality I see people that go around people that are clearly trying to stay away from people because they have cigarette. Most adult smokers do obey the 25ft rule and most discard of their cigarette butts the right way. To have a no smoking policy on campus is really to me a waste of time and energy that could be put forth to better things like improvement in work areas.. I think everyone goes a little crazy with the smoking thing. Clearly, if someone is smoking close to a building say would you mind moving as the smoke is coming into the building. There is no need for everyone to police people. I have heard enough about smokers. I do not see many of them. I think everyone of us has a crutch be it alcohol, food, smoking, drug, love, exercise or whatever. It is time we leave everyone else alone and mind our own demons.
230. We should foster a caring environment where we offer everyone assistance in quitting substance addiction. Prohibition is costly and ineffective. We are happy to provide Heroin addicts needles and safe injection sites. Smokers often stay close to buildings to get out of the weather. Maybe designated smoking areas with some protection from wind, rain, cold would encourage them to do the right thing.
231. I am a new student at Cornell, and to be honest, the smoking policy is one of the most unattractive characteristics of this university. From my personal experiences, I would make the educated assumption that the "25 ft rule" is widely disobeyed. I grew up in a household where my father smoked. He never smoked in our home, but he smoked in his car, and outside, like a chimney. Both my brother and I developed asthma that was extremely irritated by smoke as a result. For those of you who are not aware, when you smoke, not only are you exposing yourself to toxins, but you are also exposing others; and some people have terrible reactions to smoke. There have been numerous occasions where I have been subjected to toxic smoke fumes just by walking to class, and quite frankly, I think it is an infringement on my rights. My body, my choice!! Now, with that said, I think it is unreasonable to expect people to change their habits for my sake. "Your body, your choice" right? However, I do believe that while on this campus, it is the responsibility of Cornell University to ensure the safest environment that can be provided. There should be specific locations where smoking is allowed, and those caught violating these rules should be punished heavily.
232. We are adults. I am a smoker. I am courteous and aware of my surroundings. I smoke in the designated area's and do not leave trash behind. The smoking area's I am aware of, are not in main populated area's. Staff that smoke should be reminded of where the appropriate area's to smoke are. If smoke is coming into the building from a smoking area, maybe the area's should be moved further away. Honestly, we have much more important things we could be doing with our time and energy.
233. Every time I exit out of Uris, I always smell second hand smoke, despite the prohibition on smoking near the building. The job of a University is to balance the interest of different student groups — on the one hand, the desire of some to smoke and on the other, the need for others to not have to inhale

dangerous second hand smoke. As such because of the difficulty of enforcing the smoking regulations on campus, I would recommend to provide specialized places to smoke on campus and to ban smoking everywhere else. This should not include vaping since the water vapor appears to be safe and this should not include chewing tobacco. This solution would strike a balance between the compelling interests, especially for people who have serious medical conditions.

234. Aside from the health issues mentioned in so many posts, I wonder how many respond, as I do, to the cigarette TRASH that litters sidewalks, the sitting area around Uris, and really everywhere. Respect smokers? Do they think cigarette butts are not trash?? I'm in favor of a ban. Period.
235. The current 25' policy is not effective where buildings are tightly clustered. I have personally witnessed people smoking 25' from an entrance but against a building so as to be shielded from wind or rain just below open windows and/or air intakes. As an asthmatic, I would much prefer to never have to be near someone who is smoking. However I recognize a campus-wide ban is not practical. And until some kind of shelter is provided people will continue to smoke in places where their smoke is affecting others. Perhaps providing shelters with adequate filtration and ventilation strategically placed throughout campus is a strategy to consider.
236. The 25 foot/no smoking indoors rule would be fine if it was enforced. As it stands, I would support a smoking ban, if only for health purposes. Still, I believe that if the existing rules were enforced, then a smoking ban would not need to be put in place.
237. I don't know if a smoke free campus is the right direction, but I do know that the 25 feet rule is not followed. My office is less than 1 story about a very busy entrance to a high traffic building, and I can definitively say that I have smoke wafting into my office quite frequently. Specifically, rainy days and the winter months are particularly bad for second hand smoke. There is no one who actually enforces the rule, and I'd like to see that as a first step before going to a full campus ban.
238. This is a health issue as well as an equity issue. can't stand the smell of smoke, the smallest waft is offensive to me. as a community i think accommodating smoking is stupid and enabling. i also think it is unfair that smokers waste time while others sit at their desks working. i watch the same people go outside for smoking breaks that go beyond what is allowable without the slightest adjustment in their habits or thought about who is inside still working. then they take lunch breaks on top of that. so what if it is harder to have a smoke? good, maybe they will cut back. get gum. and how much more do I have to pay for my insurance premium to cover all the smokers in our insurance pool. I do think the campus has tried to address food concerns for those trying to argue that a smoking/tabacco ban is too controlling. the 25' policy is a joke. somehow as a state we have managed to survive the smoking ban in restaurants. smokers can adjust or work elsewhere. we are an institution of higher education and should aspire to healthy lifestyles for all in the community. it is never too late to quit smoking, if you want to continue to smoke figure it out, go off campus or work elsewhere. it has been offensive to me for 30 years. fed up!
239. I believe we should enforce the 25 foot no smoking rule. It's a choice for people and we should not punish people that choose to smoke. Cornell is supposed to be all inclusive yet you are then setting the

precedence to exclude certain people because of their choices. This is from a non-smoker that was raised with smokers, I choose to be a non smoker.

