



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Key Ohio Tobacco Policy Issues: History and Next Steps

Micah L. Berman, JD

**Stephen F. Loeb's Professor in Health Services Management and Policy &
Professor of Law, Ohio State University**

Sept. 18, 2024
AOHC Fall Conference
Columbus, Ohio



Ohio judge rules to uphold cities' rights over tobacco control

by Alex Caperton | Mon, May 20th 2024 at 10:18 AM

Updated Mon, May 20th 2024 at 10:19 AM

WSYX Columbus 



Disclaimer: Views Are My Own



Indoor clean air bill seen beneficial for all

By SUSAN T. HESSEL
Of the Tribune Staff

Both smokers and non-smokers would benefit from a proposed state indoor air bill, a representative of the American Lung Association of Wisconsin said last week.

The bill, which would limit smoking in public places, would allow smokers to enjoy their cigarettes, pipes or cigars "in peace," said Margo Redmond.

"I think that enlightened smokers who think about the bill realize it protects them. It allows them to smoke in peace without infringing on their neighbors," she said. "It doesn't make them out to be good guys, but protects them from being bad guys."

Ms. Redmond, Madison, was in La Crosse representing the American Lung Association, which is supporting the legislation. She is a volunteer for the association and not a paid lobbyist.



Margo Redmond

cancer and other health risks.

She mentioned a 1980 University of California study of 2,100 middle-aged males exposed to concentrated smoke by their work. Those persons showed significant incidences of damage to

gered by exposure to smoke, she said.

The public cares for persons with physical handicaps by requiring ramps to buildings, she said. The invisibly handicapped — those who appear healthy but could suffer from these attacks — also need help.

- Economics and energy.

One state study indicated that air has to be exchanged six times as often in smoking areas than in areas where smoking is not allowed, Ms. Redmond said.

That requires a 20 percent increase in energy use, she said.

- Indoor air laws have worked in Minnesota and the city of Madison, both of which passed them in 1975.

She personally polled the owners of 20 restaurants in Madison, many of whom had opposed the original ordinance. The owners said the legislation had created minor inconveniences, according to Ms. Redmond, but built



TO: George Minschew
FROM: Bill Trisler
RE: Pro-Active Pre-Emptive Meeting in Ohio

A meeting to discuss the possibility and viability of introducing pre-emptive and/or pro-active legislation in the Ohio General Assembly during 1990 was held in Columbus, Ohio on September 11, 1989. Those in attendance were the following:

Scott Fisher, PM
Neil Clark, PM Lobbyist
Harry Lehman, RJR Lobbyist
Doug Trail, RJR Lobbyist
Jack Advent, OATCD
Pete O'Grady, TI Lobbyist
Bill Trisler, TI
Bob Pruett, TI



BANS ON SMOKING RULED ILLEGAL



August 29, 2002 | Columbus Dispatch, The (OH)

Author/Byline: Jon Craig THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH | Page: 01A | Section: NEWS

979 Words



Read News Document



Smoking bans in a dozen Ohio communities -- including Licking, Meigs and Muskingum counties -- were snuffed out yesterday by the Ohio Supreme Court, which said local health boards lack authority to restrict smoking in public places.



Decriminalizing Commercial Tobacco

Addressing Systemic Racism in the Enforcement of Commercial Tobacco Control

This joint statement from a consortium of public health organizations sets forth aspirational principles to help local and state health departments, decisionmakers, advocates, and other stakeholders advance equitable enforcementⁱ practices related to the purchase, possession, sale, and distribution of all tobacco products.ⁱⁱ These principles can also help address tobacco addiction and reduce tobacco-related harms while maintaining and improving the efficacy of enforcement of commercial tobacco laws and policies.





Ohio Senate overrides veto, prohibiting local regulation of tobacco

by WSYX Staff | Wed, January 24th 2024 at 4:09 PM

Updated Wed, January 24th 2024 at 6:29 PM



“By the enactment of this section, it is the intent of the general assembly to preempt political subdivisions from the regulation of tobacco products and alternative nicotine products.”



Ohio Home Rule: Ohio Constitution, Article 18, Sec. 3

“[M]unicipalities shall have authority ... to adopt and enforce within their limits such local police, sanitary and other similar regulations, as are not in conflict with general laws.”





Indoor clean air bill seen beneficial for all

By SUSAN T. HESSEL
Of the Tribune Staff

Both smokers and non-smokers would benefit from a proposed state indoor air bill, a representative of the American Lung Association of Wisconsin said last week.

The bill, which would limit smoking in public places, would allow smokers to enjoy their cigarettes, pipes or cigars "in peace," said Margo Redmond.

"I think that enlightened smokers who think about the bill realize it protects them. It allows them to smoke in peace without infringing on their neighbors," she said. "It doesn't make them out to be good guys, but protects them from being bad guys."

Ms. Redmond, Madison, was in La Crosse representing the American Lung Association, which is supporting the legislation. She is a volunteer for the association and not a paid lobbyist.



Margo Redmond

cancer and other health risks.

She mentioned a 1980 University of California study of 2,100 middle-aged males exposed to concentrated smoke by their work. Those persons showed significant incidences of damage to

gered by exposure to smoke, she said.

The public cares for persons with physical handicaps by requiring ramps to buildings, she said. The invisibly handicapped — those who appear healthy but could suffer from these attacks — also need help.

- Economics and energy.

One state study indicated that air has to be exchanged six times as often in smoking areas than in areas where smoking is not allowed, Ms. Redmond said.

That requires a 20 percent increase in energy use, she said.

- Indoor air laws have worked in Minnesota and the city of Madison, both of which passed them in 1975.

She personally polled the owners of 20 restaurants in Madison, many of whom had opposed the original ordinance. The owners said the legislation had created minor inconveniences, according to Ms. Redmond, but built