

Compilation of All Comments from Park Ordinance Phase 2 Community Engagement

For greater context and background given on each topic, the text of the survey content can be found [here](#). This is a compilation of all responses from the online survey and the virtual community conversations collected in July and August, 2021.

[Project Background](#)

[Project Objectives](#)

[Community Engagement Objectives & Goal](#)

[Phase 1](#)

[Purpose](#)

[Internal Review](#)

[Racial Equity Review with Partners](#)

[Phase 2: Community Engagement](#)

[Background](#)

Park Hours Responses

[Park Hours Option A - What's appealing about this?](#)

[Park Hours Option A - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions](#)

[Park Hours Option B - What's appealing about this?](#)

[Park Hours Option B - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions](#)

[Other ideas for park hours](#)

Smoking and Tobacco Use Responses

[Smoking and Tobacco Use Option A - What's appealing about this?](#)

[Smoking and Tobacco Use Option A - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions](#)

[Smoking and Tobacco Use Option B - What's appealing about this?](#)

[Smoking and Tobacco Use Option B - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions](#)

[Smoking and Tobacco Use Option C - What's appealing about this?](#)

[Smoking and Tobacco Use Option C - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions](#)

[Other ideas for Smoking and Tobacco Use](#)

Fines and Penalties Responses

[Fines and Penalties Option A - What's appealing about this?](#)

[Fines and Penalties Option A - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions](#)

[Fines and Penalties Option B - What's appealing about this?](#)

[Fines and Penalties Option B - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions](#)

[Other ideas for Fines and Penalties](#)

All Other Sections of Ordinance

View a grid of comments on all other sections of the ordinance [here](#). NOTE: the draft language is dated 7/16/21. This draft language was presented for community engagement. **This is not final proposed language.**

Project Background

The Ramsey County park ordinance was adopted in 1992 and last amended in 2007. The purpose is to promote the safety, health, enjoyment and welfare of everyone in their use of parks, and to protect park property and resources.

[View the current ordinance online.](#)

Project Objectives

The current ordinance revision process aims to:

- Respond to long-standing community feedback about park access.
- Minimize or eliminate regulations that may be enforced in a discriminatory way, and increase racial inequity.
- Modernize the ordinance and address contemporary park issues.
- Changes should result in an ordinance that is equitable, consistent and streamlined; promotes greater enjoyment of the parks; increases user safety; and protects park facilities, property and natural resources for everyone to enjoy.

Community Engagement Objectives & Goal

- Use a phased approach with early review and guidance from regulatory and legal entities, as well as key municipal partners and county committees.
- Share basic information about the ordinance, and potential or anticipated changes based on internal and racial equity reviews.
- Understand racial equity impacts of the current ordinance and ensure that final revisions reduce negative impacts.
- Gather community feedback on the ordinance.

The goal of engagement was to **consult** with the public: to obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions. Project organizers committed to keep the public informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.

The overall process of the ordinance revision can be broken down into three distinct components in two phases:

- Phase 1
 - Internal review
 - Equity review
- Phase 2
 - Wider community engagement

Phase 1

Purpose

The purpose of Phase 1 was to evaluate the current ordinance, finding ways that the ordinance could be more equitable, reducing recreational conflict, protecting park property adequately, reflecting modern advances and understanding, and promoting positive park usage. Additionally, the entire ordinance was viewed through the lens of racial equity, uncovering negative racial equity impacts within the ordinance. This was accomplished through an [Internal Review](#)

process, and a [Racial Equity Review](#) process, and results from this phase of engagement were the foundation upon which the topics for Phase 2 were designed.

Internal Review

The purpose of the Internal Review was to evaluate the current ordinance, finding ways that the ordinance could be more equitable, reduce recreational conflict, protect park property adequately, reflect modern advances and understanding, and promote positive park usage, all through a lens of racial equity. To accomplish this, reviews were conducted with the following Ramsey County departments in the Winter of 2020 through Fall of 2021: Parks & Recreation, Sheriff's Department, Ramsey County Attorney's Office, Policy & Planning, Diversity, Inclusion & Organizational Development, Enterprise Risk Management.

Racial Equity Review with Partners

Starting in April 2021, Parks & Recreation staff conducted virtual sessions with the groups listed below to examine the ordinance and uncover ways that the current ordinance could be discriminatory and/or have a negative racial equity impact.

Partners in this phase of public engagement included:

- Members of the Ramsey County Equity Action Circle
- Public Health Law Center
- Public Defenders working in Ramsey County
- Parks & Recreation Parks Commission
- Parks Racial Equity Leadership Team

Several key issues and priorities emerged from these Phase 1 engagements:

- The ordinance should be written in plain language to support accessibility, comprehension and compliance.
- Current park hours are too restrictive and should be expanded to provide greater access.
- Currently, every ordinance infraction can be cited as a misdemeanor, which is a criminal penalty carrying a maximum of a \$1,000 fine and 90 days in jail. This can disproportionately impact communities of color and people in poverty, and efforts should be made to decriminalize ordinance violations.
- Foraging for fruits, nuts and mushrooms is important to some communities and cultures, and should be balanced with protecting natural resources.
- Smoking is detrimental to health and limiting its use in the parks should be considered. This should not include smoking for cultural and ceremonial purposes.
- The loitering section of the ordinance can be used in discriminatory ways and should be removed.
- Elements of the ordinance that are redundant with state statute should be removed.

Results from this phase of engagement were the foundation upon which the topics for Phase 2 were designed.

Phase 2: Community Engagement

Background

Phase 2 opened up the entire ordinance to feedback from the residents. Three primary topics that needed detailed public input were derived from the Internal Review and Equity Review in Phase 1.

Overall, Phase 2 community engagement saw a robust response. The community participated in the following ways:

- Two virtual community conversations
 - August 11th, noon, 40 participants

- August 17th, 7:00 p.m., 5 participants
- Online survey
 - Open July 17th through August 20th.
 - 1,495 participants. 8,673 comments.
 - Survey and community conversations communicated through county website, multiple newsletters, signage throughout park system, organic and paid social media ads to Ramsey County residents, partnership with cities, Spokesman Recorder, and outreach to stakeholder groups.
 - Three main topics derived from equity review: park hours, smoking and tobacco use, fines and penalties for violations.
 - Every part of the ordinance is open for feedback, with side-by-side comparisons of current language and revised language.

Park Hours Option A - What's appealing about this?

Option A: Setting year-round park hours from 5:00 am until 11:00 pm

What's appealing about this?

"half an hour before sunrise"/"half an hour after sunset" is a time nobody knows off the top of their head. Having set hours is much easier for the public to adhere to.

(legally) allows more opportunities for recreation during darker winter months. Falls in line with larger park schedules.

1. It is a set time so easier to remember. 2. It matches city of New Brighton park hours. 3. As I tell my kids, nothing good happens after 9 pm. We need to have a closing time for parks to respect neighbors' quiet hours for sleeping.

10 pm when noise ordinances start is better.

11 pm is too late

11 pm is too late for productive/prosocial park use. Without bathrooms open, people in parks use the park/grounds as a bathroom. Sheriff patrols need to monitor the parks.

11pm is still too late especially for those that live near a park. Fireworks and car racing are just some of the problems.

11PM seems too late and potentially a problem with gatherings that late. Current schedule works

5 a.m. early hours may be ok but 11 p.m. is too late, encourages parties

5 a.m. is a great start time, people are up and working out!

5 a.m. would allow early morning access for runners and walkers.

5 am is fine, but close at sundown.

5 am is great. Not too many trouble makers out at 5am.

5 am opening

5 Am to 10 pm non smoking and kids friendly

5:00 am- good for early morning fishing/ exercise.

5am is fine but 11pm is way to late. Many people live near these parks and have to work the next day. Noise and people assembling after 10pm is unnecessary. We live near a private park that has a 10pm curfew. It is not enforced by Ramsey County. I have also lived in Ramsey county for 40 years. Most of the activity after 10pm at the private park led to massive clean up by the neighbors in the morning(not by the users. It also OFTEN led to issues of drug sales under the cover of darkness. The people that used the park after hours could not see at night well enough to clean up and left litter all over the place, and noise was also an issue.

5am is fine to open

5am is fine, 11pm is to late, 10pm is plenty late

5am is good for those looking to recreate or workout early in the morning. With increasing summer temperatures this is even more important. 11pm gives those who work non-traditional work hours more time after work to recreate, in addition to it being cooler during the summer.

5am seems early - better hours would be 6am to 10pm

5am-11pm gives people working third shift extra time to use parks one hour before work and two hours after getting done with work to enjoy time in a park.

6am-9pm would be more appealing. Sunset is too early in the winter for park closing time.

A closed park leaves less chances for criminal activity and for teens to hang out and cause trouble. Plus, close-by homes will have less worry with the park closed.

A more reasonable option to allow evening winter activity and early morning commuters. Allows neighbors nearby the peace and security of enforcement of regulations to ensure park remains welcoming place for family activity.

A schedule. Early mornings to night time is appealing because it's worked before. Reasonable time slot considering the park would only be closed for 6 hours.

A set time is easier to enforce/understand.

A step in the right direction. I would support open 24/7. Allows getting most out of the public asset. Everyone doesn't work standard hours. Night skies offer much to be enjoyed in parks. I hope this also allows use of canoes on waters to latest hours. Lakeshore property owners seem to have 24/7 access.

A wide range of park use is good

Ability to access parks when it is convenient

Ability to have programming early or late...Movies in the park. Candlelight hikes

Ability to realistically use during winter

Ability to recreate throughout the winter during non-daylight hours lawfully. Promoting greater use of the park by those who are not able to recreate during daylight hours.

Ability to ride during the dark of the winter.

Ability to ski in the early morning for people who are working and also ski at night after work.

Ability to use park longer when the days are shorter in winter.

Ability to use the park for stargazing, observing lightning bugs, or owling

Ability to walk or ski after work in the winter.

Able to use parks before and after work, etc.

Able to use parks for walks/hikes in evening in the winter when 1/2 hour after sunset occurs very early in the evening.

Access after dusk and before dawn in the winter months.

Accessibility.

Accessible

Accessible for bicycle commuters during short days of winter.

Accommodates more schedules

Accommodates most temporary use, and consistent without having to think about sunrise or sunset precise times.

Accounts for large variance of daylight hours throughout the year. Dawn to dusk based hours might be easier: open an hour before/after.

Accounts for winter

Adds an element of safety for everyone using the park.

Affords use during winter.

Allowing for hours of non-use; ability to collect fines for violations.

allows access for many

Allows access in winter.

Allows before work access and access after I put the kids to bed.

Allows early morning joggers, walkers, bikers access for a safe morning routine away from busy roads.

Allows early morning walks in the winter months.

Allows early users access

Allows evening and early morning use in winter

allows for bike commuting/walking commutes. Sunrise/sunset hours are difficult to keep track of as a guest but also as a worker/enforcement officer. Winter is long y'all, closing an outdoor option for recreation based on daylight hours in a region where everyone enjoys outdoor activities safely makes no sense.

Allows for early morning walkers etc to access park.

Allows for greater flexibility for people with non-standard working hours.

Allows for more hours of healthy activity.

Allows for park use in darker winter months

Allows for people to have more access to the parks that may otherwise be unable to due to work hours, etc.

Allows for people who work non traditional schedules to also use the parks.

Allows for people who work varying hours

allows for use of ski/hiking trails in the evenings in the winter. Even without lights, this may be appealing to some. Full moon hiking is always fun.

Allows for winter recreation in the parks when the sun sets early. Also, great for individuals that may be in the parks in the early hours exercising or walking a dog before work.

Allows for winter use

allows me to walk my dog or go for a run whenever I need to, year round

Allows more park use in winter when daylight is much shorter.

Allows more time for recreation.

Allows park users more and structured time to use the park daily. Seems to line up with city and regional parks and other outlined time periods.

Allows people more access than previously.

Allows people that work to access parks for recreation

Allows people to access parks depending on their schedules.

Allows people to exercise before or after work, even in winter.

Allows runners and people with non-standard work hours to exercise.

Allows teens to be in the park until their curfew starts at 11:00 PM

Allows use after dark through the fall/winter when sunset is so early.

Ample opportunity for everyone to use the park. I would like have all parks close at 10pm for safety.

Ample, set year-round access that accomodates a spectrum of activities, interests, and individuals/groups.

As a resident living in the area near a park, it is comforting to know that things creating noise and disturbances are intended to be "closed" at times when we're relaxing and resting at home.

As long as park patrol during open hours.

As stated those of us who work long days. this still gives us a chance to use our local parks for walks and bike trails.

Available time even after it gets dark early in the fall/winter.

Bad idea.

Bad things happen in parks after 11pm.

Based on your information, it seems like this is already happening so you might as well put it in writing. I believe people should not be loitering in the parks after night fall.

being able to enjoy sunrise & sunset

Being able to enjoy the outdoors all year round with no restrictions on activity times, staying consistent year round.

Being able to gather even after dark and being able to gather longer in the winter.

Being able to still use parks in fall when it's dark

Being able to use the park year round, particularly in the winter.

Being able to use the parks early in the morning

Being able to use the parks more easily before and after work.

Being able to visit park during the winter to ski! We often have to go later on in the day because of our schedules so having the park open later would help a lot.

Being able to watch sunrise/sunset

best idea

Best method to keep cars vehicles from staying for days or weeks

Best option. Safest

Better access for working people who want to run/walk in parks early morning or in the evening, outside of work hours.

Better aligns with winter uses before daylight for commuters.

Better for recreation before work or commuting to work.

Better in the summer when sunrise is early and sunset late.

Better than 24 hours

Better winter access

Bike commuting

black and white times - easier to remember

Broadens park usage

Can do more night activities or go to the park during the winter, when there's limited daylight.

Clear

Clear and defined hours; in spring and fall allows for early morning runs

Clear availability. And more evening opportunities!

Clear hours year round.

Clear set times instead of knowing how long ago the sun set, etc.

Clear time frames. People seem to not understand when sunrise and sunset occur. Also, in winter we lose so many daylight hours which shortens park hours.

Clear times

Clear, consistent. Allows for evening winter sledding at some parks that would technically be closed otherwise.

Clear. Does not change with seasons

Comparable to City and Regional parks, which seems to be working.

Consistency

Consistent

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency

Consistency - - and people can go by clocks without worrying about sunrise/sunset times.

Consistency - don't have to keep track of sun rise and sunset times.

Consistency - I think this is a good idea. Anglers already use the park after dark. Having a fixed 11 PM close allows this while still putting limits on all night access.

Consistency and allowing for more usable hours in the winter when a lot of people working 8-5

Consistency and being able go off a clock rather than look up sunset or sunset time or gauging it.

Consistency and commuting

Consistency and extended hours

Consistency and objectiveness are ideal instead of questioning when sunrise and sunset it.

consistency and realistic

Consistency for all parks, regional or not, to follow the same park hours.

Consistency helps people know what to expect

Consistency is good.

Consistency is key across seasons, it doesn't make sense to change hours when people should be encouraged to get outside and enjoy the public resource we all pay for.

Consistency with city park hours

Consistency, easy to remember and enforce, longer hours for park use.

Consistency, no need to figure out exact time of sunset/sunrise

Consistency, provides additional use hours from current, but still limits overnight use.

Consistency, with set times

Consistency. Allows people freedom to decide for themselves how safe they feel in various lighting situations.

Consistency. Also hopefully less night time noise for people who live near a park

Consistency. Prevents people from camping in the park

Consistency. We always know when the parks are open.

Consistent

Consistent

consistent

Consistent access for all, no guessing about hours.

Consistent all year. Matches up with other city's parks.

Consistent and doesn't limit use in wintee

Consistent and easy to understand.

Consistent and known ("sunset" and "sunrise" are arguable) Possible to go out and see stars over a lake without getting harassed by police

Consistent and not subject to interpretation of when sunrise or sunset is.

Consistent hours all year. Greater access to parks/facilities.

Consistent hours allow for less guesswork when planning ahead.

Consistent hours are a positive

consistent hours more easily enforceable

Consistent hours throughout the year, hours are clearly defined

Consistent hours would be easier communicate abd more fair to enforce.

Consistent hours. Allows use longer in winter.

Consistent so you are not suggesting the hours based on season.

Consistent time

consistent with city parks

Consistent with hours of other parks in the area, expands time for people to enjoy the parks

Consistent year round

Consistent year- long hours; potential for less crime during late-night hours

Consistent-everybody knows the hours because they won't change

Consistent, clear expectations at all parks.

Consistent, easier for people to know when parks are open.

consistent, matches other local communities

Consistent.

Constancy

Could go to a park after 4:30pm in the winter

Could use for evening outings winter and summer. Best of the two options.

covers all seasons

Covers most issues with bike commuters on trails or passing through parks in the early morning. A 10pm closure at night is probably a more reasonable balance between allowing access and night safety.

current hours are too short in the winter. I ski at night but that doesn't fit the current hours

Current park hours are fine with me. Extending the day seems reasonable

daylight hours are best. Unless there is a special event (star gazing for example), no reason to have park open late at night.

Decent hours with a quiet time

do not care for this. Families use the parks at reasonable hours and the only use at the earlier and later times are for loitering

does not seem appropriate for recreational use

Don't have to guess sunset. Early in winter

Don't have to guess when sunrise and sunset are.

earlier allows for early morning workouts and use for commuting

Earlier hours are good; later hours are NOT!! It should remain 10pm at the latest.

Earlier morning hours are understandable for bikers, runners, walkers.

Early AM access, year round.