240. Please ban smoking. I came to Cornell to get a degree, not cancer. These kids need to stop developing nicotine dependencies.
241. I am a non-smoker. An entirely tobacco-free campus would be extremely inconvenient for folks who are tobacco product users. Cornell's campus is very large, open 24-7, and people would not necessarily be able to get to a spot where they could use these legal products in way that is convenient, safe, and accessible within their designated work or class breaks. It would be even more difficult if the tobacco user require special transportation or parking access due to an injury or disability – how are these individuals getting to a space where they can use their tobacco product? And what would enforcement look like? Do campus police want to enforce this? I don't think supervisors/faculty/resident assistants would like this to be part of their duties. How are you going to reprimand someone who is chewing, vaping? We have people who are living their entire lives on campus (living in campus housing, attending classes and events). If we ban tobacco use on campus, where exactly are people ending up when they need to access a tobacco product? What is our impact on our neighbors, and what areas of campus edge would be the most altered by this policy change? I wonder about who exactly would benefit by this policy change... call me suspicious but I think this is more about lowering a Cornell-wide insurance premium than creating a meaningful improvement in student or employee campus experience and overall health. I think people should be allowed to partake outside as they are walking or in designated comfort areas as long as it's not near fresh air intake, entries/exits or at public gathering spots. If there are smokers who are disregarding signs in problem areas, there could be a reminder campaign or citations issued to resolve this issue. Cessation programs are great for those who want to quit or are trying to minimize their tobacco use, but there are people who don't want to quit or can't quit. I want people to make healthy choices and really appreciate Cornell's health and wellness programs , but I don't think anyone should be forced to make certain health choices or utilize certain programs at their employer/educator's demand.
242. Ban outright please. All and every pressure to limit both active and passive smoking should be employed.
243. I think instead of an outright ban on both smoking and vaping, it would be most helpful to just ban smoking. It is obvious that the 25ft rule isn't being enforced and isn't respected– scrap that rule and let people who smoke use vaping products instead. It's not fair to freshmen to have to breathe second hand smoke or else not be able to air out their rooms. They can't live somewhere else, but the staff and other students do not have to smoke cigarettes.
244. As someone who smokes, and has struggled with quitting, going a whole shift at work without being able to take a quick smoke break would be detrimental to my job performance. Forcing all of those that work and study on Cornell's campus to either walk, or more likely drive due to the huge campus area, would create a barrier for people to get a needed smoke break. At UPenn, it is much easier to get off-campus due to the urban setting. Smoking is an addiction, and banning the substance on campus is not a healthy way to treat the addiction.

245. Ban smoking on campus. A great deal of evidence exists that second hand smoke can lead to lung cancer. So why do we tolerate one person's habit imposing the risk of cancer on another person? The 25 ft rule is not sufficient protection. Not only is it difficult to enforce, as evidenced by many of the comments here, it also fails to protect people from second hand smoke in areas away from building entrances. People may congregate near buildings, but smokers may stand almost anywhere else on campus, where others are walking, waiting for the bus, exercising, etc. Why should a pedestrian have to walk through a cloud of cigarette smoke? Why should someone waiting for the bus have to tolerate second hand smoke while they wait? One's personal liberty ends at another person's ability to breathe freely.
246. I am very much in support of a smoke-free campus. While smoking is a personal decision, the effects of smoking in public spaces affect everyone around. Every single day, I have to walk through areas where there are people smoking which negatively affects my health, as I have pretty severe asthma. I don't have an option about the spaces in which I exist in that sense (I don't choose where my classes are or how to get there because of time limitations), but those who choose to smoke can choose to do so in a way that doesn't impact others. I have read other comments on here saying that this would lead simply to finding hidden places to do so. From my point of view, this is inevitable and honestly fine because it still achieves the same goal of not imposing your own personal choices onto others. I also do not believe this ban should imply shame onto those who do smoke and vape. Although it is scientifically proven to be detrimental health-wise, shame alone will not lead to smokers quitting. There needs to be support for those who choose to quit, and a welcoming environment that encourages them to make that decision. The programs rendered by Cornell Health should be equitable and easy to access, especially when considering that these programs can be of benefits to students, faculty, staff, and service workers all the same.
247. I am very much against any smoking ban on campus. It's a discriminatory action seeming to dictate what people do with their own bodies. The current regulations already heavily restrict smoking in areas where others would experience second hand smoke. Please stop trying to further protect people from themselves. You should rather educate about the harmful effects of smoking. If smokers aren't harming you, then you shouldn't be discriminating against them.
248. As a Cornell staff member, I concur with the comment regarding the importance of thinking through the strategy of how this ban would be enforced or more importantly, not enforced. Getting input from CUPD is paramount as this is even considered. In addition, if we were to ban tobacco/nicotine, we would need much more infrastructure and resources for helping people cope with preparing to quit and actually quitting. I think this is possible and needed even if this campus wide ban does not occur.
249. We know that smoking causes cancer. How can we be Ivy League, model citizens if we permit it? I mean, someplace, somewhere culture needs to shift toward consideration of health and citizens.. If not us toYes a band on campus is needed, I have to walk by too many smokers outside campus buildings. Thank you! consider, seriously, then who?!
250. Stick with the current restrictions. I'm an employee.

251. I am a non smoker researcher. I hate cigarettes smoke, but I think that a complete ban is way too much. Enforcing the current rules of smoking at a certain distance for buildings (which I often see broken by staff, sometimes near ventilation ports so the whole building smells of cigarettes) would be a better solution, but I do not think it is easily enforced (unless you want to add cameras on top of each door, and staff/"AI Chinese style" the video feed). Another solution could be to ban smoking from campus unless you are in a spot reserved for smoking. Both solutions require investment of resources, so possibly the cheapest/less inconvenient should be implemented
252. PhD student. To address other comments, what they are proposing is a tobacco ban, so yes that includes vaping and dip as well as smoking. The main issue is people smoking too close to entrances. Sometimes people are not being mindful of the wind/open windows etc. Make smoking prohibited except in specially marked areas where this won't be an issue. People can still smoke, just not right in front of buildings which is where people are currently smoking. I don't really care if people smoke on campus, but it's pretty ridiculous when people are smoking right in front of busy entrances. Why do people want to smoke right in front of a doorway that literally hundreds of people are passing through in a few minutes (e.g. Olin Hall). Every single person has to smell your smoke, yes it does smell strongly and is unpleasant. The issue isn't the negligible amount of second hand smoke. It's having to deal with peoples disgusting and unsightly addictions.
253. Doing this is completely unnecessary. I've never found a problem with other people smoking and there is no reason to ban it. First of all, it wouldn't be enforced very well. And even if it was people will still do it. I don't even smoke but I see no reason to have a smoke free campus.
254. I would love to see a smoke-free (does that apply to BBQ?) & tobacco-free campus that includes banning vaping and chewing tobacco products. There are places on campus where the 25ft rule is laughable — outside the Johnson School, particularly, one finds packs of smokers and butts all over the ground. As the weather gets colder it seems the measuring device shrinks.
255. It is always helpful to enforce existing rules before deciding that they are inadequate and making new rules that will require better enforcement. Cornell is not currently doing an adequate job with smoking rule enforcement.
256. I am disgusted that Cornell is considering this. I am not a smoker but study tobacco control policies. Take a look at the literature on this question! This is exactly the kind of "feel good" policy that is antithetical to actually improving public health. There is very little evidence that smoking bans reduce smoking, and there is evidence that it displaces smoking to potentially more harmful places (such as at home and in cars, where there are children). The university has so many challenges. Why is this something we are even discussing? We are not school children. It is paternalistic and is bad policy in terms of the outcomes it is trying to avoid.
257. Bottom Line: Why are we still legalizing and accommodating a known drug addiction? Smoking claims lives, vaping claims lives. Why are we still, after more than 50 years of warnings, still accepting smoking and vaping as the norm?

258. I fully support removing smoking, vaping, chewing, etc. (tobacco, nicotine, cbd, marijuana) throughout all of Cornell University's Ithaca campus. I believe it will be a happier and healthier community for all. For students I think that it would relieve the pressure of having to "fit in" with the vapers and for staff and faculty I think that it will help with the overall goal of cessation. For those that want to continue to use those products they can do so off-campus and on their own time. We can all breathe a little easier. Horray!
259. As a staff member and a recent graduate, I do not think Cornell adequately enforces the smoking policies (and state laws) currently so I see it as a waste to try to implement stricter policies. I have asthma and have problems with being near smoke as well as smoke that has saturated a person's clothing. While I understand from personal experience that other people smoking can be hazardous to another person's health, I don't think the university should ban tobacco products/smoking (whichever they choose to ban) on campus since 1) it is a personal choice to use tobacco products (which are legal substances) and 2) Cornell has not proven to me that they are capable of enforcing the current policies/state laws.
260. Cigarette & Cigar Smoking are disgusting habits. I genuinely welcome a non-smoking campus. Few, if any, campus-wide smokers obey the 25 ft rule (which in and of itself is quite ridiculous – after all air does move), meanwhile their exhaust finds it's way into buildings, offices, and classrooms polluting the already stale air that everyone breathes in daily. I definitely do not want to be afflicted by lung, or any other type of cancer, as a direct result of inhaling second-hand smoke. For non-smokers the thought of being forced to spend our own time and money combating the effects of someone else's repulsive, personal habit, is sickening to say the least. Not to mention carrying the stench of cigarette smoke around all day in our lungs & hair and on our skin and clothing after walking through a cloud of vaporized poisons leaves me with nothing but nasty thoughts and harsh words.
261. I am confused. Is a "tobacco free campus" the same thing as no smoking or vaping allowed? What about smokeless tobacco; i.e., snuff or chewing tobacco?
262. I live in an older dorm without air conditioning or much circulation, so we like to keep our windows open. Recently we have had to close our windows because our dorm has begun to smell like cigarette smoke due to the construction workers and staff members who I see smoking behind our building. Even if a complete ban is not instated, I think it is necessary to ban smoking from all of the residential areas on campus (i.e. north and west campuses), since the smoke poses a serious health concern to the people who live there, even when the smokers follow the 25 foot rule.
263. As it currently stands, very few people smoke on the University campus. I can hardly remember the last time I noticed someone smoking on campus. Campus is large enough that second hand smoke is not a problem and as such I do not see what the policy actually hopes to achieve other than impose ever more rules and regulation. Further, it seems problematic to implement policies that are at odds with state-law. Additionally, while Yale is provided as a model example of a tobacco free campus, the implementation there leaves much to be desired and I suspect that enforcement of the policy is almost non-existent, especially given the university's poor relationship with the neighboring town community.

264. I'm a graduate student. I would welcome a tobacco-free campus. It's important for the health of the students. I'm exposed to second-hand smoke throughout the day while walking outside the library too often.
265. I am a grad student and, alas, a smoker. I found smokers at Cornell generally very respectful of rules and others. A total ban of smoking from campus would be an extremely illiberal and divisive measure. Focusing on the rules already in place which are perfectly adequate in safeguarding the health of non-smokers should be the priority.
266. Has anyone done an assessment that concludes there is significant risk to nonsmokers from someone smoking a cigarette more than 25 feet from a building? If so, has it been compared to risks from exposure to other hazards on campus (e.g., exhaust, fried foods, ice cream)? If the answer to either or both of these questions is "no," then what is the basis for a smoking ban? Who exactly will benefit and how? You need to publicly answer (with supporting data) all these questions before you can have any ethical basis for proposing a ban. For the record, I'm a staff member, a non-smoker, and I lost my Mom to lung cancer way too soon.
267. Probably enforcing the existing rules would be enough. If people are smoking where it is not allowed they need to be written up. 3 strikes and your out.
268. The survey asks for Nicotine Use – does this include nicotine gum? Enforce the 25m rule – and provide smoking shelters/etc which are away from buildings for harsh weather (or at least clearly delineated/signed smoking areas). I think this comes down to a "second hand smoke impacts me" vs "They shouldn't be doing it" argument. If all tobacco is banned, people will still do so in e.g. private vehicles in the parking lots. The loss to productivity of a tobacco ban could be large.
269. Having worked in healthcare for over 20 years, what I find baffling is the amount of energy dedicated to 'banning' smoking in private and public spaces and not on smoking cessation initiatives from institutions. Nicotine is an addictive drug. I dislike second hand smoke, but let us have a bit of compassion for people who have an addiction. Designated smoking areas should remain accessible, along with access to smoking cessation resources. Tools – not rules- are the path to a sustainable future.
270. I am an employee. Like the other smokers here, I try to be as conscientious as possible when smoking in public. I do however find it offensive to think that I need to go to the street corner to do so. I'd like to quit one day, but my doctor and therapist have discouraged me attempting this until my anxiety disorder is under control. To echo others here, instead of banning smoking outright we really should better enforce the 25ft rule. The question is how. I witness students all over campus smoking wherever. As another said: We are an institution of adults. Some adults smoke. For many, it is not a choice any longer. Treat your faculty, staff and students with dignity and respect. Treat them like adults who can make their own decisions. Do not make this a tobacco free campus.
271. I used to smoke, but I quit 5 years ago. I am glad I did and I hope everybody does. Until they do, please don't treat them like they are criminals. They have their right to a space to meet their needs.