Early and late users can use the park

Early hours

Early hours good for those who want to exercise in fresh air before work. 9:30 or 10 pm close in summer except by special permit for later hours. Would county parks be subject to ordinances of cities they are located in?

early hours not a problem 10PM would be a good ending time so there aren't conflict with noise issues

Early I think in ok. Late evenings I think you are opening yourselves up to things that can go wrong. Trouble usually happens when night falls.

Early morning exercising for those who would like it.

Early morning hours ? 5 am is yoo early. 11pm is too late. Park goers can make enough noise without violation of noise laws but still disturb close neighbors. 11pm to 5am is only 6 hours of sleep- not enough.

Early morning opening @ 5 is fine. 11 pm closing is too late.

Early morning runs in the park would be available now.

Early morning swims in lakes

early morning times for walkers.

early morning walks are appealing, but nothing good happens after 10pm in a park.

Early walkers and joggers

Easier to keep track of when the park will be open, if a consistent schedule is set

Easier to remember

Easier to remember than hours based on the sun

Easier to remember, all the same timeframe

Easier to remember, allows more winter recreation (even headlamp hiking).

Easier to remember, and work into routines.

Easy

Easy for all to remember

Easy to enforce. Works well with potential city curfews for minors.

Easy to get in a morning run all year round, and go on a moonlit walk.

Easy to remember

Easy to remember and assess; time of sunrise and sunset may not be understood by, or accessible to everyone.

Easy to remember the hours, less ambiguity. The hours do appear generous. I can't imagine that anyone would have a good reason to be in a park after or before these hours.

Easy to remember with no seasonal changes.

eliminates overnight use

Encourage people to come to the park. Standard daylight. Clear rules. Early morning summer runs. No nighttime problem folks.

Enough time, late park access could ena problem

Establishes good expectations

Even in winter the park has good accessibility.

Evening hours in the winter

Evening use when daylight is short. I commute on bike with light and feel safer on park paved trails then street

Expanded access for all

Expanded access for county residents with minimal to no cost increases for the county.

Expanded access outside of hours determined by season

Expanded evening hours

expanded hours make park more accessible to more people

expanded hours seems reasonable

Expanded hours so as not to be concerned about how long I'm in the park or knowing exactly when sunset is.

Expanded use during long summer daylight periods sounds nice. 11pm for an evening campfire might be nice.

Expands park hours to times when people are most likely to use the parks responsibly

Extended hours with limit on overnight use

Extended hours/use and consistency with other community resources.

Extended park hours offer people a chance to use their parks for longer times, especially during darker winter months where it can be difficult or impossible to be outside during daylight hours due to long work days.

Extended time allows for more use during shorter daylight seasons

Extending to be consistent with park ymwho run 5a - 11p seems reasonable if you have adequate security patrol. People can bike/walk to work who leave early

Extends the park hours without increasing problems for the park, police and surrounding neighbors.

Extends times from current option

Extra hours to hang out with others outside, especially during COVID and other periods when it's not safe to gather inside with a group of people.

Fixed hours are better than 24x7.

Flexibility

Flexibility for people who need to walk dogs or exercise prior to going to work

Flexibility for people who want to use the parks, who can regularly use parks earlier or later in the day.

Flexible for people working different hours in the day

Folks understand time and may not know about sunrise and sunset. There's still a time limit so our parks cant be used as camp ground for homeless people.

For me nothing really as I would use the parks only during the peak hours of the day say 9 am - 5 pm

For me, there is no value to having my parks open this late.

Forces people to shift schedule to use the park and provides better timeframe for families with children.

Gives a broader range for people who would like to commute through the parks earlier/later. More people are working outside of 9-5 hours.

Gives people more hours to use the park which is a good thing.

Gives people more time to use the park in all seasons.

Gives people the chance to run early or late. Gives a few hours unlit (I'm assuming) which is prob better for animals who are there.

Good for consistency and people won't have to wonder which hours apply

Good for early risers and particularly for those who wish to observe and listen to the dawn chorus of birds : 11pm closing is good to clear our folks at end of day who might cause issues

Good for people that don't work a traditional schedule.

Good for people who don't work 9-5 and want to use the parks. Also nice for the summer when we have more daylight.

Good for people who work unusual schedules or wish to avoid crowds

Good for winter when days are shorter.

Good hours

Good idea because it encourages more access to the parks.

Good idea until the question of enforcement is asked.

good in the summer, not so much in winter

Good to have a time limit. Gives the natural habitants some human-free time.

Good to have parks closed during overnight.

Great

Great hours for use, anything more is not necessary, it's dark outside. People can go home.

Greater access

Greater park access

Group picnic areas will be extended to 11pm. Soccer and baseball fields can play until 11pm

Hard and steady are easy to understand and enforce.

Having a restriction in place theoretically would deter activity outside of those hours. I live near the park and would love to feel like it is not a free for all that could lead to destruction of the park and disturbances in the neighborhood.

Helpful for people who use the trails early in the morning or later in the evening.

Helps people who work non traditional hours

Honestly- I'm not an early riser- but if someone wants to jog, walk, snow showers, ski in morning before work- the early hours are nice- as for evening- it allows for more time fir night hikes with groups especially in fall, summer picnics and swimming on hot summer nights and to take a later walk/hike

Honestly, not so appealing. No problem with 5 AM, but 11 PM is later than really required, as that is well past dark.

Hours are more standardized and discreet

hours are open later, appealing for late night runs to avoid higher summer temps or scheduling issues with work/family hours

Hours match most city & regional park hours, so less confusion

I agree with year round hours. This does not criminalize park users who may only be able to enjoy our parks before and after work. Daylight should have no bearing on this.

I am a night person. I enjoy being out after dark.

I am ok with earlier hours but against late hours. So the early opening is appealing. I live near Bate Creek Park, but my comments are generally applicable.

I am strongly in favor of limiting the hours

I appreciate any form of expanded hours for parks. As somebody who often works long hours at work, in the winter there are days when I wouldn't have very much access to a park in the morning or evening. These hours would help to alleviate that.

i can get my camera set up to catch the sunrise

I can walk in the park in the evening

I do not need to think about what time the sun sets and when the half hour would occur.

I feel it's the best for everyone

I feel keeping parks open later is public safety hazard and concern. Since the pandemic and with the rise in crime, data shows there are too many unsupervised young adults who are out after dark and may be armed. Given that the park has inadequate lighting or ongoing patrols, I would vote against a later closing time.

I feel this provides plenty of time to enjoy this park. I think 5 am until 10 pm is plenty of time and would not encourage mischief or crime potential.

I have never understood park hours. They discriminate against people who work the night shift. If some night visitors are causing issues, the appropriate thing to do is to regulate/enforce the specific issue that these visitors are causing, not punish everyone for the actions of a few. Thank you for considering making them accessible 24/7. I recognize this is unusual for parks and hope that Ramsey County is willing to take this step to be one of the first in the nation to offer more freedom of movement and recreation.

I like early morning walks.

I like it that folks cannot use the park as their living space.

I like that it more closely matches city park hours, allows for more winter recreation, but does have a closed period.

I like that the time the park is open is not dependent on sunlight.

I like that there is a set time.

I like that this extends hours three more seasons of the year.

I like the concrete time so there's no guesswork but think 11 is too late

I like the idea of longer hours, but sense good reasons not tho have them open 24/7

I like the increased flexibility of this option for people who want to use the park for its intended purpose

I like the longer hours

I like the year-round option and think county parks should have some hours during the night when they are closed to prevent crime.

I like this because it provides more access for more people

I like to ride bikes after dark when the air quality is better.

I like to walk the dogs after I get off work esp in winter when it's already dark

I like walking around sunset and this would allow me to not feel rushed around sunset to get to the car. I also like walking during the winter after work and it is never possible when the hours are tied to shorter winter sun hours. We have a memorial bench some people have wanted to visit but it wasn't possible due to the park hours after a dinner. I enjoy the temperatures when the sun is down for walking.

I like walking in the evenings and I will be able to do this in the winter. I love moon light walks and star gazing activities. Also, this is better for bird watching.

I live close to the park and if the hours were extended, I assume recreational traffic in the mornings would increase which would be nice and feel safer.

I prefer the sunrise to sunset within a half hour. I believe crime will be difficult to control after dark.

I say no! Current time slot is ok by me. Not many good things happen after dark, especially after 9pm.

I see the value of early AM hours a lot more than extending night hrs especially if parks are generally unlit. Early AM people are rarely making mischief but can't say the same for people who may want to linger from evening activities

I suppose the early hours would be good for bird watchers and runners and the late hours for teenagers and partiers.

It would enable parks to be used longer.

I think city parks should be open anytime as long as the people follow the other rules (noise ordinance, curfews etc). So extended hours are great.

I think it's nice to have some sort of ordinance and lock appropriate buildings- for safety.

I think that's fair. Not everyone has a daytime work schedule and should be allowed to enjoy parks even when it's dark out.

I think the hours should be 7:00 am to 8:00 pm

I think the time should stay the same. 11pm is too late to be in a park.

I think these are good park hours

I think these hours are fair

I think this communicates the time clearly. The sunrise sunset stuff is highly variable and makes the park unusable for many in the winter.

I use the dog park at night in the winter

I walk early so I like 5 am

I will actually know the park hours. Otherwise no chance

I would be for opening at 5 am but they need to close at 10am. Parks are in neighborhoods

I would bring a degree of consistency to Ramsey County facilities with others in the region. We'd finally be able to use the parks in the winter without being ticketed.

I would feel unsafe using a park in the dark. I expect it would also lead to more criminal activity.

I would not like this, please leave at 10pm.

I wouldn't have to figure out what time sunrise or sunset is.

I'm an avid runner. To fit in some of my daily runs, I sometimes need to run very early or very late in the day.

I'm a bike commuter and access during longer hours is important.

I'm always thinking of teens. They always need somewhere to go. My 19 year old and her boyfriend use cemeteries after work to walk around and unwind. Later Park hours would permit people who work odd hours to use it.

Ice fishing in winter

If a change is needed, this could be acceptable. I don't see a need for a change. I hope the lives of the people living near the park is considered. Most of us work daytime hours and need sleep at night in a quiet surroundings.

If bad guys are doing something in the cover of night, the police have an ordinance to give them an initial reason to investigate if something looks or sounds bad.

If this serves people who want to be outdoors, exercise or groups relaxing in the evening, it's appealing but if it requires more policing or toilets/trash clean up and removal, it's not appealing.

If you're going to have hours, these make much more sense to me than going by sunrise and sunset. They're consistent and accommodate a wider range of folks.

In the winter, these hours are ridiculous. It is dark until 6 or 7am and then again around 5 to 6pm ...so what nocturnal humans or nocturnal activities take place until 11pm that is needed.

Increased access during winter and shoulder seasons. Reduced confusion since opening/closing times would remain consistent.

Increased access For diverse population. It's a good compromise.

Increased accessibility and clearly defined hours. Currently parks are not accessible in the winter to anyone who works business hours due to early sunset effectively eliminating evening use. Additionally, current closing time is ambiguous as there are several different definitions of sunset making differential and discriminatory enforcement more likely.

is clear and matches other available parks

Issues regarding cars that sit in the lot and meet there to race up and down the city streets like the McKnight and Upper Afton Rd

It allows adequate time for park and trail usage

It allows early risers to use the park (ex. as a runner having access to the park early in the morning - despite odd sunset/sunrise hours is a way of approaching equity for all users.)

It allows for early morning and late night access for both winter and summer

It allows for evening campfires (in the appropriate areas). It allows people who are already using the park later than sunset to do so without penalty.

It allows for more usage by a bigger variety of people who work and recreate at times different from the standard 9-5.

It allows for setup and usage of a park before an event. It also allows those who work non standard hours time to use the park that is convenient for them.

It allows more use in the winter.

It allows the use of the park and trails to more citizens based on differing schedules and accounts for winter's reduced daylight.

it covers morning and evening hours

It doesn't appeal to me.

It doesn't change. 5am is 5am. I'm not sure if 1/2 hour after sunset is now or in 10 minutes. Its just nicer to say that this is the time and that's that.

It establishes certainty on what hours the park is open.

It gives a lot of hours for the parks usage & for people with different work schedules. You know open and close specifically

It gives people who work during the day time to get out when it may not be daylight

It helps avoid criminal and reckless activities and keeps more people safe.

It is clear and consistent. People will modify it depending on sunlight or lack thereof.

It is closer to my preference, which is 5 am to 10 p.m.

It is consistent - no guessing. It allows for more early evening use during late fall/winter months. This is often the only time to hit a trail for those with daytime working hours.

It is exact and easy/clear to understand.

It is less egregious than the other option, but it far less desirable than the current policy. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to prevent after-dark usage for the consumption of alcohol and other drugs.

It is not appealing.

It is not. I agree with the sheriff. No reason to be there after dark

It is standard throughout the year

It is the same throughout the year. It makes the parks open for most of the day.

It is very "set it and forget it".

It is very clear when open times are for the park

It keeps the parks open when it gets dark early.

it lists a specific time parks could be accessed.

It makes sense.

It maximizes the amount of hours one can spend at the park, while still closing during a time of higher potential criminal activity that could occur in darkness and with fewer people around observing activity.

It offers more freedom and will allow residents more usage. I think 24 hours is too much. No one needs to loiter at a park at 3AM.

It preserves quiet times for the neighborhoods parks are located in. It keeps parks from becoming de facto homeless shelters.

It provide clear and consistent guidance for users.

It reduces crime in the park, especially if there is not much lighting. It also keeps people from tenting and sleeping overnight in the park.

It removes the question as to when the sun fully sets or rises. clarity is better.

It sets boundaries. I prefer the time be until 10 pm though. I would like sheriff patrols to be ongoing during the timeframe the park is open.

It will cover the times when most people use the parks with a fair amount of the time surveilled by the Sheriff

It will give people that like to walk, bike, or run and have work schedules that don't allow them to do it at the park with current park hours.

It would allow for ice fishing later/earlier in the winter

It would allow more time for early morning/late evening activities while more closely aligning with the hours of parks in surrounding communities.

It would be easy to know when parks are and are not open.

It would be good for bike commuters and early morning exercisers.

It would be more consistent.

It would be nice to be able to access parks in the winter hours when the only daylight hours are typically the 9-5 work hours.

It would be nice to have the parks open earlier in the winter

It would help keep noise levels down for people in homes surrounding the park areas and make it easier to remember when the park closes.

It'd make it easier to use the parks in winter when there is limited daylight

It's a nice, set schedule. No need to look up sunrise or sunset times.

It's a set time. I love walking at night as well, especially in the winter.

It's appealing that some winter activities could take place in the evening hours. I agree that lighting is an issue, but many skiers and snow-shoers use headlamps that would make evening trail use possible. I still think that 10pm is probably late enough.

It's better than unlimited 24/7 hours

It's better, especially for regional trails, where as mentioned, commuting by bike might be technically prohibited during much of the winter for most people. I myself definitely end up technically breaking this rule as I sometimes work late and am commuting home or to work well after dark.

It's consistent and easy to follow/remember.

It's consistent and reasonable.

It's consistent, always the same time, I don't need to know sunset, and winter, of course I would want to walk after 5pm in the park

It's consistent.

It's is straightforward, no calculations required but keeps overnight activities out

It's less confusing than the current system and at least would reduce accidental violation of rules. This system would make people aware that police protection is not available after hours.

It's more accessible to individuals who work varying hours.

It's nice to be outside after dark sometimes, especially in the months where the sun sets earlier

It's nice to have a set time so that you don't need to know what time sunrise and sunset are.

It's standard, it's straightforward, and reasonable

It's the same all year and you don't have to look it up every time you need to know.

It's universal. I never know when sunset or sunrise are.

It's a horrifying thought

It's a set time but lack of lighting sets citizens up for danger

It's appealing because it's not 24/7.

It's by the clock and not a guess.

It's clear and consistent, regardless of weather or season.

It's clear when the hours are as opposed to guessing the sunset time. This gives clear guidance to let abiding citizens. This allows law enforcement to have contact with individuals who are up to no good in the parks.

It's consistent

It's consistent

It's good because often I cross country ski at Battle Creek and the light turn off at 9. Elm creek and hyland close at 10. I would support that extra hour or two now that the plan is to make snow.

It's more consistent and will allow evening use in the Fall and Winter.

It's more in line with city and state park hours

It's not dependent on the sunrise/sunset schedule. It's easier to remember and anticipate the hours.

It's not! 11 pm is way too late to keep park open! 5 am is a good morning opening

It's often cooler in mornings and in evening for things such as trail walks.

Keeps flow of people in and out of the park to specific times. Too much crime and other things happen in the middle of the night.

Keeps it standard without constantly changing

Keeps people from sleeping in parks

Keeps people out of the park when it is more likely they will engage in questionable activities (it's better than being open 24/7)

Knowing there is a set open and close time helps with scheduling visits and basing it off of changing daylight hours.

known hours of opening/closure for all parks, extended to match summer daylight hours

Large span of time. Generous.

Later is better. Cross country skiing at Battle Creek is only open until 9 pm. Elm creek and hyland are open until 10

Legalizes bike/walk commuting in the early morning/evening.

Less ambiguous

Less confusion than current sun-based hours that are always changing; gets rid of the issue of "here I am but I don't know when sunset is so I'm not sure if I can go in." Also if this is more consistent with other area parks, that's helpful - I can never remember which park is part of which system, so having them match would be lovely.

Less need for law enforcement at all hours of the night. My family lives near long lake and we already hear fireworks going off at random times throughout the night at the lake.