272. I would welcome a tobacco-free campus. It's important for the health of the students!
273. How is it possible that a campus that promotes inclusivity of all regardless of race, gender, opinions, and actions is going to consider banning smoking – an act which many smokers are embarrassed about many times can not even control. Is this not counter to the proposed inclusive nature of the environment? Would banning smoking truly make people smoke less, or just in secret? What is a much better solution (and is currently in place) is designating smoking areas for smokers, because this way you are not restricting their freedom to smoke, and their freedom to smoke is in no way obstructing your preferences.
274. Cornell should give staff that don't smoke extra time off like other companies are doing to compensate for all the time / breaks that smokers take during work days.
275. I used to smoke, but I quit 5 years ago. I am glad I did and I hope everybody does. Until they do, please don't treat them like they are criminals. They have their right to a space to meet their needs.
276. I'm a first year student here and I know that me and many of my friends would be extremely in favor of a smoke/tobacco free campus. Most smokers on campus do so closer than 25 feet away from a building, and the wind blows the smoke close to, and into, most buildings anyways. I find it very hard to concentrate when all I can smell is the smoke and then it lingers for hours. It gives me a headache and hinders me unproductive; however, I realize that most of the smoke comes from our building staff/care workers and faculty, and that it is part of their lifestyle. I still think a ban is necessary, but to lessen the impacts that could cost them, Cornell could implement policies for their staff/faculty to provide help for those affected by addiction by addressing their staffs' wellness and mental conditions. But I think a ban on smoking is necessary to increase efficiency and decrease the pollution on campus. Many campuses have a strictly smoke free policy with no issues, so it's certainly possible we can too.
277. I support a full ban on smoking (vaping/chewing) on campus. Allowing smoking on campus condones a practice that science has proven to be deadly for users and bystanders. We are an institute of higher learning and we should be setting good examples for the students and community. To remove soda from dining halls while continuing to allow smoking on campus is pure hypocrisy. Cornell will need to provide much more support to smokers trying to quit. I recommend dedicated counseling services and free cessation aids. The majority of the smoke clouds I have to walk through are from construction contractors so they will need to be addressed as well.
278. I think more should be done to enforce the 25 feet policy and respect non-smokers, but I would prefer if Cornell doesn't discriminate staff and students based on addiction. I'm a staff member, I don't smoke or vape but I think people should be free, as long as they don't pollute others.
279. I am a staff member. I consider smoking a serious public health issue not only for the smoker but for anyone that happens to go by. We have a beautiful campus and we should take advantage of it to enhance our healthy habits. My Alma Mater imposed a ban on all smoking on campus last century. (Vaping didn't even exist!) I'm all for a tobacco, vaping, etc. free campus.

280. I'm a staff member at Cornell. I'm in favor of a *near* smoking/vaping ban on campus, but not to take it to that extreme. I know that some individuals smoke/vape even though they'd rather quit, others may rely on it for comfort/anxiety reduction, etc., and banning them from any smoking/vaping on campus would be against Cornell's inclusive practices. Cornell's campus is large, so if you work in a central building, I imagine it would be challenging and/or distressful to have to get off of campus to smoke, particularly for some hourly workers on a tight schedule. I also agree the 25ft rule doesn't work well, or it only works in some circumstances. What if there were designated smoking/vaping areas on campus that were clearly marked? These could be distributed throughout campus so that they are accessible, but it would help to regulate the smoking near entrances problem that occurs. On a related note, I just got back from a conference where people were expected to smoke no closer than 25 feet from a building entrance. Even though people were generally honoring this, the construction of the building and the air currents worked together so that the cigarette smoke was sucked into the building and funneled all the way up to the 3rd floor where many of the sessions were. For those sensitive to cigarette smoke, it was an uncomfortable conference.
281. I support a campus ban. I'm unable to open the window to my university office due to people smoking nearby. Smoking is a public health disaster and a leading cause of death in the US. It should not be permitted on campus.
282. If someone smokes cigs or vapes but in a non-intrusive way, ie, not affecting you whatsoever, then you have absolutely no right to ban tobacco. It's an infringement upon individual rights. Why should you tell me what to do with my body when it's none of your business? I thought this country cared about freedom lmao.
283. Some of the survey questions are poorly designed: Q3, belief about smoking/vaping by others – obvious answer not available is “some do and some don't”. Q7, how would policy affect eagerness to come to Cornell – obvious answer not available is “no effect either way”.
284. I do not smoke, and have not observed any issues with the current state of affairs. I do observe that many on our campus smoke, including students, visiting scholars, and staff. I don't see how inconveniencing these members of our community by requiring them to leave campus to smoke benefits the university. Given the strong campus push for inclusion and diversity, this feels jarringly out of step with effort to make Cornell an inclusive and open university and community.
285. I support a tobacco free campus. The college I attended enforced this my senior year and although there were multiple students against it, it did help decrease the number of times non-smokers had to walk through smoke filled areas. They originally had the 25 feet from buildings rule but it was not managed well and there were many individuals that broke that rule, in addition to buildings being relatively close, that there was never really an option. If they are enforcing this new rule of tobacco free campus-it needs to be enforced and those that do continue to smoke need to be held accountable for breaking the rules. I think that there should be specific smoking areas possibly because going off campus is a hassle because of how large the campus is-difficult to get off campus for those working during a typical work day. On the other hand, is there a rule on smoke breaks vs typical breaks throughout the day. I know this came up during previous employment for myself, in addition to multiple other organizations but 'some' smokers are taking multiple breaks throughout the day to