Less opportunity for the sheriff's department to interact negatively with the community. Their not-so-friendly reminders that the park is closing in an hour, just escalate situations.

Let's people shore fishing fish into the prime time

Limited access

Limiting disturbances for nearby homes.

Limits the number of night time hours and therefore less crime

Limits transient activity and allows the Police reason to keep people moving along.

Longer access--could walk in cooler time of day in summer

Longer access. Ability to use bike trails to commute.

longer hours

Longer hours allows more people to use the parks

Longer hours are always better

Longer hours for use.

Longer hours means I would probably use them more.

Longer time to enjoy the park

Longer use in winter.

Makes parks more accessible

Makes sense

Makes sense - people can use after dark, especially in the winter

Makes sense.

Makes the hours of use consistently understood and enforceable year round and regardless of cloud cover causing misunderstandings.

Makes the parks more usable for everyone. Right now, winter solstice hours are about 7:15 am - 5 pm. Parks are not available for people working traditional hours. Jogger and dog walkers would have legal access vs the illegal access that occurs now.

Manages noise and traffic in parks near residential areas

Many people use the parks for commuting or exercise the same hours year round. They usually bring their own lighting knowing that it will be dark.

many people want to walk and it is hard in the winter since we have so much darkness. This would still allow exercise in winter months.

Matches city park hours. And allows for home owners near by to easily identify a time when activity shouldn't be happening. This helps to remove bias in calls. Just the ability to say "it's 11:30 - people shouldn't be there." Versus "there is a black person that looks suspicious. Please come." Commuting typically does not happen outside of 11 pm - 5 pm. And the reality is, these park hours are minimally enforced, and they are often not ticketed if they are stopped. Just a warning. So at this point, I would just pick something very definable.

Midnight should be cutoff, if any

More "allowed" hours means more use of the park by the public without fear of -useless- punishment for using a public space.

More access and flexibility to use park

More access for individuals working AM and PM work shifts

More access for some who have a limited time schedule or who work at times that require greater flexibility

More accessibility during the winter months, more straightforward as one doesn't always know when sunrise and sunset are.

More accessibility to the public.

More accessible for those working all different shifts and using for exercise

More available time for public use, esp considering the short winter daytime hours.

More consistency than sunrise/sunset

More consistency year round, more recreation and biking on winter evenings

More consistency, especially in winter.

More consistent, better for winter

More consistent, don't have to worry about sunset time

More enjoyment and more accessibility.

More evening hours

More flexibility to get out to the parks! Some of us work odd hours or try to come at non busy times.

More hours during winter

More hours for normal recreational activities. Normal hours for ever other park.

More hours to access

More hours to enjoy park

More open hours allows more people to enjoy the park with unusual work schedules.

more opportunities for use year round

More opportunity to use the park facilities in the spring, fall and winter due to the decline of daylight

More park operating hours allows for more outdoor activity for the community. It's also nice to have consistency because sunrise/sunset are always changing.

More park tome

More park usage. Possibly less crime (per sheriff's office).

More practical than daylight hours

More public access for fitness and fishing

More recreation time in the winter

More time for morning or evening walks

More time for recreation on weekdays for full-time workers and commuters.

More time for use.

More time to access the parks. Set schedule based on time, rather than the sun, makes it easier to understand.

more time to play in the park

More time to spend in the park as some people's schedules will limit park time

More time to use the parks.

More time to visit, especially for families who don't work traditional hours.

More time while staying safe

More times. Allows for recreation

Morning access

Morning allows use before going to work, but 11 p.m. is late and can allow groups to become too loud and too intimidating just in numbers of people in each group. As an aging person, I start to feel vulnerable to larger crowds so would tend to stay away from parks. I would no longer feel that the park(s) are also managed with me in mind as an older person who likes to walk.

Morning and evening availability, especially during shorter winter daylight hours.

Morning hours allow for people who want to exercise before work.

Morning time makes sense for before work exercise

most legitimate park users will be there between these hours.

My husband and I could jog through the park after 9pm in August.

My husband and I enjoy walking on a snowy evening in the dog park, I can be light enough after current park hours to see, we can wear headlamps if it gets too dark in the wooded areas

n/a

Na

Need hours to enforce- not burden police more

Neighbors who live near by have hours of quiet time.

No ambiguity and allows for winter access.

No confusion over sunset time.

No guessing

No more wondering when 30 minutes after sunset is for closing times. Love it.

No one needs to be in the park after dark.

No one should be in the park in the middle of the night or when it's dark. I love a stone throw away and there are issues

No one will be arrested for taking an early morning walk across the park to visit other family members and friends for coffee. No one will be arrested for partying after most children (and adults that need to wake up early) have "tried" to go to sleep

No overnight hangout

no overnight use

No rush to leave the park at dusk. But quiet hours should start at 11pm

No way. Party and drinking. Super bad idea!!!!

No wondering about when it's open

No. Too much questionable activity happens with extended hours projected or a open hour schedule. We have seen increased drug, spray paint, vandalism fireworks activity, street roding on park roads and parking lots with open entry in Long Lake late evening/ early morning. Most of the time these activities are called in, exhausting further our safety department for major emergencies.

Noise and crime will increase.

Noise will be reduced if hours are set.

Not a good idea. Bad element of folks come to our park after dark.

Not affected by shifting daylight hours. Predictable and easy for the public to follow.

Not appealing

Not appealing at all. I believe extending the hours does not provide extra safety to users or residents. That is an absurd argument. I have a ring security system and the amount of people roaming around, checking car doors, removing cameras, stealing property, and damaging homes is alarming. It is ridiculous to think that extending park hours would minimize this activity, as many of these people use the park system to maneuver through neighborhoods. I highly doubt that the city is going to improve/increase budget/maintain more lighting in these areas.

Not appealing because too many hours in early morning and late evening will cause more crime to occur. Mainly because of very poor lighting. More chance for crime. Less safety for residents in surrounding community

Not appealing should be light or near light out

Not appealing.

Not appealing. What would people be doing in a park during dark hours?

Not much

Not much

Not much is appealing about this in my neighborhood- Langton Lake. I already do not feel safe in park at night due to homeless people living and fighting loudly in the park woods so avoid waking after dark. Increased access to people living there and proving they have a right to be there late doesn't feel safer.

Not much.

Not wondering why there are people in the park all hours of the night. Nothing good happens after midnight.

nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing - No reason for changing the hours

Nothing - Stupidest thing I have heard of! How are you going to provide safety and security to those using the park after dark! More problems occur the later it gets and most people should be home in bed getting sleep. More vandalism occurs in the dark of night. Who's stupid idea was this? All you are going to do is to provide more space to do drug deals and to create noise for neighbors to the parks.

Nothing /

Nothing as it just make those of us that live near the parks have to put up with loud music past most of our bedtimes and before we get up!

nothing daylight hours are less in winter. stay with the sunrise and sunset times

Nothing good happens after 11pm

Nothing good happens after dark No

Nothing is appealing about this

Nothing is appealing about this.

Nothing noth

Nothing unless it will be patrolled till close and law enforcement will actual do something besides driving through.

Nothing-safety will be a concern during the dark hours.

Nothing, and I don't recommend it. In my opinion, the current hours are best.

Nothing, I live by McCarron's Beach, many problems seem to happen at the park after dark.

Nothing, prefer current rules

Nothing; I don't believe anyone needs to be in the park as early as 5am or as late as 11pm.

Nothing! What is the benefit of such hours? Ramsey county park users and city residents are intimately located (as neighbors) not miles or hundreds of feet apart .

NOTHING!!! NOT appealing!!! especially when you've publicly shared that Sheriff only patrols till 10.Ten should be MAX. AFTER DARK by free reservation only like you have to do for a pavilion but they need to specify where or it needs to be designated. Otherwise ppl will start bon fires here there & everywhere. Ppl need to show photo ID. Then they're more likely to be accountable. Anything less after dark An invitation for more crime. "Safety of ALL CITIZENS" should be your #1 priority.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing. 11pm is too late.

Nothing. Greater opportunity for crime.

nothing. it just provides additional time during darkness for potential crime and other nefarious activities to occur.

Nothing. It sounds like an opportunity for criminals to rob and rape.

Nothing. Since there is no lighting in these parks, it is dangerous for people to be in them after dark or before dawn. How can you walk, ride a bike, etc. in the dark without risk of injury or being assaulted? It seems to me that only nefarious activities would be occurring at times of darkness-illegal hunting (in parks like Vadnais or Sucker Creek), criminal damage to property, sexual assault, break-ins to cars, arson to pavilions. etc. The idea that more people "recreating" in the dark will prevent crime is ludicrous. Crimes such as shootings and assaults are at an all-time high. It is likely that alcohol and drug use in the dark would occur leading to lowered inhibitions and people being assaulted or killed.

Nothing. The current hours provide plenty of opportunity for equal access

Nothing. The park shouldn't be used after dark due to lighting issues and noise for people who live by the park

Nothing. There is no reason for someone or a group to be in a park until 11 pm

Nothing. There shouldn't be any legitimate reason people are in a park that early or late.

Nothing. This is great for people who work 9-5, but not others. This prohibits quieter walks at night.

Nothing. Too early and too late

Nothing. What good occurs after dark without lighting. Biking in the dark? Just not safe.

Ok

Okay, but not the best

Only if patrolled early am and past 11pm. Police deter criminal activity. Star Gazing?

Only slightly more appealing than 24/7.

Open too late at night. Better 5am-10pm or 6am-10pm

Open when most people are awake

Opens it up for evening use in the winter when daylight hours are short.

Opens up for early and later uses

Opens up to nighttime activities, including removing boats on/off water.

Option A

Other than summer, cool in the morning

Park accessibility throughout all 4 seasons and keeping safe

Park opened longer year round.

Parking could be more accessible, ie, vehicles parking in lots vs on the street.

Parks open while majority of people would use.

Parks that we go fishing at should not have a close time if fishing ...

Parks would be quieter and less populated during "closed" hours, allowing wildlife reprieve.

people and pets can keep a routine consistent throughout the year

People can enjoy the park for more time. I can see opening early so people can exercise and people staying longer after sunset in the summer.

People can go early morning for run or bike ride& later hours give access to people who might have to work later or want to be in a cooler environment.

People can go fishing in designated areas early in the morning or go for an early morning workout

People can still walk through the parks at night. Commute through or enjoy it on balmy evenings. In the winter it is easy to walk or ski on moonlit nights or use a headlamp.

People could more easily use the parks before work

People have greater access and aren't having to guesstimate when sunrise and sunset are going to happen.

People have the ability to go before and after work to get in some physical activity, which is what a park is good for!

People living close to a park can have reduced noise.

People may want to exercise early/late and need the extended window of time, especially in the winter months. If bike commuters are technically using the park outside of permissible hours, then for that reason too.

People not being able to tent it. Nothing good happens after dark

Perfect hours for the summer and year round for people who would like an early morning or late evening stroll.

perhaps commuting in the winter hours, but this seems unnecessary with regard to park use overall, and peak times and volumes of people at later hours in the summer.

Personally, as a female living in Saint Paul, I would not be in a park at 5am or until sunrise, especially fall/winter, I would not be in a park at night probably after 7 or 8pm.

Personally, would not use extended hours

Please do not make the park accessible 24/7!!

Plenty of time to use parks

Potentially deters overnight camping or criminal activity but unless the parks are patrolled may not have that effect.

Predictability. And firm limits.

Predictable hours

Predictably and enforceability

Prefer to keep park hours as is. I think it limits noise and use of parks during evening hours.

Provides a bit more access while still ensuring the park is “closed” at night for safety

Provides ample time for people to enjoy the parks and reduces overnight vagrancy concerns.

Provides for greater use in early morning and late evening for exercise before work or commuting on park land.

Provides most of the benefit of the 24/7 option and aligns it with most city park hours, making it easier to remember the hours.

Provides time for the animals in nature to not be disturbed, to live without disturbance of people.

Provides use of the park for intended purposes, and allows the ability to restrict overnight camping in the parks.

Reasonable for early morning runners and walkers.

Reasonable for what's available to do at the parks.

Reasonable hours

Reasonable hours for people to enjoy parks.

Reasonable time to be in parks.

Regular time not determined by the seasonally changing sun patterns.

Rules.

Running or snowshoeing in the mornings or at night.

Safest as it keeps tent cities from taking over the parks.

Safety

Safety ... 24/7 may attract crime

Safety and easier patrolling of these areas by police

Safety and quiet time to respect the neighborhood

same thing that is “appealing” about a bar closing at 2 - nothing ...just encourages people to test the limits further and hang out later - changes nothing for sensible citizens, gives more “freedom” to those who aren’t

Seems a reasonable time for 99% of park use.

Seems a reasonable time frame. I do like how this will create a more accessible park during the winter when dusk begins as early as 4:30

Seems fine

Seems good. Though I never observe park hours, but honestly I’m never out early or late.

Seems reasonable

seems reasonable

Seems reasonable

Seems reasonable, but also not sure why the park has hours at all besides noise restrictions.

Seems reasonable, plenty of time, like a closing time

Set hours for people to expect being able to access the park and effective cutoff time for enforcement.

Set time is easier for everyone to understand! Less confusing!

Set times are more helpful than 1/2 hour before and 1/2 hour after guidelines.

Sets a standard that is easily predictable

Setting and enforcing set hours of operation provides a standard that all can understand and abide by. Eliminating these hours could easily turn the parks into campgrounds which I don't believe falls into the parks design and intended use

Should be 7AM to 9PM

Should be even more restrictive. Maybe 6:00 am to 10:00 pm?

Simple and clear rules

Simple and reasonable

Simple and straightforward and easy times for people to remember

simple to understand

Simple, but disregards seasons and daylight.

Simple, straightforward. Largely aligns with the unwritten rules as enforced.

Simplicity and consistency year round

Since most county parks have no lighting, it is not appealing.

Sounds fine

Sounds like good plan- it could be better to close earlier as nothing good happens after 10pm

Specific with limits. Yet still offers hours that are reasonable.

Stable, consistent, easy to know exactly when (as opposed to basing on daylight).

Standard for year round. Makes more accessible for those who work other than classic 9-5 shift of work.

standard hours

Standard hours for all parks.

Standardized times to make it simpler for users to remember.

standardizes hours, regardless of time of year/season/daylight hours

Staying open longer past sunset in the winter is appealing, as sunset can be so early.

Straight forward hours that don't change, improves accessibility

Straightforward, easy to understand, and I'd argue covers the majority of uses.

Streets cleared in nite

structured - is in line with city and regional parks - why would anyone need to be in park after 11 pm ?

Sundown is before I'm done with work for much of the winter. Longer hours are appealing for after hours walks.

Sunrise/sunset walks without the risk of being out outside of the designated hours

Sunset is around 4:30P from November to March. Consistent evening closing hours year-round allows for recreation after 9-5 work hours.

Supports the parks being open when usable.

T

Teens need a place to go with their friends. They enjoy campfires and talking- I can see my 19 year old and boyfriend liking the later time options.

That would capture most, if not all commuter/recreational uses that would use the park before sunrise. I dont see a reason to be there until 11pm but I also do not have any issues. That time is reasonable.

That you can use the parks in the evenings in winter

Thats a good set of hours

the 5 am is good for bike commuters, but the 11 pm would open the parks for vandalism, theft, etc.

The ability to enjoy the park in the evening even in the dark winter months.

The current park hours (30 minutes before sunrise and 30 minutes after sunset) are critical for the safety of the surrounding community and the lake. These park hours give all individuals and communities all daylight (plus more) hours to enjoy the park facilities. Option A is an extension of the existing hours and would be well into before and after daylight (especially in winter) which has many concerns noted below.

The early opening

The early opening for various uses, including fitness.

The extended hours would make it easier for illegal activities (e.g. drug deals) to occur under the cover of darkness. This would be good for drug dealers and their customers.

The hours are clear and standard

The hours are too broad.

The obvious more ease of use for people.

The ONLY thing appealing in my opinion is clear set times never change. This has a down side however.

The only thing appealing is year round. No one needs to be in a park at 11 pm. Parks should be closed after dark

The opening times. Somehow I feel like making closing 10 pm vs 11pm is a subtle difference that deters late night hanging out.

The parks can be utilized when the hours of daylight are longest

The Ramsey County park system would have similar hours to city parks. Many people don't differentiate between city or county park.

The time park is opened

The window of daylight in the winter is very small. Consistent hours year round make sense.

There are some parameters.

There is no reason for a park to be open 11p-5a. These hours are reasonable to do what a park has to offer.

There is nothing appealing about this!!!! Folks don't need to be in the park in the dark. They should be home.

There should be no overnight squatting at the parks by vagrants and criminals.

These are reasonable hours and would allow better use of the parks especially during winter months with limited daylight.

These hours are more consistent with County park hours.

These hours are reasonable times to do reasonable things in a park-walking, eating, socializing, playing. Between 11:05 pm and 4:55 am a public park does not need to be open. My tax dollars should go for things people do during reasonable hours.

These seem like sufficient hours.

They are set hours.

They're specific and exact; there's no guessing.

Think it might be good. Many walkers and runners are out early

This addresses the winter hours and also addresses the ability of park patrols to empty the park of those abusing any of the noise and curfew ordinances

This allows for later activities, especially in the winter.

This could curb unsavory activity in the middle of the night.

This could give more access in the winter not sure it needs to be 11. Could be 10.

This eliminates the need to know what the sunrise and sunset times are each day/week (most people won't bother to look them up anyway). It is easier to patrol or police those park closing times when they are consistent.

This gives people clearer expectations about when the parks are available for use

This is a good compromise

this is a good idea so more people can enjoy Ramsey County Parks

This is better than 24/7 however I believe 5am-10pm would be better

This is consistent and enforceable.

This is enough duration to enjoy park.

This is good because it is the same year round.

This is more appealing than 24 hour open parks.

This is not a bad idea so people don't have to figure out when exactly is the sunset and sunrise.

This is not appealing. Most criminal activities happen after dark and there is going to be no one to police the area. Why offer a space for such activity especially since there won't be police presence.

This is okay.

This is ridiculous.

This is the better option

This is very appealing as several park visitors would appreciate more time to walk dogs, jog, ride bikes, go snow-shoeing etc.

This is very appealing for winter use when it is dark before and after I work.

This limits gatherings where illegal activities can occur. With the current hours as is, I personally have witnessed drug deals, prostitution, homeless camps and overnight camping in Langton Lake Park. This is with the current hours! I can just imagine what would go on all night long if open 24 hours.

This makes Parks more accessible while still having quiet hours.

This makes sense to allow more use during the winter when we all need to be out getting exercise - especially if many people don't get off work until after dark.

This meets the recreational needs of both early morning, evening, and late evening groups. It gives groups a safe place to meet. It seems more realistic.

This option A is a good option for me.

This option may make sense for people who use the shoulder times (early and late) for park access.

This potentially allows more people to use the park in the winter-myself included.

This removes difficult to police closing time and leaves no question for when folks should be clearing out.

This seemed to be a good option.

This seems appropriate as people have different work schedules and these hours would better accommodate varied schedules.

This seems reasonable

This seems standard and has worked for a long time.

this sounds good and reasonable. nothing good happens after 12 pm. ;)

This sounds reasonable to me, although we would prefer a 10:00 pm closing of park! Honestly, not much good goes on after dark...no reason to keep open this long after dark. For those of us that live close to one of the parks, and needing sleep early, the noise is an issue being open til 11.

This will allow folks to walk, run or bike in the park in the early morning or late evening. This will allow greater use of the parks

This would allow people to be able to use the parks for a longer period of time.

This would be good during the summer.

This would be helpful for winter dog walking and other exercise that can't be done with the current schedule before the work day starts in the winter.

this would be very appealing for evening walks in the winter. however, i would unlikely be out later than 10.

This would make the park available year-round same hours which makes sense.

This would provide better hours for providing wildlife watching, night hikes, and stargazing opportunities.

Those hours are acceptable

To be honest, I use Battle Creek until 10pm regularly--I'm out on the trails with a headlamp after work during the seasons with limited daylight. I had no idea I was breaking the ordinance. Especially considering some of the trails at Battle Creek are lit, it is pretty funny that use is technically not allowed after 5:30pm or so in the winter. Why light them, then?

Too early and late. Consider the elderly and children who need quiet at these times. More importantly, more noise and crime during later night and that early morning.

Too early too late

Too late at night, need quit time past 10

Too late for residents who live near park.

Uniformity, predictability, greater use during winter

Use of the OLDA's is expanded, consistent with city parks to eliminate confusion

User access friendly

Using the park after work in the winter

Very little good could be the result of altering the hours.....

Very reasonable hours

Very reasonable hours to allow for recreation year round.

Walking and biking when it works in my schedule.

Walking at night can be nice. Maybe 10 pm?

Way safer then 24/7 I wouldn't want some teenage kids playing till midnight and then have to worry about homeless people just sleeping in them.

We know when the park is open all year without wondering if and when it will change

We need the bathrooms opened earlier if everyone can enjoy the park

We walk early

When I was younger I routinely ran in Ramsey county parks before and after sunset. Would be nice if that was allowed

When Winter comes around there will be more time to be at the park since the sun goes down early that time of year.

Why 11 PM? Nothing good happens after dark.

Why would you say 11pm when directly above you stated the sheriff patrols til 10pm? This makes ZERO sense.

Will have no impact. In reality, won't materially impact park use regardless of "official hours". People go when they want to go.

Will provide better access and ability to commute year round.

Will provide people with more opportunities to use the park outside of work hours.

Winter birding

Winter evening walks!

Winter evenings the park would be open later when it's dark for walks, and after dinner playing in the snow. Also I'm not an early bird but people should be allowed to walk/run after 5am.

Winter hours it gets dark early

Winter sports

Winter walks, jogs, skiing, snowshoeing

with bathrooms, police scanning in squads, activities like walking clubs etc etc, snow shoeing and lighting like a grown up city needs in an environmentally exquisite way..... enter the 2020s

with such short days in the winter, it makes a lot of sense to open based on actual hours rather than daylight.

Won't affect my uses, but early morning would be good for many who run, bike, or commute. Would there be early tee times at sunrise? This would make it equitable for me.

Works for more people without traditional 9 - 5 jobs

Works for the early birds and the night owls

Works with most people's work schedule

Would be a huge improvement for bike commuters, especially during winter hours.

Would not change anything for me. Neutral.

Year round consistency

Year round use regardless of sunrise and sunset time.

Year-round standard schedule is reliable, no surprises.

Year's around rules makes sense but 11 PM it's a bit late for the neighborhoods surrounding a park

Yes

You always know when the park is open, some people don't keep track of sunset and sunrise times.

You can go star gazing in the park

You don't have to remember different times.

You will always know when it is open and when not, doesn't change based on the season. The hours seem reasonable. Parks aren't just for people, other creatures live in them and they need time to themselves without people around.

You would know exactly when you need to leave.

I believe McCarrons is currently open 6 am to 9 pm. this works well.

Set hours= consistency

the current hours accommodate all seasonal dusk/dawn

I prefer set hours because of security...authorities have to arrange for security

6am to 10pm

Nothing appealing as those of us near the park need more than 6 hours of quiet time,

More time in the Winter to participate in the parks

It provides better early morning access but keeps parks closed in late night/early morning.

Consistency with other Regional Park Implementing Agencies

Recognizes our winter limitations of daylight and kid's need to play!

Allows going for a walk after work year-round.

Like more open hours.

Park users can bike commute, ice fish, ice skate, all kinds of activities that happen all hours.

Ability to do certain activities like those mentioned (ie. biking, ice fishing and etc.)

Don't have to worry as much about when we need to leave the park

Appealing only in the sense that it is CLEAR.

I agree that it is CLEAR. How someone would be able to really know if it's 1/2 hour before sunrise or after sunset is fuzzy and an unrealistic expectation.

I agree about consistency with other parks in the region

Consistency with other park hours to avoid confusion when shared spaces are noted.

Making County Park hours the same as city park hours or regional park hours would make consistency easier.

lighting would be nice in parking lot areas at least.

5:00 a.m. is okay, but 11:00 is not appealing—too late. Very opposed.

Allows bikers and runners to use trails

Allows for consistency of usage between seasons. Example: running daily at 5:30 before work. Work schedule does not change with the sun.

Consistency, no need to pay attention to changing opening closing times.

Expanded use of parks.

I could go running before sunrise

I would occasionally use parks for early morning walks

It seems good to have a curfew. I hear there's funny business going on in the parking lots at weird times

Keep status quo, please!

Limits off hours

Nothing about this is appealing. The hours encompass darkness.

Nothing good happens after 11pm

Nothing. Keeping the parks open from sunset to sunrise is adequate. This helps minimize disturbance at night and is protective of nocturnal species that need quiet at night.

open to flexible family schedules

Puts a time limit on park activity after dark, and most people that the ordinance seems to think would deter criminal activity would not be there after those hours, they would be home in bed - and probably also would not WANT to be there because of the increased criminal activity because of patrols that have been discontinued - civilians are not trained to be a police force and those engaged in criminal activities would not cease their park activity because civilians are there.

The majority of people do recreational activities during these hours and sleep at night. No need for additional hours.

There is consistency and access to parks all year round by setting times; this makes it easier to remember when parks are open.

This is a reasonable time.

Park Hours Option A - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions

Option A: Setting year-round park hours from 5:00 am until 11:00 pm

Please use this space for questions or concerns *and* suggested solutions.

- How will hours be enforced? Currently, they aren't and New Brighton Public Safety becomes solely responsible for patrolling the park, taking away valuable resources for city residents. -Will Sheriff Dept. extend the hours they patrol the park? -How will area residents affected by this report concerns to the County? How will they address concerns? Current response to concerns have been extremely lacking. Suggestions: - Use an electronic gate to enforce park hours. Look at Elm Creek Park's system for examples of how this can be easily done. - actually ENFORCE the hours. There is little evidence that this is being done to any degree that creates accountability and discourages willful violation. -Increase Sherriff presence and patrol. The park is a county resource, not a city. Enforcement is the counties responsibility.

- the implication that if the park is open, then that must mean the park is being watched and is safe . - increased number of broken car window/thefts (noticeable uptick began spring 2020)

10 pm would be late enough.

10 would be better

1030 pm closing might be better

10pm is a good time to close parks, 11pm is to late. I live off a very popular city park and if it closed later than 10pm park noise and activity would become a problem for sleeping at night or simply enjoying quietness

10pm is a more reasonable closing time

10pm is a more reasonable closing time.

10pm seems much more appropriate. If we are asking for longer hours to more closely mimic the length of days during the summer, then 10pm would be plenty late (it's dark by that time in summer too). Perhaps I am missing something, but what activities would be happening that we would need the parks open until 11pm?

11 feels a little late and I would have concerns about adolescents/young adults congregating late at night. What about a close time of 9 or 10pm? Or, could the sheriff's office park more frequently/later into the night?

11 is a bit late 10 would be better even in the summer it is dark then.

11 is to late

11 pm does seem late. I would prefer 10 pm closing.

11 pm is a little late. Nothing good happens after 10. And nothing good really happens an hour after dark, especially in winder.

11 pm is too late

11 pm is too late, crime opportunity

11 pm is too late. 1/2 hour after sunset would be enough except to access ice in winter is permitted.

11 pm seems a little late

11 seems late. People living around might be subjected to too much nose when trying to sleep.

11 seems pretty late. If folks get into trouble rescuing or helping that late and dark would be a challenge. It would be midnight before a limit could be set.

11:00 is rather late and I'd be concerned of noise for those who live nearby

11:00 is too late. This is well after dark even in the summer and too many issues can occur after dark. Would suggest no later than 10:00

11:00 p.m. is too late

11:00 p.m. seems too late.

11:00 pm is too late. 10:00 pm at the latest. Any later seems to increase probability for increased illegal or problematic behaviors and choices. Gives kids enough time to get home before curfew too. Gives law enforcement time to check on parks before shift changes.

11:00pm still seems late for neighbors who live near the park - Noise and traffic after 10:00pm should not be happening.

11pm is a little late for a week night, would prefer 5am-10pm Sunday-Thursday till 11 on Friday and Saturdays.

11pm is late and would require extended patrol - consider 10pm close time. Also without lighting, usability of the park is limited. Consider some solar powered options for basic, minimal lighting.

11pm is pretty late. What about 9? Then it will be quieter earlier for people who live near the parks. Additionally they should maybe be closed after patrols stop for the evening at 10.

11pm is really quite late and some parks already see questionable activity after dark. Aligning with Ramsey County 10pm would be better.

11pm is too late even in summer.

11pm is too late to close...should close by 10pm We live close to the park and the later it gets the more problems we are seeing in and around the park.

11pm might be a little late. 10pm should be good.

11pm seems a little late, perhaps 10pm

11pm seems pretty late even for summer. 10pm seems more reasonable. Even if there are noise and age ordinances it will still be loud if people are there for neighboring houses.

11pm would be late especially with no lighting or activities going on.

4am start time and 12 AM closing time.

5 a.m. to 10 p.m.

5 am - 11 pm sounds like awfully long hours. I would suggest 6 am - 10 pm. I know that doesn't sound like a big shift, but those are more normal hours to socialize and work in.

5 am until 10 pm!

5am is light in the summer and 11 is always dark so maybe 4-10

5am to 10pm and close the gate at 10pm

6 am to 10pm Memorial Day to Labor Day until 9pm after Labor Day.

6am to 10pm ... better hours for those living near the park. Especially true for BE regional park where we see little or no patrolling

7:00-10:00. Lights and noise a concern for neighbors.

9pm seems more reasonable if the sheriff patrols til 10pm. Allows time to clear out.

a

A gate at the front entrance would be ideal to keep people out when the park is closed

A lot of dark hours in winter

A park is ground owned by the public, and shouldn't be closed to the public. Limiting hours of access limits availability for people that wish to recreate within the park. I've been asked to leave a park while fishing in the past, and I wasn't there to do anything but enjoy some time outdoors.

A set opening and closing is a good idea however 11:00pm is too late. 10:00pm is more appropriate.

Add strategic lighting

Additional lighting could be added to parking lots and other high traffic areas to address crime concerns.

Additional lighting in parking areas and on some trails would help promote safety when it is dark.

After 9 pm drinking, driving across park lawns, fighting, gang activity are observed to be more common

After dark in the evening there can sometimes be unwanted activity. I think the closing time should be earlier, perhaps 8 PM.

Allowing open hours after dark can be concerning. Possibly limiting to ancillary boat in/boat off after dark would be appropriate.

Allows for discrimination to continue.

Although not ideal, I would not be opposed to this option. I would prefer to keep the hours unchanged.

Any curfew type law will be selectively enforced based on called in complaints which will disproportionately affect minority groups that are subject to public bias. Also there are plenty of legitimate reasons to want to be in a park at night and I highly doubt breaking park rules is an actual deterrent to people who plan to commit harmful crimes. Why limit the access of people who just want to enjoy the park.

Any person hanging out in a park late at night is up to no good

Are there any liability issues for the county if the park hours are expanded, regardless of daylight hours? Concern: lack of lighting in parks if the hours expanded regardless of daylight hours

At some times of year, this could mean the park is open more in darkness than in sunlight. There would need to be some sort of method for raising alarm about violent criminal activity - like the panic buttons we see on college campuses.

Battle Creek Park is a park. There aren't any (as far as I know) major structures or equipment with significant value, aside from the parking lots to be monitored by a body at any hour of the day, really. If there is, a few surveillance cameras could be put in place by the Sheriff's Department.

Can party 24/7

can still be limited in the summer, where, with the heat, people might be recreating at later time. a suggested time of closure would be midnight. in warmer climates (AZ, TX, etc) people will run/bike, etc starting at 10pm, so it is not uncommon to finish past midnight.

Can the system invest in safety measures such as lighting and blue phone systems?

Change from 5:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. Later hours impinge on the nearby neighbors' evening quiet. Permits for monitored activities such as ball tournaments can be issued for games that could run late. Immediate neighbors must be notified and allowed to be part of the permit decision.

Change park patrol hours to 4 pm to midnight so they patrol during peak problem hours.

Concern about crime

Concern about patrol hours ending one hour before park closure (if current schedule of 10pm for patrols stands). Options include extending patrol hours to 11 or having a 10pm park closure time.

Concern that most parks have no lighting & concern about law enforcement being stretched.

Concern would be lack of lighting.

Concerned about excess noise after 10:00 pm and before 6:00 am

Concerned about hours during periods of darkness. I prefer the current hours

Concerned about noise - dogs barking in the morning, teenagers/young adults being loud in the evening.

Concerned about parks being open after dark and people partying after dark, increased drug use and safety concerns. Best solution is have parks opened during daylight hours, not after dark.

Concerns about crime late at night.

Concerns: long time, beyond patrol hours. 6am to 10 pm seems appropriate.

Could be more dangerous

Could encourage crime as more people would be hanging around the parks when it's dark.

Could result in more crime

Crime rates can go up during later hours. More patrols would be needed between dusk and 11PM.

Crime. More cops

Criminals taking advantage of the darkness and robbing folks. Please add more lights and cameras. Maybe a stronger police presence

Curious what safety enforcement looks like outside those hours. Living near a Regional Park that has a history of violent incidents in the past, I want to be sure that all my neighbors are safe, as well as me.

current hours are fine

Darkness. Lighting allows people to be more aware of their surroundings.

Definitely need good lighting and security cameras

Do not allow parks to be open 24 hours - period!!

Do other parks have crime issues closer to 10 or 11 pm? Will trail lighting be added?

Do you have any idea what happens in the parks, let alone at these hours??

Does law enforcement have resources and priorities to enforce noise orders?

doesn't adequately capture the changing seasons/daylight hours. If there are no facilities in the parks that can occur after dark why have them "open" - only leads to no good (especially with limited lighting & visibility).

doesn't allow erecting of tents or temporary housing units

Don't do it

During the summer, the parks are closed by RCSO park closers. Could the gates just be shut on the parks after they close up to avoid confusion?

During winter, darkness comes hours earlier than 11pm. When it is dark, it allows opportunity for crime to happen.

During winter, when it's darker longer, there's nothing keeping groups from congregating. Usually this is harmless but sometimes it is dangerous.

Earlier would be great but later I do not have an opinion on.

Early-morning activities, especially in summer, could be impacted.

Early/late hours will lead to too much noise in the neighborhood

Easier for negative activity to go unnoticed during dark hours.

Evaluate lighting with regards to safety during winter's limited daylight hours.

Even during daytime hours there have been break-ins and theft from cars at some of these parks—for ex. at Sucker Creek's Co. Rd F parking lot.

Everyone has equal access to the park from ½ hours before sunrise to ½ hour after sunset. What is the purpose of the change? This does not give the adjacent residents enough quiet time.

Existing hours are fine. Later hours will likely lead to more drinking in the park and vandalism.

Expanded hours Hard to enforce undesirable behavior in parks thru. Leading to more crime rap theft and robbery. . Maybe a happy medium like 900 pm Early not an issue. The late is an issue. -1 pm is ridiculous!!!!!!!!!! Nothing good happens after 9 pm except underage drinking, drugs. Should be after 9 by permit only if u have to have it. Otherwise no!!!!!!!!!!