smoke while non-smokers are still working. I personally do not have to deal with this where I am working on campus, but I am sure others do based on the frequency others are outside smoking. How is this being monitored? Going off campus would require more time but then again, smoking outside the building is far from ideal as well? Additionally, I think Cornell provides a plethora of options to help their employees out, I am unsure if addiction is one of them but I think that would be super beneficial for those that do use tobacco as a helpful alternative as it 'seems' like many want to quit but might not have the direct means to assist so anything that we can do to help those as well would be beneficial.

286. I cannot stand the smell of cigarettes, and I've seen family members succumb to the horrible destructive health effects. I despise the industry and the product. BUT. A complete ban is excessively paternalistic and I do not support it. In a region like this, it also places a bigger stigma on the poor health habits of our working-class employees, compared to those of higher socioeconomic standing. Cornell's main campus is enormous, which is to say nothing about its many barns, fields, and facilities that are in the outlying areas. Presumably these also would be banned areas? Getting to the edge of Cornell property in order to smoke legally is not as simple as it would be in an urban center like that of Penn. By all means, please do keep second-hand smoke away from non-smokers and let smokers manage their own health decisions. By all means, support people in their efforts to stop smoking, through health interventions and programs.
287. Currently people vape in eating areas and no one says anything. Zeus for example is horrible to sit and eat when folks are vaping openly. Smoking is a health hazard not just for the smoker but for others. It drives up the cost of health insurance. The butts detract from our beautiful environment and cost us extra to clean up. Most health care campuses have become vaping and smoke free. Please do it here!
288. What is the point of a ban? Better health for non-smoking employees through reduced exposure to second hand smoke? Lower health insurance premiums? Why don't we require smokers to pay the true cost of their health insurance? If everyone is bundled together non-smokers are subsidizing smokers.
289. I am totally in favor of a no smoking, vaping free campus.
290. Why do y'all always wanna legislate for other people's actions? Yeah, smoking in a closed space can lead to second-hand smoke, but outside? Why's it a big deal? We all agree smoking is bad for you but come one...so is eating doughnuts and pizza everyday... seems a little pretentious to me.
291. I believe in banning smoking on campus and I haven't seen anyone violating this rule and so the current cessation services could be adequate. It is important to enforce this rule because smoking harms people around also.
292. I'm a Cornell student—the 25 foot rule seems good, and thanks to this rule I haven't really encountered anyone who was bothering me terribly when smoking (I have asthma and am allergic to cigarette smoke)—but it's a good rule to keep people who CANT smell cigarettes smoke safe, while allowing people who do to do so safely. Although I would prefer a campus ban, I understand that some people enjoy smoking/vaping or need it for medical reasons.

293. I do not smoke. If someone smokes/vaps, that is their business. We do have some people that smoke, at my building, where there are outdoor ash/cigarette receptacles located according to university guidelines. Their smoke does not bother me. I do not see any need to turn this campus smoke free. We have enough rules and regulations here telling us how to think, how to act, how to walk, how to drive, etc. Let the smokers smoke if they want to.
294. I support a no-smoking policy on Cornell's campus. My previous university in Australia instituted this policy in mid 2018 and it has been an enormous success. Cornell should demonstrate its commitment to providing a productive, safe and healthy working and learning environment. Banning tobacco helps to protect staff, students and visitors from as many avoidable health risks as possible, including risks associated with exposure to second-hand smoke.
295. I have never smoked. I grew up in a family of smokers, though, and had numerous bitter arguments with my addicted parents and brother. It is fair to say that I hate cigarettes. And yet, I do think a total ban is probably tantamount to overreach and harassment. I cannot imagine any reason to do this whatsoever. Is this on principle alone? That rings a bit fundamentalist. Enforce the current rules better, already pretty onerous in the midst of winter I would imagine. No need to chase people off campus with bans that have no rhyme or reason.
296. I like the model they have in Japan (and implemented very well in Tokyo): can only smoke in designated smoking areas in public outdoor areas. However, this or whatever method Cornell wants to institute would require enforcement.
297. Setting cigarettes aside for a moment, a ban on vaping is nothing more than virtue signaling. Vaping affects only the user- there's no second hand smoke, no lingering odor, no nuisance created at all. Vaping will continue, but users will just feel more alienated from the campus administration (and thus less likely to seek their resources)
298. To think that making the campus tobacco-free would reduce smoking is inherently ignorant. I'm not sure if that's the goal here, but if it is, it's incredibly stupid. I very rarely encounter students smoking or vaping, and when I have, it has been outside and 25ft away from a building. Also, why is vaping even mentioned here? Vaping is nowhere near as unhealthy as smoking, and does not even necessarily involve tobacco use. Second hand vapor is essentially harmless. By making this campus tobacco-free you are not only inviting people to smoke inside but promoting permanent property damage. If students can't step outside and be away from others to smoke, they're just going to do it in their dorms. Quite frankly, I don't want my dorm to reek of cigarette smoke because the last student was forced to smoke inside their dorm.
299. Over at Trillium every morning the staff is out there in the grass on a picnic table smoking and it smells horrible. I must be at least 15 feet away walking down the sidewalk and all I can smell is stale cigarette smoke. I don't care if people smoke but I would prefer not to smell it. It's strong and makes me feel sick. I am an ex smoker.
300. Yes vaping and smoking should be banned on campus, the services are adequate. I want them banned because it is unhealthy, smelly, and smoky to other people.

301. The public health risks to smoking are well established. The current smoking policy unjustifiably generates costs to the university community by having to furnish receptacles for cigarette butts, emptying receptacles, and cleaning up refuse. There is no compelling reason to continue to permit smoking on the Cornell campus. I support moving forward on a total ban.
302. I agree with people who have posted on how a total ban will alienate some, will be hard to enforce, and is ridiculous. However, I haven't seen a discussion on how cigarette butts are littered everywhere, even around designated smoking spots, because the trash containers aren't emptied. I support limiting and enforcing the current rules. But if we can't even handle those, how are you going to do a full on ban?!
303. Don't tell adults they can't do something they are legally allowed to do out of weird moral superiority. If you want to regulate behavior, let's start with sexual assault, drunk driving, hazing, the incompetence of Cornell Health, etc.
304. International students from nations with different attitudes and rates of smoking will be discriminated against. Moreover, this policy prioritizes whims of entitled, wealthy elites who do not smoke over some of the lower SES staff (underpaid by Cornell) who do (not stereotyping—just statistically, the people more likely to smoke are those in economically worse off populations—to the degree that holds at Cornell...) It also ignores that smoking is a better coping mechanism for mental health diagnoses than alternatives.
305. The public health risks to smoking are well established. The current smoking policy unjustifiably generates costs to the university community by having to furnish receptacles for cigarette butts, emptying receptacles, and cleaning up refuse. There is no compelling reason to continue to permit smoking on the Cornell campus. I support moving forward on a total ban.
306. I'm not a smoker but I think that things are fine the way they are and smoking on campus should not be banned entirely. Maybe make some smoker areas could be made available far from entrances to help decrease smoking near building doors. A complete ban would result in clandestine smoking and littering.
307. This is an extraordinarily paternalistic policy. I suggest you look at the research on this question before enacting policies that sound like a good idea. The vaping ban in particular is not good policy – it is impossible to enforce, and there is no “second-hand” smoke from vaping. We cannot just ban behaviors we do not like. I do not smoke but believe that bad policy is a bad idea. There are world experts on exactly this issue at Cornell! Consult them!
308. I think that smoking should be banned but vaping should follow the previous set rules for smoking as it doesn't cause the same negative effects.
309. Absolutely shouldn't be allowed. If anyone wants to smoke, the only place for them should be their own private bathroom.

310. I think Cornell should focus on enforcing its current smoking/vaping policy because I often see people smoking outside of the library at night much closer than the 25 feet required by policy. Completely banning it will probably be less effective, as it's a difficult habit to break for many smokers and it would probably be easier to continue smoking than make a conscious effort to quit the habit.
311. I support banning smoking and vaping on campus.
312. Full campus ban, please. Isn't Cornell as evolved as other top schools?
313. I think that it is incredibly paternalistic to tell individuals they cannot make a choice like smoking on a campus they pay to attend if they are obeying the laws regarding the issue. Not to mention, would this apply to guests who are staying at the Statler Hotel? That would seem to greatly limit individuals' liberty. Health concerns are of course an issues. However, vaping products do not necessarily constitute the same health concerns. Perhaps the distances from the buildings should be better enforced or incentives to stay away from buildings while smoking should be reformed.
314. Current research on cigarette smokers (https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/fact_sheets/adult_data/cig_smoking/index.htm) shows that most smokers are lower income, less educated, and more likely to be of a racial minority. Banning tobacco on campus will disproportionately affect the hourly, temporary, and lower income workers on campus who have the least access to medical resources and education on quitting. The effort is better spent on outreach, on making programs to assist these individuals with quitting available, and on providing incentives to quit rather than punitive bans. BU implemented this ban while I was on their campus, and it did nothing to curb or help smokers quit, it vastly INCREASED the litter because now there were no places to dispose of cigarette butts, and it meant that the people with the least power on campus were now at risk of being harassed over their ten minute smoke break.
315. The xft away from a building rule is not efficient. Today, I walked out of my dorm and there were cigarettes on the ground and smelled like tobacco., and it disrupted my morning to class.
316. It is my hope that Cornell intends to be not just tobacco free but a smoke/vape free campus as well. As an employee, I'm very much in support of this moving forward. Thank you for being interested in the health of the entire Cornell community.
317. I have smokers outside my door. I have sympathy for their addiction.... but I do have to clean up after them and I resent this. They throw butts down the drain which ends up in the lake I believe. More butt disposal canisters and an assigned dumper is vital. Mental health breaks from screen time for example would be fair. All staff should be able to go outside for 5 minutes every two hours if they choose. I think hypnotism and acupuncture should be available to faculty and staff- that is the only thing that works- maybe patches and gum if these modalities are not practical. It does appear that building care has a much higher percentage of smokers of any group on campus... so a targeted incentive program would be most effective rather than ramped up enforcement and penalties- carrot not a stick please. Calls for 25 foot enforcement just creates conflict... who is the ciggy police?