Expanding accessible hours may require additional sheriff patrols initially. Nearby residents may make more frequent complaints about noise after dark.

Extending hours later will only invite crime.

Extending morning hours are fine. Extending. Evening hours is a mistake. If this is voted in each person that voted yes should be held responsible for clean up and any issues that arise.

fall and winter, will be dark for the extra hours

Find a way to add lighting in some areas—especially for winter walking.

For me, policing and crime are equal concerns in the dark, so lighting or plowing in the winter would affect my use. I would love to be able to move more in the cold months safely.

For neighbors to the parks, this could be disruptive

For parks where there is fishing boat launches and fishing piers, sometimes people will want to fish early in the morning or later in the evenings. Please consider this option. Perhaps a noise control recommendation instead? Most people will fish and enjoy the silence, so having people there, but quite shouldn't be an issue.

For security at dark hours, have plenty of lighted areas.

For what reason do things need to change

For winter months we can reduce closing hour to 9 PM.

Given the number of car break ins at Sucker Lake, staying open until 11 pm is just asking for more problems. Keep park hours the same.

Good luck trying to enforce these hours. Will it be complaint based? Or every day routine monitoring?

Half hour before and after sunrise/sunset seem wise to move automatically/visually with daylight. Middle of winter and summer hours adjust to the sun, not the clock. AND daylight saving time messes with the clock too and not the sun.

Harder to patrol in darkness for illicit activity. Greater risk for assault

Have all parks close at 10pm due to safety concerns.

Having defined hours restricts access. Although, it may work for some doesn't work for all. Some folks who want to run at 3 am should be able to go run on their own responsibility.

Having parks open until 11:00 seems way too late. On the longest Daylight days that leave the park open an hour and a half after dark - Which, given the lack of lighting throughout the park system good contribute to increased crime in neighborhoods near parks And gatherings for people/cars that could easily violate the noise ordinances

Having set hours would be very beneficial. Allowing the park to be used more in the winter months. This also would eliminate the guesswork around when sunrise and sunset is.

Honestly if you changed the park hours to be 6am to 10pm that should be sufficient.

Honestly, 11 seems really late to be out at the park for children or adults. I get opening at 5 am but the 11 pm seems really late to me, but then I would not use the park at 11 pm, so I am not the audience. That said, I would worry about safety in the park if it is open until 11 pm. Would the park hours be enforced? I live near a park and individuals/cars are moving through the park at all hours of the day and night, some enjoying the scenery and space while others whip donuts in the parking lots, drag race, and damage property. How will there hours help or hinder those who are not utilizing the park in a responsible and respectful manner?

Horseback park patrol would be necessary and welcome.

Hours as is are fine. Longer hours would create more noise for those who live on the lake. As noise carries from the water people who want to sleep are prevented from doing that.

Hours should change season.

Hours should remain as is. There is no reason to be in the park when it is dark out. It is difficult for the police to monitor the safety of the park with extended hours.

how about 9 pm for bike commuters?

How about closing at 10 year round?

How many people actually would use or pass through the parks during these times? Do more staff need to be available then? Experiment and do a time study.

how many people have used or would use the parks at 5am, especially in winter? I think this is way too early. I would suggest sunrise to 10 pm.

How will it be enforced? The park by my house has no gates.

How will you enforce this? Who pays for the enforcement? Will taxes increase to pay for enforcement?

how would safety be maintained?

I am concerned that hours would be expanded and bring in unwanted behavior and noise.

I am female. I restrict my after-dark recreation to locations that have lighting. I encourage the installation of more lighting for the enhanced safety of all park users.

I and families throughout want closed park hours, eliminating the increase potential for the acts noted above to multi fold.

I appreciate decriminalizing presence in parks.

I believe that many people are likely to respond with safety concerns about being at the park in the dark, I believe that while lighting could obviously assist with that, I think that also there's a level of self selection that will happen. Those who are comfortable going out in the dark will and those who aren't won't, and I think that's okay. Those who are uncomfortable with the dark will have essentially the same park hours they do now, and those who are comfortable, like myself, will be able to use the park during winter hours when we haven't been able to legally in the past.

I can't speak for all the parks after dark, but I have witnessed problems at McCarron's Beach, fireworks, I know that guns have been fired at the beach, loud parties. Also, the beach is not well lit for patrolling.

I could see allowing earlier use because people may start their runs/bike rides/workouts at parks earlier than existing times. However, I think extending park hours in the evening will just encourage partying, fireworks, etc.

I do think water access sites should have 24/7 access because night fishing is a reasonable pursuit and should be available to the general public, not just those with private water access.

I don't have particular concerns about this, though some might express concerns about possible noise. I think this could be solved by having suggested quiet hours that might start earlier than the end of park hours, like in state park campgrounds.

I don't understand limited hours. Is 24 hours a day available to walk trails and such?

I don't feel increased hours would be helpful, just justify extra walking traffic from people who don't have good intentions in our neighborhood as that is how our neighborhood has been cased by people in the past. Our home and several neighbors have had things stolen, catalytic convertors taken, we have a homeless couple fighting and chasing people away in Langton Lake park and I don't see any increase of police patrols or any at all in our park currently. They seem unconcerned and have basically said we need to live with it because it happens. If there is an increase in hours, I would like to see a real increase in patrolling.

I feel park hours should really represent the park amenities, brightly light, well equipped, secured with camera, style parks could be open longer or even 24/7.

I feel the park should not be open past 10 pm. Late park hours will only promote issues.

I have never understood park hours. They discriminate against people who work the night shift. If some night visitors are causing issues, the appropriate thing to do is to regulate/enforce the specific issue that these visitors are causing, not punish everyone for the actions of a few. Thank you for considering making them accessible 24/7. I recognize this is unusual for parks and hope that Ramsey County is willing to take this step to be one of the first in the nation to offer more freedom of movement and recreation.

I have no concerns about providing greater access to the parks.

I like sun up to sun down as many parks are not lit.

I like this plan.

I live in the enclave and during regular hours you can hear cars hot rodding, fireworks, etc. having this park open 24/7 will be a disaster for residents close by.

I live near Conway Rec Center & Battlecreek Rec Center. Vandalism is already a problem. I don't want an increased police presence or cctv monitoring the parks, although cctv is preferred over police.

I live next to a Regional Park. I'd prefer a closed gate each night at a set time to keep large crowds and parties out overnight.

I lived by a hidden park and teens liked to hang-out there late night. They broke beer bottles on the play ground and then burned a large spiral slide. Teens are going to do whatever they want, but a closed park might be a help factor with police patrolling.

I pick up litter in the park there is already too many used condone, liquor bottles and other trash left in the areas at night. Vandalism also happens at night for the most part. While there are supposed to be patrols, I rarely see patrol cars driving through. Also, kids in groups descend on the Battle Creek Park at night. I do not feel safe there if I get caught near closing time on a path. Finally, we have had homeless folks living in the Battle Creek Park the last few years. I do not feel safe if I run into one of these capers under the influence on the path. Frankly, you should step up security near closing time and after and close off access to the parking lots like you do on the Water Park side of the Park.

I prefer the hours of before sunrise and after sunset. Why change it? The description stated above does not provide any compelling reason to change hours, as far as i am concerned

I see kids running around the park late into the night, fireworks blown off, loud noises and I would like to have policing over these issues. I do not feel comfortable having the park open all night long, I have seen an increased amount of trash, condom wrappers and beer bottles and would like to keep out the rift raft.

I see no reason for parks to be open after dark

I think 11 is even a little too late.

I think 11 pm is pretty late. It's dark year round at that time. The only acceptable reason for this late would be for a private rental, for a organized gathering.

I think 11pm is late and May conflict w noise regulations for 10pm

I think 5:00 AM is to early. Maybe 6:00 AM. And 11:00 PM is to late. Maybe 10:00 PM would be better.

I think 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. is better. Try to give folks who live near the parks 8 hours of peace each night.

I think a more reasonable time frame is 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. 11 p.m. is a really late closing time for folks who live near the parks to have to worry about noise, etc. Lots of folks are leaving for work at 6 a.m., And I think the 10 p.m. closing helps ensure 8 hours of quiet.

I think having parks open this late gives people the impression that they can party there. Extending park hours will probably increase the alcohol use which, in turn, may likely cause issues not limited to violations of park ordinances such as: Section I (audio devices), Section H (use of fireworks), Section F (alcohol and controlled substances), and others. You are asking for solutions, which is great, but you are not identifying a problem, except for a reference to racial discrimination or simply that the current ordinance may be out of date. Nothing about park hours should be related to race. All kinds of people deserve to feel safe in any park, and people that live by a park need to be free of disturbances, especially while they may be trying to sleep. An 11pm park close can easily be pushed even later by folks who don't want to stop partying. My solution, therefore, is to keep the existing hours.

I think hours from dawn until dusk are appropriate .

I think it is too late. You would have to ask law enforcement to go into the parks that late and remove people. It seems like that would be dangerous. What are people doing in the park in the dark?

I think sunrise and sunset are appropriate. Otherwise it's a space for men only in the dark hours or we create scattered light pollution.

I think that enforcement could still be uneven. I don't think changing the hours will deter police from harassing youth and BIPOC.

I think that lighting parks could be accomplished with some sort of intermittent or motion sensor lights so they are only on when someone is nearby. I also think using lights that are significantly dimmer would be extremely beneficial as well. Park lights wouldn't need to be light enough to read by, just enough to navigate the trails or play for in the dark disc golf. Human eyes can see surprisingly far with minimal light. Having less bright lights would also help reduce the amount of light pollution in the city. These could possibly help minimize disruption to nocturnal animals as well.

I think the current hours are adequate

I think the hours are reasonable. An earlier start is no issue, and a sunset "packup" and 11PM out time also make sense.

I think the park should close by 10 p.m. and continue a security drive-through after closing.

I think this is the most viable solution.

I want this neighborhood to be a safe place and having the park open for all hours makes me worry about the safety of this community.

I wonder if this would cause a need for increased policing in terms of enforcement.

I worry about safety at all hours but especially when dark. There is also an expectation of facilities being open when the park is open...which is stated above will not be the case. Can year-round porta potties be brought in?

I would be concerned that the later hour might lead to more crime.

I would close the parks at 10

I would even say 6am to 10pm year round is sufficient.

I would lessen the hours to 6am-11pm

I would like it to be 10pm end time.

I would like the park patrolled at night for safety and sound management.

I would prefer it stay at 10PM.

I would probably feel unsafe after dark. I have found packets of drugs in the parking lot at Crosby and some mornings there is trash from drinking parties near the river. I'm not in favor of more park police but it may take some park employees present to clean up and be around to call for help if things get threatening

I wouldn't feel safe in a park after dark if there is no lighting. That would have to be added.

I'd be more concerned about nefarious dark time activities taking place. However, I would not personally ever be in a park after dark.

I'm focused on school hours and the negative impact of noise and traffic on residents neighboring parks before 6 am and after 10pm

If a group needs extended hours, they can get a permit from the city.

if Facilities are available at all hours may be a problem

If mini Ramsey parks include bike commuting areas, it would be nice to have additional lighting for bike trails, especially in the winter.

If parking lots are to be kept open, will they be plowed/cleared of snow in the winter? Want to make sure that an garbage is cleared daily.

If people are not legal hold accountable

If there is no barrier for people getting in or out of the park, what difference does it really make. How to you get the word out to everyone about park hours. There are not enough police or sheriffs to patrol the city parks. Does it mean that lights would stay on until 11:00 pm. What do people who live near or around the parks think of this. How does the city main drug traffic in the parks?

if you don't open facilities (such as bathrooms) to match park hours, aren't you inviting improper use of park - trash issues, public urination/defecation, etc?

Inadequate lighting at current locations. Fundraiser or tax increase to improve lighting.

Increase in crime / violations in neighboring areas with extended park hours. However, I approve extended park hours until crime has been shown to increase during these extended hours

Increased hours likely means increased crime; car break-ins have become rampant. Only support these increased hours if expanded police patrolling.

Increasing the work load of police for a few more people is disproportionate and not necessary. The current hours are fine.

Install path lighting so paths can be used during the winter during these hours.

Interesting question - as a female, I would not use a park outside of daylight hours.

Is 11 too late if it's close to houses. And I guess is 5 too early? Having these hours but a FULL CAPS noise ordinance for the first and last hour...?

Issues with possible crime after dark. Though doesn't some of that occur anyway?

It concerns me that patrolling would be an issue and the funds aren't there. This could attract vandalism.

It means unlit parks are accessible for many hours in the dark. Harder to patrol, may not feel safe.

It seems like some lighting for safety after dark would be appropriate for key locations along trails such as entrances, trail junctions, orientation maps, facilities like toilets.

It will require more police, fire and EMS resources to address crime and injuries that occur later at night.

It would be great to have better lighting thought out our parks for better usage during the winter months

It would mean the parks would be open when it is dark out perhaps opening the door to more crime?

It's easy for people to hide or get lost in a wooded area at night. I had a friend break her ankle trail running. Would she have got help in the dark? Add more light and a possible night payroll/staff member.

It's better to keep it tied to the sunrise/sunset hours.

keep as is

KEEP CURRENT CLOSING AT SUNSET bc of reduced city emergency response ppl and sheriff stops patrolling a 10. More ppl isn't a deterrent bc if someone has a weapon, it doesn't matter how many ppl are there. There's already been a 25% increase in crime in Ramsey Co. Wasn't the Chief Sherif wounded?

Keep hours the same

Keep reasonable hours

Keep sunrise to sunset hours

Keep the Dawn to Dusk regulation.

Keep the hours as is.

Keep the hours at the boat launches the same as always.

Keep the park hours as posted

Keep the same hours

Keeping it open until 11 PM will only encourage it to be a late night hang-out and bring trouble and noise to the neighborhood.

Late hours are a problem

Later nights will attract more Crimean activity

Leave hours as is

Leave the park hours as is. They are reasonable now.

Let me keep my dog, leashed, at my picnic table.

Let's not add any more lighting to public parks. Dark areas are necessary.

Lighting

Lighting for safety but avoid light pollution. Please choose International dark skies approved lighting

Lighting will become necessary: both for darker days in winter AND to ensure adequate and equitable enforcement of policy. It is not appropriate to wait for neighbors or NIMBYs to call in extra enforcement.

Lighting, esp. on lumpy trails. Low pedestrian traffic might encourage less-lawful activity

Lighting should be expanded in certain areas of the park, especially ski trails during winter.

Like this - no issues.

Longer park hours

Making sure lighting is available

May be less safe after dark.

Maybe 10 pm to help manage noise (my parents live right next to the highland pavilion and it gets loud.

Maybe compromise on hours and try 5am to 10pm. That should work in both winter and summer months.

Maybe extend to midnight on weekends?

Maybe this would require more lighting which I support. A concern is deciding at what time the park should close (and the lighting should go off).

Midnight should be cutoff time, if any

more crime after dark

More Lighting Random patrolling Help call boxes

More lighting required if this is to happen.

More lights or cameras can be put to prevent crimes

More opportunities for crime to occur.

More well light walkways

Most parks don't have lights, so it doesn't make too much sense to change hours to set times. Might be good to have them as 1 hour before sunrise to 1 hour after sunset

My concern about these new park hours is the lack of lighting on the paved trails. I would likely not utilize the trails unless they were at least partially lighted.

My concern if an early start- is safety of those using parks and crime- but we have those concerns in city parks- how about a 6 am opening

My concern is for residents whose homes back up to the parks. The crime we see in our nearest park (parking lot) is disturbing. How would these areas be policed? The criminal element is bold in the daylight; what's to stop them under the cover of darkness? We would need to light and video the parking lots for sure. More undesirable lighting? No.

My concern is that 11pm is too late and will invite noisy activities.

My concern would be the safety of people, particularly, women in the park during darkness. I would hope that there would be more Ramsey County Sheriff rounds at the parks, particularly during darkness.

My only suggestion would be reduce that to 10pm. I have never had anything that I have been doing till 11pm that has been in a park unless you are looking to start making star watching events and having reduced light hours in the county.

My preference would be for 5 am to 10p.m. Residents frequently stay longer than allowed, and 10 pm is already late for any parks that are near residences.

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

need a permit to run on off hours

Negative activities may occur after dark in an unlit park. I'm unsure of what positives there might be for folks' ability to engage in activities after dark.

No

No concerns

No concerns to this plan.

No concerns, would recommend this option

No concerns.

No concerns.

No not change policy

No problem with this

No questions

Noise and insufficient lighting

Noise and traffic issues for the neighborhood at extreme hours is undesirable. 11pm is too late.

Noise could be a concern, although as an east side resident, there is noise everywhere, all the time, not just in parks.

Noise factor in evening is definitely not appealing

Noise, crime would increase with later hours.

None

None

None

None

none

None

None.

Not a good idea. Bad element of folks come to our park after dark.

Not enough security/ patrolling or lighting. High crime risk.

not sure what the park hours affect? are people kicked out of the park after hours? do you lock the bathrooms?

Not sure who is doing anything legitimate at a park at some of those early or late hours. I would be concerned more illegal or unhealthy activity will result.

Not until 11pm. I think neighbors around parks may find the noise to be too much. 10 pm at the latest.

Nothing good happens after 10 p.m. For the safety of those living on or near parks, 11 p.m. is too late. 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. is good. Looking at peak times for local police, I would limit the evening hours to ensure enforcement/compliance measures are available.

Nothing good happens after 10pm. Close at 10.

Nothing good happens after dark. Noise travels on the lake. People get louder after more drinking, drugs etc .

Only concern about 24/7 is that the parks might then become hangouts for the homeless

Open 5AM to 10PM

park hours 5am to 10pm seems more reasonable

Park hours should be from 8AM to 8PM. There are many homes close to parks and we do not need the disturbance of park users after 8PM. In addition this raises safety issues. We need to keep our parks safe.

Park hours should be set (something like 6am to 10pm) rather than 1/2 hour before sunrise, 1/2 hour after sunset - that is too ambiguous and leaves too much room for judgement and potential issues.

Park hours should remain limited.

Park needs to be patrolled more often. Have had criminal activities in off hours, fights, attacks and loud parties.

Park open/close time doesn't really matter since anyone can technically go to a park any time already.

Park rangers rather than police who actually go into the park (not just sit in their vehicles in the parking lot) who could perhaps say "time to turn in, folks" at 11pm

Parking lot security esp. early and late.

Parks are places where criminal activity already does occur. Battle Creek park has illegal fireworks happening often after park hours and yet those aren't stopped. The park is not well lit. This park in particular would require an enormous investment in lighting to provide safety for people using these areas and trails after dark. That would affect the light pollution in the surrounding neighborhood.

Parks being open after dark in the evenings seems like an invitation for trouble.

parks should be well lite for safety and to encourage usage

Parks without parameters are open to abuse, misuse and dangerous activities

Parties, drugs, fights, noise, not safe.

Patrols should be passing by the parks in the overnight hours.

People could access earlier during the summer for activities if sunrise/ sunset rules existed

People living around the parks don't need to be worried about groups being there until 11 pm

People who live near parks may be impacted by higher noise level since family gatherings, etc., may not end until 11:00 pm.

People who live near the park might be concerned about noise. Fines if too noisy?

Perhaps 6-10 is more reasonable?

Please Consider a 10pm close. As someone who lives very close to Como park, it would be nice to have it quiet after 10pm.

Please do not extend the park hours in the evening. 99.9% of people do not go to the park after dark and as someone who lives near a park, it only allows people to cause a nuisance later at night.

Please ensure that parks are closed for overnights. But the ever changing sunrise/sunset is not predictable. Also, beaches must be staffed—we need lifeguards when beaches are open! Currently there are none which is not responsible.

Please make the closing hours 10 pm

Police are limited and can patrol areas better when hours are shorter. I highly doubt that there is that big of a concern to use the trails and the beach in the dark.

Potential crime. A solution could be to promote use. Add fire pits and lighting in park areas to make spending later hours more appealing

Potential for nefarious activity under the cover of darkness. Additional costs to the county for patrols and such. Leave current hours? I am not personally aware of hardships caused by current limits, but suspect it does prevent early morning/late evening legitimate use.

Prefer a closing time of 10 pm

Primary concerns would be increases in vandalism to county property and illegal activity occurring under the cover of darkness. Vandalism not only impacts the county image and beauty of the park but also requires taxpayer money to repair. Illegal activities put our citizens in danger. I also believe there would be drowning deaths in the parks with beaches. Daylight hours allow for good Samaritans to either help or contact authorities if a dangerous situation occurs.

Really good solution.

Recommend 6:00 am to 10:00 pm year round.

Safety and enforcement

Safety at night or early morning when dark.

Safety during dark. Hire more "cruisers" to deter any personal crimes.

Safety for those who use park at dark, safety for those who live by parks wan will deal with more dark time activity by their homes from strangers

Safety in a park after dark is a concern. Close parks at dark / after sunset

Safety issues: who will patrol the area to make sure it would be safe for everyone? What would happen if people were loud and the neighborhood could not sleep?

Safety issues. Both worried about being attacked at night and also if you were to fall/get hurt it would difficult to be seen.

Safety! Who is going to police this? You want to eliminate fines for violation of park rules? You eliminate the rule of law and there are no consequences to your actions why follow the rules? Are you going to provide call stations, who is going to provide public safety, what good comes about actions in parks late at night? It just invites people in the dark of night to do things they wouldn't dare do during the day. Are you also going to provide bathroom facilities for those who use the park at night after sunset? How does the current hours impact use by all races? We don't need anymore areas for youth to congregate and get in trouble. Current hours are just fine and the laws for violating the park rules should remain intact and enforced. What does public safety say about keeping the parks open this long? You are just inviting trouble. What can people do in parks after sunset? Look at what happened in some of the city parks when they allowed evening hours a few years ago?

See no reason to extend hours a reasonable option would be 5am to 8pm

See previous answer.

Seems like during dark hours particularly in evening there is a lot more chance of abuse/crime at parks and there will be increased maintenance costs due to dealing with this (beer cans, fireworks, etc.).

Set hours to 8:30 am-8:30 pm year round

Setting specific hours in MN when the daylight is radically different from winter to summer makes little sense.

Should never be open that late at night as that's when trouble starts

Some of the parks with gates already don't get opened timely, and expanding the hours may not help

Some trails are used as commuting paths for second/third shift or for errands (living near Battle Creek the trail is a good connection to downtown St. Paul) - perhaps paved and/or developed trails can be 24/7 while the rest of the park is closed. Some people may want to go to the park late at night - insomnia, odd work hours, etc. - could make park 24/7 or have specific areas of the park that have that ability (maybe more open areas?)

Sometimes of the year, up to half of these hours would occur in darkness. Many people would not opt to be in a park at night, for safety reasons.

Specific times would be very helpful.

Specifically, why are you proposing extension of the hours? What benefit to the community is there to extending the hours? Both options A and B are an extension of existing hours. Why isn't the current hours an option? If forced to choose, Option A is preferred. Concerns include: Keeping the park open when there isn't daylight has several safety factors: - people will go swimming at the beach without daylight posing greater risk of drowning - people will launch boats on the lake after dark posing greater risk of the wellbeing of the lake (how can they check for

weeds/mussels without daylight?) - people will go on the ice after dark and won't be able to see weak spots posing greater risk of breaking through/death (last year a 6-7 ft hold was kept open on the ice near the beach-someone would fall in without daylight) Suggested solution: Leave the current hours as they are.

Star gazing, meteor showers, and eclipses are often best viewed outside of the hours listed, but perhaps on those nights when there are predictable events a park, not all parks, can remain open for what could be considered a civic event. I'd think enough people might show up to deter crime having a park open even later than the normal hours.

Start composting. Make waste receptacles clearly labeled. 0 tolerance for nonsense & lawlessness. This is a space for kids. Fine trouble makers heavily. Consequences will deter future problems.

Stay with the current sunrise sunset

Still an issue for non-motorized transportation users who rely on bike/walking to work for late shift hours. Going to work shouldn't be criminalized.

Suggest hours 5 am until 10 pm

Suggest to support extended hours but limit until 10pm.

Suggestion: If a rise in troublesome activity occurs in the year or so following the expanded hours of operation, you could go back to the previous hours of operation.

Sunrise to sunset is perfect....it gives people plenty of time and options.

Sunrise to sunset seems to be a better set of hours for parks. Or so many hours before and after sunset.

T

Telling us when we are allowed to use public property is authoritarian.

That idea would have the park open all the time except for six hours each day. Adjacent properties will be negatively effected by the activity and noise. It would also provide an opportunity for illegal and raucous behavior under the cover of darkness and reduced visibility.

That said, I personally would not use the parks alone after dark.

That's pretty late. Having the park open that late is less safe for visitors.

The Battle Creek Regional Park trail that is parallel to Lower Afton Road is always covered I thick ice. Use sweeper to clear snow after it is plowed.

The concern is winter safety because it gets dark so much sooner. The sunup/sundown schedule is better.

The entrance to the Gramsie parking lot is suppose to be close at 10pm, I do not see this being closed at that time, sometimes that chain that keeps cars out is never used to close that area.

The idea that any open space that is paid for and maintained by public funds would be restricted for use in given times is ultimately just costing the public, the county, and anyone involved limited resources. Let people use the park whenever they want to.

The late closing hour will increase noise around neighboring communities.

The legal uses of unlit park spaces are few after sunset. It's an open invitation to crime in the neighborhood.

The need to add lighting. Add lighting to certain trails. Have them marked for night use.

The noise factor. You can use a lawn mower after 9PM. I don't want to listen loud music and people till 11 PM

The park hours are perfectly sufficient at this time. With the current pressure to limit police protection, is the city seriously going to increase the budget for safety? I don't think so. My suggestion is to not change/increase/expand open hours. Stupid idea, based on the current increase in crime already.

The park hours extend past the park patrols timing. Those two things should align, at a minimum

The park hours now are 1/2 hour before dawn and after dusk. That is perfectly fine for any activities on the lake and the park , summer or winter, regardless of who you are....

The park spaces near my house are not well lit and so people walking or waiting for the bus could be vulnerable to unwanted attention or worse.

The sheriff's office's concerns are valid - more crime does occur under the cover of darkness. While it is true that more people recreating can deter crime, the county should be open to revising the rules to once again close the parks after dark if that recreating is not regularly occurring. Simply put, if this change does create a problem, the last thing the county should do is close its eyes to that problem and pretend everything is okay.

The surrounding neighborhood is having difficulties with noise and amplified sound. There has also been increased fireworks being set off. It occurred every evening the week before and after the 4th of July. The Maplewood Police Department is not responsive to calls.

There could maybe be some evenings during the year when there are evening events with luminaria, etc. Also, because with good snow cover and moonlight, it may not be totally dark. However, on evening openings I think law enforcement should be present.

There have been many times I have wanted to use parks in the winter just after sunset but couldn't. This would let me enjoy the parks year round. By opening up the access though, more people will be using the facilities year round so the paths may need to be cleared when it snows. More people, including myself, will want to use the parks during the dark. Unfortunately many people, including my partner and I, would be nervous to do so with how poorly lit many of the parks are. Police patrols are welcome, but sometimes make me feel like I'm doing something wrong

There is much data to support that late night access only facilitates unwanted and potentially criminal activity.

There is still a problem with water access. Fishing is often a nighttime activity, and one that is supposed to be constitutionally protected in Minnesota for all regardless of income level. Restricting hours of water access points results in limiting night fishing to those wealthy enough to own lakeshore, which is a significant equity issue. If Option A is used for general park hours, water access points specifically should still be made 24/7.

There would be concern around noise if it is open too early or late.

This county park has poor lighting and no assessable walkways from street on lakeside!

This does not address the actual usage concerns; i.e. what people are doing when they are at the park. To address that, clearer rules, more signs, and a public education campaign would be more helpful.

This is not appealing. 11 PM is late for the neighborhood and if Park goers are loud that's a problem.

This just drops real estate value around parks as then people can make more noise longer.

This park closure time encourages people to use the park after sunset. I'd rather the hours be tied to sunrise and sunset.

This would be great

Those hours proposed are too late, and too early. Increased noise and nuisance.

Time is more helpful/strict than Sunrise and Sunset. Solar powered lights.

Too much crime going on.

Too early in the winter and too late in the winter. Too late all year round.

Too late at night year round which will draw inappropriate behavior, problems.

Too late. 5am-9pm

too late. Nothing is appealing about this

Trouble often starts after the sun goes down.

Trust that most people will make good, safe, rational decisions when using park day or night. Open them up to be enjoyed day or night. Broad high tech safety capabilities are affordable to protect the good folks and catch the bad actors. Smart Phone interactions with "reporting" infrastructure. Emergency safe stations tied to "all lights full bright" if emergency indicated. Closed circuit camera monitoring, etc..... More good folks present will translate to less bad actors willing to risk getting caught carrying out crimes on people and or property.

Unfortunately, moving closing to 11 p.m. would likely have significant, negative safety implications

Unfortunately, people will still utilize the parks when they are "closed". That is just the way our society is.

University of Mn is implementing some security stands on campus that allow someone to reach out for help when scared or have an emergent issue. I believe they work as security lights or at least light up. Install something similar to add light as well as increase security with less needed police presence.

Unless there can be a large beefing up of staff, to cover all the after dark activities, extending hours is pointless. There will be constant vandalism in that beautiful park.

Use until 11pm will likely result in disturbing neighboring homes as use of parks is often loud (music, microphones, etc).

Vandalism of vehicles and park structures is already a problem between dawn and dusk.

Very confusing at parks like Spoon Lake. Is boat launch still open outside park hours? Illegal parking and after hours use is rarely enforced.

We highly object to a 24/7 accessibility! It will bring less safety to our Park.especially at this time of less Police presence, so crime can be deterred. Mainly our Safety will be compromised. We believe the existing hours are working and have for 50 years. Why try to fix what's not broken?

We live on a lake. I don't want folks putting their boats onto the lake in the dark and having access to all the docks and boats on the lake. Many parks have residences on the lakes. Who is looking out for our safety????? Of our homes and possessions. We pay big taxes to live on a lake and everyone else gets to enjoy the lake. Why can't we be protected and folks can be at home at DARK???.??

We would much prefer it be a 10 pm cut off. There is already crime in some parking lots - even mid day. Late night cars just add to risks. Between 10-11 it could be prone to teenage hangout without solid judgement and precautions....being targeted by opportunists. 10 pm seems more reasonable compromise.

What about having different hours for summer vs. winter. I think people use the parks during the summer at night much more than in winter. Would patrols be extended to the hours proposed?

What about seasonal hours? Having a park "open" when it's dark during the winter doesn't make sense unless it is well lit. Maybe then have it open till 10pm.

What about snow plowing - people need a place to park and move car

What does "open" mean? When the parking lot gates are opened? When restrooms are available?

What does a person do in the park after dark?

What does park closure mean? How do you keep people from being in the parks during "closed hours" now?

What does set park hours accomplish?

What good ever happens after dark in the parks? Just gives another place for bad things to happen under dark.

What would be purpose of extending the hours to 11pm? Maintain the current hours.

When festival's have bands it would be nice if they could play till midnight

Where are the park hours enforced and against who?

Why 11 pm? Why not 10? Seems reasonable and also safe. Will this be "enforced"? Or is it more of a guideline?

Why are people using the park before or after dark but causing problems for near by residence why are they not home with there families

Why can't this be maybe a 9:00 or maybe 10:00. No reason to be 11:00.

Why do you only patrol until 10pm when the times there are usually crimes/concerns are between 10pm - 5am? Add an gate like an Elm Creek Park reserve that allows those in the park "after hours" to leave but does not allow access after a certain point. This would help on patrolling.

Why does the park need to be open when it's dark, that seems to be asking for trouble

Why limit park hours at all?

Why should it close in the first place? What if I work nights, so I sleep during the day?

Why would you close the park

Will extended hours provide a safer place to deal drugs? Some Young adults have little sense of responsibility and this will give them another place to go astray.

Will lighting be added to some areas of the parks?

Will longer hours encourage prior to use parks for "untoward" behavior of some kind? I don't know, just a question I wonder about.

Will there be physical closures?

Winter hours should be shortened due to shorter daylight hours

Without lights some paths would be dangerous. Maybe light play areas but not wild areas. Have moonlight snowshoe sessions to get people out at dark.

Woodview should then get some kind of lighting, there are safety issues concerning dark parks

Worried that after dark groups may cause trouble when they cannot be seen as easily possible increased patrols after dark would help this so everyone feels safe

Would all-night hours require additional policing hours?

Would be great if some lighting was added.

Would lighting be added for safety? How would the lighting affect wildlife? Would vehicles be safe in parking lots after dark (since there are already issues with break-ins)? Would women feel comfortable visiting after dark, or would this only increase access for men?

would like law enforcement to have means to control unruly groups and individuals - I do not agree that general public use deters crime as stated in premise

Would need to increase park security/ patrols (I'm a woman who likes to run alone. I stopped going to Ramsey county trails alone about two years ago due to increased crime.)

Would noise be a concern for neighbors? I know nothing about crime stats at parks. Would this change be more difficult for law enforcement? Would added County or city staff be necessary?

Would overnight camping be allowed?

Would park patrol hours expand to cover through the new closing time? With no current physical barrier to entry/exit, what is the penalty for being in the park or on the trails after the posted hours? It seems the posted hours set an expectation of the most appropriate time to use the park based on the facilities available. I would expect there would soon after be a demand for additional lighting for parking lots, shelters, restrooms, etc. for those expanded hours. What would the cost be to upgrade and maintain the expanded lighting.

Would Ramsey County sheriffs exams their patrol hours?

Would this increase crime in the park?

You are just asking for trouble if you have people in the parks much after dark.

your staff of parks and directors of parks no doubt are predominantly white or even if POC behave to white ways, the caucasian definition of life as if it were better and best.... its not

Parking a car overnight in the parking lot?

Parks aren't good for stargazing.

More crimes happen after dark.

Concerned about safety.

Where will people go to the bathroom?

Who will patrol?

How about 5 am to 9 pm

safety of being in the park after dark

will there be patrols out over night if open 24/7?

has there been any study as to if folks actually would use more after hours? (will we need to put more resources into park maintenance)

I can see the value of being open 24 hours for certain populations to access easier. However, it would take more resources to patrol and monitor.

Worried about enforcement of hours.

lack of proper lighting for darker times - safety related concerns

Still blocks nighttime fishing for non-lakeshore-owners, since Ramsey County Parks Department controls nearly all access to lakes in the county.

What happens when someone stays out later than the current park hours?

Where do people go to the bathroom later?

Overnight parking such as RVs?

Will bathrooms be available during this time as well?

Noise related issues

Lots of things happening under the cover of the darkness especially during winter months with less day light.