318. I am not a smoker, but I have employees that smoke and feel as though it is their right to do so. The campus is too large to ban smoking altogether. It is not reasonable to expect that they can walk off campus each time they want to smoke. I feel as though a ban would cause more instances of smoking in buildings/bathrooms/etc. The 25 foot rule is enforceable, a ban is not.
319. I've just tried to take the UA's nicotine survey. It's useless. What is a "typical student/employee/faculty member at Cornell"? There are many absolute non-smokers/vapers, there are many frequent smokers, and I have no idea how many people fall in the middle. That's what the previous question was trying to get at. Then the question about "If Cornell had a tobacco-free campus when you applied as a student, staff, or faculty member, how would that have affected your decision to come to Cornell?" — the choices are "excited to be here" or "wouldn't have come." How about, "I wouldn't have cared one way or another" (which is substantially different than "I don't know," which was the last choice). I've decided not to finish filling out the survey as I doubt the utility of the results.
320. A problem other than cigarette smoke that has been neglected is marijuana smoke. The scent is intrusive and very triggering for me. I feel violated having to smell weed when I want to open my windows at night to get some fresh air.
321. I have seen many universities with a "smoke free campus" policy and I agree with it. Many people have sensitivities to strong smells, smoke, etc. (enough so that the east hill human resources departments often have notes in their emails for anyone coming in that asks for people not to wear perfume) and I think it is perfectly reasonable to make this a policy here. Unfortunately, the current 25 foot rule from entrances and bus stops does not always work- people do it anyways because they seemingly do not get punished. A campus-wide cigarette ban and more monitoring of the problem would be great in my opinion.
322. I'm a non-smoker and I do not vape. I do not think there should be a campus-wide ban, even though I think smoking is bad for your health. Because second-hand smoke is a concern, I think we should enforce current rules and perhaps create more smoking areas and cigarette butt disposal spots. Obviously away from congestion points. And perhaps signs to direct people who are using congestion points. It seems fairly draconian and inconsiderate to ban tobacco usage for an entire campus. As long as no one litters or smokes too close to others, I feel it should be left alone.
323. I support the university's policy. As a nonsmoker, I find it irritating that I'm subject to second-hand smoke by smokers. However, I wonder how this policy will be implemented. Even with the 25-foot policy I still see smokers near building entrances. How will a tobacco ban change anything? What will be the consequences to smokers on campus?
324. Nicotine use has no place on this campus. It is disruptive and serves no purpose.
325. You've obviously never had to deal with blue collar work and the anxieties that go along with it. Cigarettes are sometimes their only line of defense against social stigma and economic pressures, not to mention that they are within generations where smoking was not only culturally accepted but encouraged. Step outside of your own self-centered perceptions.

326. Yes, ban it. Or provide a smoking room with vent hoods like they have in European airports.
327. I am in complete support of a total ban on smoking. The people who say, "I'm so careful where I smoke" do not get it. Your smoke travels far and wide. You may think it's carried up-up and away but it doesn't and it often hangs in the air, especially in summer. The person who commented about those with asthma really does get it – a whiff of secondhand smoke can send people with asthma to the ER. (and yes, there's pollution from other sources but this type is highly preventable). No one commenting so far has discussed the Ag Quad. Those of us who work there have to constantly dodge the clouds of smoke hanging in the air close to entrances.. A person may technically be 25ft from the entrance but that is *still really close* to the entrance. The signage and trash cans for cigarette butts are few and far between. There is literally zero enforcement (which I understand). So instead of the majority of people having to suffer the poor health decisions of the minority why not just ban it altogether. Am fully in favor of \$\$ to help cessation etc.
328. I think it is important to be clear on what this is intended to do. A Tobacco-free campus suggests chewing tobacco is included (yes, I did teach in the South). Does a smoke-free campus including vaping products or not? How about a Tobacco-free campus (it does list vaping above but is nicotine the same as tobacco?)? And are we worried about the health of the users or the non-users – which may be construed as a choice vs. non-choice situation but that may not be what is intended either. Clarity would be helpful. Thank you.
329. I'm academic staff. I don't think UPenn is an adequate model for Cornell. I've worked there. It's a smaller, urban campus, so it isn't exactly difficult to walk a few blocks and be off-campus. Like the other smokers here, I try to be as conscientious as possible when smoking in public (i.e. away from building entrances, people, open windows, etc.). I'd like to quit one day, but my doctor and therapist have discouraged me attempting this until my anxiety disorder is under control. To echo others here, instead of banning smoking outright we really should better enforce the 25ft rule. The question is how. I think the problem is that a lot of smokers don't realize how bad even brief contact with their smoke can be for people with conditions like asthma (just as people who wear too much perfume/body spray likely don't realize that they've triggered a full-blown migraine for me). They think as long as they're outside, then brief contact with secondhand smoke is not a serious issue– and it might not be for people without respiratory problems. There should be more of campaign to better emphasize how dangerous secondhand smoke can be even outdoors. If people understood how someone could have an asthma attack coming into contact with their cigarette smoke, maybe they would be a little more thoughtful before they light up, say, right by the entrance of Olin Library.
330. I am a former smoker. It is really hypocritical and offensive to talk of banning smoking on the campus. To paraphrase Frank Zappa, this is like treating dandruff with decapitation. What is the issue? The occasional whiff of smoke? Fears of second hand smoke? If so, start by banning automobiles and non-electric TCAT buses. Next, start gutting immediately (not 10 years from now when the money has finally been raised) buildings such as McGraw which are making faculty ill and are in dire need of remediation. Stop ratcheting up the administrative duties, cuts to staffing levels, and all of the other Bane-inspired austerity measures that generate enormous stress for faculty, staff and students and thus negatively impact their health (and certainly make me want to start smoking again.) What about all sugary drinks on campus? Heavily-salted pre-prepared meals? Alcohol at university functions? All

those choices by others impact our lives, whether it be healthcare costs, drunk driving, or (god forbid) lost hours of productivity. Speaking of productivity—one could make the argument that for some, smoking is an essential part of how they work intellectually. Read a good Cornellian's great book: Cigarettes are Sublime.