Lack of lighting on the trails

I assume with opening up the hours to be earlier and later that more services will be provided. (I.E. plowing paths)

Very important to have clear, understandable signage so that park users won't get in "trouble" for doing something they didn't know was wrong.

I second the clear and concise signage!

Can Ramsey County invest in more lighting, blue phones, etc?

A lot of folks want the ability for star gazing or watching meteor showers and parks being closed make it impossible.

Would there need to be parks staff or law enforcement enforcing this?

Still prohibits late-night green space use for those that don't own their own green space.

Park closure enforcement still has a lot of racial disparities 24/7 would eliminate that.

Safety concerns with 24/7 hours

Do we actually have resources to enforce hours? Seems ticky-tack.

11pm seems really late... both in the winter and the summer. 10pm seems more reasonable. As someone who lives near parks, 10pm would be appreciated.

Boating fishing and water skiing in the dark is NOT a safe activity.

Civilians and a police patrol do not deter criminal activity now, how could it deter that type of activity under this proposal? As a citizen I am not in the parks anyway between 11 PM and 6 AM, and if I lived near a park known for criminal activity I for sure would not be! This does not protect the parks or the people living near them. I am not your police force. Suggested solution - keep patrols they way they are and find another way to reduce costs.

dark hours may present increase in attacks on those using the trail

How will you enforce these hours? A rule without enforcement is just a suggestion!

Later hours would give more people to get drunk at the parks and drive hazardously through the neighborhood.
Prohibit alcohol use in the park

Limit the hours to 30 minutes before and after sun rise and sun set.

Need cameras in the lots and prosecution of people breaking into cars.

Too late. Latest sunset is around 9 p.m. How many people have asked for this change?

Park Hours Option B - What's appealing about this?

Option B: Eliminating park hours, making them accessible 24/7.

What's appealing about this?

:-/ No one has to wonder what hours are.

(1am-5am) seems ripe for nuisance.

1: Install better lighting; 2: Installation of a Kiosk with enhanced camera visibility for individuals to use to report a crime that connects to Ramsey county 9-1-1 central.

24/7 access probably too hard to patrol. Seems likely to result in more crime in park areas, during dark hours.

24/7 hours means more use of the park by the public without fear of -useless- punishment for using a public space. It belongs to the people, let the people make use of it.

24/7 would promote or at least not deter the use of the parks for use while neighboring homes are sleeping, night swimming which isn't safe, and a whole list of other actions that you wouldn't tell your granny about the next day.

A lot of people travel in their vehicles. This gives them a safe place to stop for the night. And note that most of these people are extremely self-conscious about keeping the place clean.

A place to pull over and rest for those of us that drive at night

A very interesting approach.

Ability for people to exercise and commute at times that work for them.

Ability to recreate at any hour lawfully.

Ability to walk or ski after work in the winter.

able to run/walk/bike at all hours, no need to have a permit. allows all different shifts of employees to utilize the park systems

absolutely 24x7x365 these are public spaces the public already pays to occupy these spaces PARKS ARE PLACES PEOPLE CAN SING AND PLAY AND PRAY WHILE SOCIAL DISTANCING

Absolutely NOTHING appealing about this.

Absolutely NOTHING is appealing about this. Homeless will move in, and it will become an RV Park the first day this goes into law. NO WAY as a tax payer do I want this

Absolutely nothing is appealing about this. I reside next to Long Lake Regional Park, and I have no interest in the park being 24/7 access.

absolutely nothing!

Absolutely nothing!

Absolutely nothing! Please don't

Absolutely nothing!! Who really needs to be in the park after dark & into the night?? Ridiculous!!

Absolutely NOTHING!!! There is no sane reason to have the park open 24/7. There are far too many things that can go wrong with this option. My closest park, Tony Schmidt, has no lights. At least seeing cars or people in the middle of the night would be reason to be investigated by law enforcement.

Absolutely nothing.

Absolutely nothing.

ABSOLUTELY NOTHING.

Absolutely nothing.

Absolutely nothing. Gives the people who are already violating the hours to do even more. Langton Lake Park has drastically changed in the last several years. I would hate to be the people living close to the parks and have to deal with all night illegal activities. I understand there are people who would use the parks for "good", but also giving the people that do bad even more opportunities to do bad things. I think this is a huge mistake to allow.

Absolutely nothing. Terrible idea.

Access at any time Day or night gives people with unusual work hours the ability to use the parks.

Access whenever wanted

Accessibility for all regardless of work schedules, short winter days, etc.

Additional opportunities for stargazing, owling, nighttime skiing, etc. Increased access during winter and shoulder seasons. Reduced confusion, as opening/closing times would remain consistent.

All for complete accessibility.

Allow access for any user at any time. Useful for 2nd and 3rd shift employees.

Allows for late night/early morning usage, e.g. watching meteor showers

Allows for more flexibility if you want to visit the park for exercise earlier or late. Even allows for more time to enjoy leisure activities outdoors with family/friends.

Allows for nighttime rituals such as sacrifices

Allows for use of the parks at anytime. Doesn't give law enforcement probable cause to interact with citizens that aren't doing anything illegal.

Allows individuals to travel via park trails at all hours.

Allows park access and use for all regardless of work hours etc. May reduce overnight illegal use due to possibility of more legal users etc.

Allows these public lands to be used by the public, eliminates a reason to harass houseless neighbors, allows off hours recreational use.

Allows use any time is helpful for citizens, especially in winter when daylight is shorter. Allows commuting

Alongside the things mentioned in Option A, there are valuable things to be done and studied in nature (insect/animal life, stars, etc.) that are only possible at night.

Also makes park more accessible to those who do not work classic 9-5 shift.

Always accessible.

always open, but then what is the purpose of the park?

Anyone can access

Anyone can go to the park anytime they want or what fits their schedule.

Are you kidding!?! CRIME, CRIME, CRIME. DRUGS, DRUGS, DRUGS. SEX, SEX, SEX. WHO KNOWS?!?!

As a local fisherman it would be nice to be able on the lake a little longer or earlier for night time fishing.

As a retired police officer, I encountered many illegal acts (sexual, drug use to name a couple) as early as 10:00 pm going on in parks even now...opening up the park for even more hours would make the situation more of a problem...instead of having an officer being able to just do a "drive-through of these areas, your proposed time change would take up even MORE of a deputy's time.

As an amateur astronomer who participates in educating other amateur astronomers, this would provide several idea urban locations for us to set up our telescopes and see night sky objects close to home with a very short ride home at 3 or 4am. Having parks open all night might be useful for supporting any urban environmental investigations into nocturnal night life.

As with before, I think this eliminates the issue of worries about access for people with non-standard schedules.

Availability for people regardless of their work schedule.

Available to all persons regardless of their work hours

Bad idea

Bad idea. The parking lots will be full of people living in their cars.

Being able to camp out? As long as no one is harming the park, themselves or others, it gives people the opportunity to go on a midnight or 4am walk.

Being able to freely use parks and not having to worry about whether they are open and accessible for use.

Being able to park and walk

Being able to stargaze in the middle of the night, or camp?

Best option. Star gazing, events happen at all hours

Better access

Big mistake. See some of the concerns above.

Boat launches specifically should be 24/7, for night fishing, meteor watching, etc. as an equity issue allowing the public the same access as those wealthy enough to own lakeshore. Elsewhere the DNR operates many boat launches 24/7, but within Ramsey County nearly all are operated by the county.

Broader access to residents.

Can go anytime

Can recreate any time desired. Great for folks who may not work regular hours or just want to use the parks whenever.

Celestial events occur at all hours

Consistency and objectiveness are ideal instead of questioning when sunrise and sunset it. Most people in parks late or early do no harm, and putting arbitrary time limits only provides an opportunity for police to negatively interact with citizens.

Consistency. Allows people even more freedom to decide for themselves how safe they feel in various lighting situations. Sometimes people just need to go for a walk. Let people choose their own safety and risk comfort levels.

Convenience. Most people probably won't change their use practices much as a result due to things like natural light, sleep hours, etc.

Could allow camping?

Could lead to safety concerns

Could legally be there at any time

criminal activity is more likely in parks in the middle of the night, can be hard to patrol and monitor.

Cuts out all confusion, which I love! Also, if I'm at a park toward the end of hours, I always stress out about whether the entrance will get blocked and I'll be stuck if I stay late. This would eliminate that worry.

Decriminalizes something that shouldn't be criminal, simply being in a park. Gives police less pretext for harassing black people and people of color in the parks.

Decriminalizes use of park trail system during overnight hours for people who rely on them to bike/walk to work.

Do not eliminate park hours

Doesn't really matter with no enforcement unless you find parks being used by people wanting to tent/spend the night

Dog walking?

Don't have to think about it. Much more accessible but no rules feels like crazy talk!

Don't need to worry about when to leave the park.

Don't need to enforce people using it when it's convenient.

Don't see the value in this, safety concerns

Drugs and thugs will take over the parks.

Ease of enforcement

easier to remember, but please don't do it. Vandalism comes next.

Easy to enforce.

Easy to enforce...as in it doesn't have to be enforced...

Easy to remember, allows for park usage for people with off schedules

Easy. No enforcement needed.

Eliminates any confusion and limits opportunities for the police to harass people just using the park.

Eliminates discriminatory/selective enforcement, makes more accessible to people with different schedules.

Eliminates rules and allows everyone access to the park whenever they want.

Eliminates the opportunity to fine people that aren't causing any harm.

Eliminates time-based enforcement needs. Accommodates people working odd shifts.

Eliminating park hours makes it more difficult to ask people to leave if they are making noise or other disturbances.

Equal opportunity use for a resource we all pay for

Equal use for those who work alternative hours

Even less, get ready for homeless encampment. We don't want to become minneapolis.

Even more accessibility to the public.

Everyone can access the park regardless of their work schedule.

Everyone can use the parks regardless of their work schedules

everyone has different schedules, and i am still not really sure what "hours" mean for a park. lets make them accessible 24hrs a day, and see what happens.

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything.

Extra hours to hang out with others outside, especially during COVID and other periods when it's not safe to gather inside with a group of people.

Extremely opposed. Do not need people in there all night. Too late at night, need quit time past 10

Fair use by everyone is possible, regardless of work schedule.

Flexibility

Flexibility for park use

flexible use

Focus on enforcement of issues or behavior, not merely being present in a public park after hours.

For fishing or leisure dog walking yes. But if out acting strange no

For me, personally, nothing. My only objection would be possible noise issues.

For the regional trails it would consistent with sidewalks and roads as explicitly accessible for transportation at all times.

Freedom

Freedom !

Freedom to use regardless of personal/time of year influences. Everyone makes their own choices as to safety. People that are doing things of concern are not going to heed the existing rules anyway.

Frees up law enforcement

Friendly for stargazing or bringing your telescope. Maybe deter late night crime?

Full access to the parks

Get ready for homeless encampment. We don't want to look like Minneapolis.

gets more people outside

Good for those with alternate/ 2nd shift schedules. Shifts enforcement to focus on behavior vs presence.

Great

Great for homeless people to gather

Great idea! (SEE ABOVE). Don't lock the good folks out of using the parks at night. COOL TEMPS, COOL SKIES. TRANQUIL TIMES. HEALING TIMES. Penalize and if appropriate lock up the bad actors.

Greatly reduces need to chase after hour users out of parks

I believe we all need boundaries

I can think of no one who would find this appealing except criminals or people wanting to use the park for nefarious activities (drugs, prostitution, underage drinking, gang activity, etc.) . It is totally stupid. See above. Totally unsafe-especially for women or anyone seen as vulnerable.

I could go for a walk anytime of day or night.

I do not disagree, I think park spaces could be available for all at anytime

I do not like this option

I do not see reason why anyone needs to be in the park in the middle of the night

I don;t know that this is a good idea with the amount of crime we have in our city. I think there needs to be some governance.

I don't find this option appealing.

I don't love it. I'm not sure why people would need to access parks in the middle of the night other than for illicit reasons.

I don't think this is the best answer, although park trails are often used by commuters so allowing them to "pass through"on a trail should be allowed

I don't find this option appealing

I don't find this particularly appealing.

I don't know why anyone would need to use a park in the middle of the night

I don't see a need for this as expanded hours should accommodate varied schedules and lifestyles.

I don't see anything appealing about this. Anyone that needs to be in a park past 11 pm isn't there to use the park for what it was intended to be or offer.

I don't see anything appealing, personally.

I don't think it is.

I feel it's important for people's health to have a safe place to visit nature any time of the day. Some people work all day, some people prefer the night.

I guess folks could camp/live there. Or use parks all the time.

I guess it could be safer at night if parks patrolled.

I guess just like any business, they have hours. I don't see why 24/7 is necessary. But I also do not oppose it.

I have actually spent some time enjoying Loring Park during late night hours, living at apartments accross- late night walking was common.

I have mixed feelings about this. In a way, I think it would be great to be able to use a park anytime. Sometimes you just want to go to a place where you can look at the stars, where there are less lights. On the other hand, I would have to feel safe enough to be there after dark. If there are illegal things happening in the park late a night, and I am there just trying to enjoy the park - I would feel very unsafe.

I have never understood park hours. They discriminate against people who work the night shift. If some night visitors are causing issues, the appropriate thing to do is to regulate/enforce the specific issue that these visitors are causing, not punish everyone for the actions of a few. Thank you for considering making them accessible 24/7. I recognize this is unusual for parks and hope that Ramsey County is willing to take this step to be one of the first in the nation to offer more freedom of movement and recreation.

I like geocaching at night and night caches. Limited parks for this could be good

I like the idea of being able to access places for all the different t nature opportunities throughout the 24hour day

I like the idea of folks being able to use the park during any time of day, regardless of whether there is daylight. I have certainly gone on night walks before and find them lovely!

I like this in theory, but feel like it might result in parks becoming more unsafe.

I like this option more. Those who would do anything nefarious after hours would do so anyways, despite the open and close times. I am a night owl as is my spouse, and there are times that we are out walking and biking after 11pm and before 5am during the spring-fall. As our winters get milder too, those spans will increase.

I love nighttime walking and being outside at night and stargazing, and parks let me be more in nature than city sidewalks, especially because the city streets and my small yard are so brightly lit (even when all my property lights are off). I really miss living in a place where I could easily do that legally, especially with my kids. And every time I'm out close to the end of park hours, I get scared of being arrested or cited (I try to follow the law, but sometimes walking back takes longer than I thought, plus I'm not always sure what time is considered sunset or sunrise). It's also helpful to people who do shift work.

I love this idea. So many people work hours that don't easily work with the current hours.

I love walking at night in the woods.

I mean, why not?

I probably wouldn't make use of this.

I really do not see the point in this at all.

I really don't see anything wrong with this. Once again, not everyone has a daytime work schedule and should be able to enjoy parks without feeling like they're going to be stopped by the cops. If crime is a concern for people, it's going to happen whether the parks are open or not.

I really like this idea because as a resident very close to a Regional Park I sometimes find myself there outside of the typical sunrise/sunset times in order to accommodate work/parenting needs. It certainly would be equitable.

I see limited appeal to having the parks accessible 24 hours a day.

I think city parks should be open anytime as long as the people follow the other rules (noise ordinance, curfews etc).

I think this is a poor idea.

I work really weird hours. I live by Crosby park and I wish I could walk at more hours. I have a headlamp for this... but police are pretty active (like yay) so I've been warned twice and could no longer enjoy my after work walks.

I would be concerned, people would start camping over night in our parks

I would enjoy night fishing from fishing piers.

I would like this for star gazing since good viewing happens well after sunset.

I would not like this, please leave at 10pm

I'd like to hear from staff how this might impact parks and particularly teen park users and people who are struggling with housing. With the proper measures the parks could be a safe place for all citizens, young, poor, rich and white. What are other examples: Finland, Argentina, etc.?

I'm a night owl and would love to freely walk a park regardless of time of day.

I'm fully behind this option. Park hours should not be limited at all. Parks should be open around the clock -- provided that visitors follow the set rules...

I'm not sure this is completely necessary. Maybe if someone works weird hours and needs to be out there at 4am with a headlamp to get their walk/run in, but are they really going to get a citation for that? I can't imagine kids playing at a playground outside 5 a.m. - 11pm. Maybe this is just my ignorance talking, but this might encourage people camping in the parks or leaving cars in parking lots overnight.

If open 24 hours people that work odd shifts can enjoy the parks

If parks are not physically blocked, the reality is that they are available 24/7 so this aligns with that idea. I am not in favor.

If they're already accessible 24/7, might as well make the hours match.

If you aren't going to use physical barriers to enforce specific use hours then why have a closed time? You not closed.

If you have hours of operation it makes it seem like they are patrolled when they are not open. If you have 24/7 then it seems like a free for all.

Improves accessibility, especially in winter months.

In many cases for me "parks" and "trails" are actually "transportation", and while some public transportation does shut down at night, it's also why I can't use that public transportation at that time. Closing down access to trails or through ways in parks at night, any time of night, to pedestrians or bicyclists who may feel safer not competing with cars for space on roads not designed for the safety of pedestrians or bicycles particularly in the dark, is a silly notion rooted fallacy that cars are the only viable mode of transportation after a certain time of night. Keep the parks open 24/7 because the "parks" particularly when the "parks" are trails, or the trails are in a park, and provide a safer way to travel for those who are traveling.

In many ways, parks are already 'open' 24/7-- foot traffic before and after current hours exists (not a ton, but some) increase usage for all; good use of tax \$

is good common sense

Is there any enforcement anyway?

It allows for gatherings to be later, good for scary stories around a bonfire, or for people who are nocturnal.