331. Smoking causes lung cancer in those who smoke and in those who inhale the smoke second hand. Campus ban please.
332. We should put the smoking post in the middle of the road on the yellow line. This way smokers still have their own smoking lane that is 25 feet from all buildings and people walking by. Smoking by doorways and near windows where the smoke can go into the building does have issues for people with breathing problems like asthma, so having to walk past someone smoking can do a lot of harm.
333. I do not smoke or vape. Enforcing current rule = highly appropriate. Banning smoking on all of campus = highly pretentious virtue signaling. That will alienate many support staff. Why not regulate the campus diet, as our food choices surely have more substantial health consequences than the small amount of smoke we currently encounter outdoors? (Reductio ad absurdum).
334. I am a Cornell student and I don't think that smoking on campus is a big deal, it hasn't been a problem in any way. In my daily activities I hardly ever run into someone smoking, and even if I do, it is outside and so it is not a big deal. We are all adults so those that smoke should be free to do so outside. I totally understand indoor smoking restrictions, but outdoor restrictions? How would this be possible and why is it even remotely necessary? Yes smoking is bad, but walking past someone smoking once every few weeks is not doing anyone harm.
335. I smoke but I am extremely careful that it doesn't cause anyone inconvenience. I like the rule that we can't drink out of building and can't smoke in the definite premise of the building. In the proposed scenario, if I have to go out of campus every time I have to smoke then please imagine the rate of productivity (I still work till 9 in evening). So, the smoking ban is little too much to afford. If it becomes mandatory then I appeal for recovery time as it's stepwise process. If I quit smoking instantly then there will be the withdrawal symptoms e.g. anxiety, inadequate metabolism and perspiration (Happy to share the research articles), and not to mention that Winter is coming. I don't understand how exactly the smoking is affecting ecosystem. If we care that much about ecosystem then we should first selectively ban automobiles in campus and build a track for bikes or trams consuming green energy. Emission from automobiles is no comparable with smoking. I am sorry, I strongly disagree with smoking ban in campus but fully support the strong rules which can prevent people's smoking being a reason for other's inconvenience.
336. What do you mean by "Nobody"? I never broke that rule. Please do not put everyone under one umbrella so that to make your point reasonable.
337. We are an institution of adults. Some adults smoke. For many, it is not a choice any longer. 25 feet from entrances is a reasonable rule. It is rare to smell cigarettes on campus or anywhere for that matter. Treat your faculty, staff and students with dignity and respect. Treat them like adults who can make their own decisions. Do not make this a tobacco free campus. Like some have suggested, post

smoking policies clearly around campus. Pay particular attention to areas of high smoking traffic (like around the library).

338. I was swayed by the argument in the Senate that asked, implicitly, about the need for the survey. There's no reason to think that answers to the survey at Cornell will be any different from this much-researched question in more general contexts, and it feels like a waste of resources, especially considering the long time frame over which it's been developed and revised. The survey strikes me as missing the real issues behind the policy: how will it be enforced? What will the costs of that enforcement be? And do those costs outweigh the projected benefits of a smoke-free campus? A more practical examination of the issue would examine: what smokers on campus would do under a new policy, what CUPD projects as being the influence on their policing, and the class-based impacts of the new policy, especially among visitors, who will not be surveyed. Additionally, we need to think through what a ban would do if it were not enforced, like the 25-foot rule. My understanding as a Philadelphian (but never Penn faculty) was that the smoking ban at U. Penn. aided in empowering campus authorities to keep 'outsiders' from moving freely through campus spaces. Cornell's "engagement" values seem to require us to do more or less the opposite.
339. I am a Cornell staff member who smokes, the 25ft feet rule is a good rule but I see several students standing by the library entrance smoking....it's too busy to have to mandate the entrance plus my regular work duties. I do think there should be smoking areas away from buildings/sidewalks. The area to the right of Uris library would be an ideal smoking area as it is away from sidewalks and far enough away from the entrance. If smoking is banned from Campus I'm sure many will find places to smoke and not be seen....I know several places. The one thing as a smoker that bothers me is that many students and some staff throw their cigarette butts on the ground instead of using the many smoker outposts that Cornell has provided, that is disgusting and looks terrible.
340. I think we should work to make sure the 25 feet rule is actually being obeyed. I don't think that we should be banning all tobacco from campus, however — there are some people who use cessation devices as a way to help with things ranging from anxiety to drug abuse. There are also many workers on campus who can't make it off campus within their 15 minute breaks to smoke. Cigarette smoking is particularly prevalent amongst the working class, and to ban all tobacco products on campus would make it incredibly difficult for them unless we offer them free cessation tools and support. I also agree that we should perhaps have designated smoking spots that are away from heavy foot traffic, but banning tobacco products entirely should not be the solution.
341. Only one in four Americans support a total ban on tobacco, which is fairly consistent amongst age groups, suggesting the statistics are similar for the Cornell population. In addition to being an unpopular policy, a ban would likely lead to increased smoking (particularly vaping) on private properties (as observed during Prohibition), negatively affecting student health. As a further matter, the term "tobacco-free campus" is in itself inaccurate, because vaping products do not contain any tobacco, but nicotine and other chemicals.
342. I'm tired of walking to class in the mornings and home in the evenings to find custodial staff smoking so close to the dorm's open windows. If Cornell allows people to smoke on campus then they better be willing to install air conditioning in my room. I don't care about smoking on central. I just think that the

custodians need to cut it out. They're seriously smoking spaces that are meant for freshmen residents to hang out and enjoy the FRESH outdoor air. (To name a few examples...Low Rise Courtyard, picnic table outside of Donlon, RPCC circle drive picnic tables...)

343. 25 feet rule is currently not working. Nobody obeys it, and entrances to buildings are terribly polluted with cigarette smoke. On the other hand, cessation services are never adequate for the hard core addicts. I am not sure what the solution is. I guess, we need to provide some space for people to smoke to discourage secret indoor smoking, but it shouldn't be entrances to buildings, or areas with high concentrations of people like the Arts Quad or Libe Slope.