It allows the Como firepits to be used at hours that people typically have fires. It closes way too early for that purpose now. It allows people to go on a quiet walk. You could even romanticize it - a quiet walk with the stars out is much more appealing than a day walk dodging strollers and dogs.

It can be nice to have them accessible 24/7 there's been times where I need to park my car and take a nap or sleep because of domestic abuse issues.

It can be nice to stop by a park "after hours" just to unwind or relax; but it makes it hard to control malfeasance.

It could be nice.

It does not appeal to me.

It eliminates pointless rules. If people are going to do illegal things in parks, they probably don't care what the park hours are.

It gives 2nd and 3rd shift workers more opportunity to visit. A midnight walk in the snow is amazing.

It is good to have bike commuter trails open 24/7 (if someone wants to bike home from a bar at 2 am, it seems fine for them to be on the trail), not even sure Battle Creek has commuter biking though.

It is not appealing.

It is not. Crime has already increased with limited hours.

It makes the parks more accessible.

It prevents people who have nowhere to go from getting in trouble for being in the parks outside of their hours. That leaves more time for the park patrol to do other tasks.

It seems people do this anyway since the parks aren't really ever closed with a gate. Maybe I'm wrong but there's probably some people that exercise in the parks before 5am.

It would allow for things like stargazing and night skiing, which are great. It would also eliminate the need for different rules for different facilities.

It would allow me to run and train for endurance events that can stretch up to 38 hours. Being able to train on park paths overnight helps to keep me from getting run over by cars on roads.

It would fit all schedules

It would make parks more accessible

It would not be safe and not able to be monitored.

It's more equitable to people who work during the day and would like access to outdoor space very early in the morning or very late at night.

It's never closed, one less rule to have to enforce, more people can use the park.

it's not appealing to me. they should close overnight.

It's simple. There's no unnecessary rules that people can use to target someone minding their own business. People would be able to enjoy nocturnal wildlife or stargazing or whatever other nighttime activities one might want to do in nature. Crimes that actually harm people would still be illegal and at least you wouldn't have to worry that reporting such a thing would get you in trouble for violating Park hours.

It's less appealing than the 11pm close

It's nice to have county parks to go to to watch the stars or see the moon. Living in the city it can be hard to get the darkness and tranquility of the country. It's also good because people won't be targeted for being in the park at 11:01. Parks are a haven and should be open as much as possible. It also allows for people to participate in night activities like moonlight snow shoeing, early morning fishing, etc.

It's not appealing.

It's not.

It's not.

It's not. Give an inch and they'll take a mile.

Knowing that a public place is always open to the public. Moonlit canoe rides come to mind.

Legitimate park use is not criminalized just because it is after hours. Suburb police departments can't ticket in parking lots during legitimate park use.

Less need for enforcement of park hours.

Less time/energy is spent on rule enforcement

Let's people that work second shift get out and fish if they want

Limitless access to a publicly funded resource

Makes it really easy for everyone

Makes me wonder if there is already a lot of crime happening during the current parks closed hours now (do you have data to zdgmhgō If so - why? I think more drug deals would happen if open at night in parks or if drugs sales can't happen then the drug sale will still happen elsewhere. How about organized activities later to deter criminal or will that put innocent people in more harms way because criminals don't care it's there pattern anyway. What attracts and detracts criminal activity?

Makes the parks totally available for everyone. Not everyone works days and sleeps nights.

Makes them more accessible to everyone.

Makes things simple if parks can't physically close

Many people do not have access to any kind of green space due to multi-family or apartment housing, making the park accessible 24/7 allows for use whenever suits a person's schedule. AND it makes it so parks can be used as a walking route between multiple destinations.

May be okay for a city park with lights and constant police patrol.

Maybe a limit on number of total hours before you have to move

Maybe get people off the streets but worried about gangs

Maybe SOME could be open 24 hours. Keep them well lit, and with lights and maybe phone chargers - it could be a place for people to gather no matter what time it is.

moonlit walks permitted

More access

More flexible?

More horrifying

More people can use parks, moonlit walks are possible

More post-sunset time in winter; an opportunity to use parks prior to work, for the very early risers.

More potential for destruction of the parks or less savory activities .

Most open. Love this option

My response is the same but I prefer this option as it allows more freedom for everyone to use the park. It allows for setup and usage of a park before an event. It also allows those who work non standard hours time to use the park that is convenient for them.

n/a

Nature at all hours.

Nature shouldn't close.

Never against the law to peacefully use the parks

Nice for some but also could be a place for crime. I wouldn't feel safe being in the park after hours

Night hikes/shoes

Night time walks would be ok

Nightfishing

No

No

NO

no

no

No

no confusion

No confusion at all; they are always open

No crime to be in park after hours.

No curfew to enforce. Park available for use by people who work odd times of day.

No need for enforcement

No need to be 24/7, but it need 10/7.

No need to remember any times

No need to spend resources on enforcing hours, greater availability to all

No one is ever kicked out of the park

No restrictions

no restrictions would allow everyone to recreate regardless of time.

No restrictions, but there are certainly concerns about nighttime activities. I am not in favor of this option.

No rules to enforce or forget about

No way. Super bad idea. Will become a party and a drug zone. A place for intimacy!!

No worries about it being closed.

No worrying about time at all.

No, don't need people in the parks in the middle of the night. Encouraging homeless to live there.

No!

No!

NO!

No.

No. Too much resources. How much does this happens anyways? I mean, how many people are sad because they can't be in the parks at 3 am? Also, increased hours in the evening means increased surveillance. It's a waste of resources.

No. Vagrants

None

None

None. There is already a lot of noise and loud parties after hours at another beach just down the street. Don't encourage more bad behavior.

Not

Not a good idea

Not a good idea

Not appealing

not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing as a resident near Bucher.

Not appealing asking for trouble

NOT appealing at all having open times 24/7

Not appealing at all. Bathrooms are closed at night? Where will people relieve themselves? In my yard? What's to prevent someone from sleeping in their car all night in the parking lot? No one needs to be at the park until wee hours of the night.

Not appealing to me

Not appealing, parks shouldn't be open overnight

Not appealing.

Not appealing. Concerned about safety and criminal activity.

Not appealing. Give nature a rest from humans.

not appealing. No need for parks to have 24 7 us.

Not appealing. Too much opening to possible vandalism

not at all appealing

Not comfortable with this

Not everyone has a 1st shift schedule.

Not everyone is a 9-5er

Not everyone is able to use parks during the specified hours. They are outside, open and public areas and works be accessible and usable to every resident at any time.

Not everyone works 9am-5pm. Some are very early risers. Some are non-criminal night owls.

Not having to think about hours at all

Not much

Not much

not much

Not much - - too wide open and encouraging for mischief

Not much good would happen in a park in the middle of the night.

not much possible problems with homeless population

not much, i dont need to use the park at midnight or 3am usually.

Not much.

Not much.

Not much.

Not much.

Not much.

Not much. I don't really see why people would want to go to a park in the dark.

Not much. You'll get overnight camping in facilities not designed for them.

Not needed

Not preferred - may attract crime

Not smart would have more crime and police calls...

Not wasting money having officers closing gates

Not.

Nothin. Terrible idea

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

NOTHING

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing - dumber then the above proposal to go to 11:00 pm.

Nothing - just invites loitering and trouble.

Nothing - that only encourages bad behavior

nothing ----it makes no sense unless you want to encourage crime & vandalism!! my vote is against keeping parks open 24/7

Nothing -this is a bad option

Nothing at all

Nothing at all - as a woman who loved utilizing our parks and now avoids them almost entirely, well...

Nothing at all.

Nothing at all. Very dangerous idea.

nothing but trouble

Nothing good!

Nothing good.

Nothing I can think of. Seems to open to more unappealing activity overnight

Nothing is appealing

Nothing is appealing

Nothing is appealing - Not much good happens after midnight - especially under the cover of darkness!

Nothing is appealing about a park being open 24/7.

Nothing is appealing about these hours.

Nothing is appealing about this!

NOTHING IS APPEALING ABOUT THIS! It will embolden people to trash the parks after dark because there will be fewer users around to observe and prevent damage. The parks will become campgrounds without established bathrooms and places for refuse to be dumped.

Nothing is appealing about this.

Nothing is appealing about this.

Nothing is appealing about this.

Nothing is appealing about this. I believe that this could allow for overnight, sleeping use. Of course this is not allowed anyway, but if people can be in the park over night then they could more easily use that as an excuse to sleep there. Langton Lake has a tent area and i dont want that to happen in tony schmitt

Nothing is appealing about this. If it is 24/7, campground registration would be helpful

Nothing is appealing because this encourages late activity close to our neighborhood where we already had a major theft a few weeks ago. People should be heading home at 10:00 pm. I believe this time frame allows time to enjoy the park safely, but would curtail more problems which tend to happen late at night.

Nothing is appealing to this option.

Nothing is appealing! Nothing!

Nothing is appealing. The park will get vandalized. Look at other cities and it will only be a matter of time before the parks are truly unsafe.

Nothing is good about 24/7

Nothing is reasonably appealing about 24/7 hours

NOTHING just increases the opportunities for crime and illegal activities. Increased cost of sheriff patrols

NOTHING NOTHING NOTHING except for ppl who are up to no good (totally does increase under cover of darkness)
CITIZEN SAFETY FIRST should be your #1 PRIORITY not the popular opinion.

Nothing that I see and encourages use for questionable activities at some hours that would require police activity.

nothing to me

Nothing to me personally

Nothing to me, but maybe people who work odd hours would appreciate it

Nothing unless dogs could be walked (perhaps permits could be sold) for protection.

Nothing unless you intend a specific park to be used for camping.

Nothing-offers opportunity for increased crime- encourages encampment

Nothing, and I don't recommend it. In my opinion, the current hours are best.

Nothing, but I'm sure the drug dealers and prostitutes will like having 24/7 access.

Nothing, It could bring in the homeless.

Nothing, it's not a campground. And it gives more people an excuse to be vagrants.

nothing, no need to have parks open during all hours and there is higher likelihood of crime is open all night

Nothing, no reason to be in a park in middle of night.

Nothing, Parks should be closed when it is dark outside. Too much mischief occurs when the sun goes down.

Nothing, people live by the park and need hours that are quiet and expected to be quiet so they can sleep

Nothing, please see above.

Nothing, terrible idea.

Nothing, the parks are still home to many woodland creatures that share our many parks and they are for the most part nocturnal, let them have their time.

Nothing, there will be vandalism and increased crime

Nothing, this invites crime

Nothing, this invites trouble in the wee hours of the morning.

Nothing, unless camping

Nothing; I would like to think that parks are public places and therefore should be available at all times. But the reality is that a lot of bad things happen in the dark, and the city's liability increases considerably with wide open accessibility.

Nothing!

Nothing!

Nothing!

Nothing!

Nothing!

Nothing!

Nothing!

Nothing! 24 hour open accessibility with no penalty and no lighting only encourages folks not using the park for its intended purposes to congregate after dark.

Nothing! I live near Tony Schmidt Park. Many times there are firecrackers going off until midnight with the current hours. Who needs firecrackers all night? There is enough garbage left with current hours. If people would keep the area clean, extending the hours might work.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

NOTHING.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Late night / early morning will be nothing but drugs, sex, and homeless folks.

Nothing. As noted above and I tell my kids, nothing good happens after 9 pm. There is no reason to be in a park at dark. We already have drug dealing, human trafficking and underage drinking in our parks—we should not encourage more of it.

Nothing. Bad idea.

Nothing. Clearly nothing. If this is the case you have zero ground to stand on if you have unwanted activities going on at midnight. Safety of the people is your number one priority. You have lost your priorities.

Nothing. I have been in parks when criminal activity has been taking place in daylight (breaking into cars and drug dealing)

Nothing. If someone is going to be in a park, that is unlit, from 11pm-5am, there is a very high chance they are doing something that they should not be.

Nothing. Invites late night problems

Nothing. It invites issues in the overnight hours.

Nothing. It may be well intentioned and politically correct, but it's chaos. Nighttime parties, homeless encampments, vandalism, negative effect on neighbors, dangerous in parks where water or ponds are present.

Nothing. It would invite people to establish de facto residences on park property. This has been tried in numerous locations and always results in negative consequences for local citizens.

Nothing. It would open the door for campers

Nothing. Lake JoHanna is a very small lake and close to a high metropolitan area. Increasing hours for this lake will highly increase boat traffic and decreasing safety. Too many boats, jet skis, and recreation activity is just dangerous for a lake of this small size. Bad idea, the current hour restrictions are in place to prevent accidents, and are working well. Many people already who use this lake currently don't have any idea that there are restrictions. How is increasing the hours to 24/7 going to help? Ridiculous, not necessary, and seriously UNSAFE!

Nothing. Not only is this a bad idea, it is downright dangerous and places a huge burden on city resources.

Nothing. Nothing at all. Removes the ability for any and all enforcement.

Nothing. Nothing good comes from the park being open in the middle of the night.

Nothing. People don't go to parks at night unless they are causing trouble.

Nothing. Please don't.

Nothing. Please tell me what is appealing about this.

Nothing. Sleeping people are harmless but it also invites destruction, increased noise complaints, more policing and affects neighboring homes.

Nothing. Sorry. I think this is a very bad idea. I good reason to be in the. Park after dark. If someone wanted to do it, perhaps you could grant access.

Nothing. Sounds like a horrible idea.

Nothing. The level of disrespect for public spaces is appalling and an open door policy invites problems.

Nothing. The natural beauty of parks I go to need a break from excessive foot travel, etc.

Nothing. The worst idea ever.

Nothing. There isn't a need for anyone to be in the park overnight. There would likely be people who decide they would like to camp in the park, or be there at odd times of the day causing disruptions to those who live in the area.

Nothing. They will be one homeless camps and have to be policed, taking officers off the streets.

Nothing. This is a bad choice.

Nothing. This is a disguised plan to make every county park into a cheap homeless shelter.

Nothing. This is a really bad idea.

Nothing. This is a really bad idea.

Nothing. This is not a great idea. The Woodview parking lot is already home to used needles and condoms as well as dumping and random garbage and damage left over night and you are just encouraging more destruction. Who needs to be in a park overnight? That's license for a new homeless encampment

Nothing. This option is ridiculous!

Nothing. Too many juveniles will be in the parks raising hell

Nothing. Unless you want drunks and fights breaking out in the parks.

Nothing. We have enough problems with bad people gathering in mccarrons lake parking lots late at night and deputies could not make them leave.

Nothing. We need to be practical, and acknowledge resource concerns. 24/7 would require more safety patrols because anyone can get hurt during a fall or suffer a medical incident while out and about. Closing parks at 11P gives the people who live next to parks peace of mind that they can expect quiet during the over night hours.

Nothing. What kind of "recreating" takes place in the dead of night?

Nothing. Wildlife need a break.

Nothing...

Nothing... What good goes on in the park after 11pm. This is just going to cause issues and bother residents.

Nothing....if it is dark, there is nothing productive on the lake or park. Do you have or have had teenagers and college age kids. Nothing good happens after dark

Now I see that this is being talked about. Why not try it? Why assume the worst about things bad happening under the cover of darkness? Let the worst of humans prove this or the best of humans disprove this. Believe in the goodness of people and try this out.

Only appeal seems to me to be for criminals of any age, gender, race, nationality !!!!

Open spaces are difficult to enforce: no reason undeveloped areas need to be closed for things like stargazing, etc.

Open to everyone, whenever they want to use the park.

Open use to everyone at every hour. Less work for park patrols so they could focus on more things at night

opening regional trails, because they are part of the transportation system

Park is easier to use for people who cannot sleep or work weird shifts?

Park users will not have to worry about the park hours.

Parks accessible whenever people have time, including for stargazers, night walkers, people who work night shifts.

Parks are accessible 24/7 to have "hours" seems unconnected to reality.

Parks are always accessible, which makes sense; why shouldn't they be?

Parks are always available for use for everyone.

Parks are public spaces and should be available at all times.

Parks should be available at all times.

Parks should be available to anyone at anytime

People can enjoy the parks no matter the time of day!

People can get out whenever they want.

People can live and camp at the park.

People could use public space anytime.

people don't pay attention to hours anyway

People ignore the posted hours anyway so it's just a waste of space on the sign.

People who work 3rd shift have access to parks during their off hours

People who work non-standard shifts have access

People with alternative work hours can still walk the dog and get exercise

People with irregular schedules can use the park?

People's work schedules aren't becoming less fixed and having options for recreation on a 24/7 basis would allow more people to have access to the parks

Per above

Personally I have an early work day, and would like the option to use the parks early

Personally, do not need extended hours.

Please do not do this without requiring an overnite permit. I believe this would encourage lawlessness in the parks in the dark.

Please for homeless to sleep

Potential for noise. I live near the Bald Eagle park and would like a quiet time in the park land.

Probably would attract homeless

Reducing crowds

Removes the need for Ramsey County and local police to police closed parks. My husband and I were questioned by a local officer because we were looking for a comet 30 minutes after sunset. That was a waste of his time.

Removes unenforceable rules about being in the park late at night.

Resources of the park are available to use 24/7, no worrying about if I'm breaking any rules by using the trails at night. Helpful especially if I want to bike to the Amtrak train as I don't have to worry about if it arrives late.

RIDICULOUS!!

Same as above. Expanded access for all county residents, no matter what time of day they chose to recreate, exercise, walk pets...

Same as above. FYI, I am working with the Met Council and Wilder Foundation to survey visitors in 122 parks across the 7-county metro area this summer. Park hours vary, but not one single person has said anything about expanding hours.

See above. Also, park paths are often the safest for commuters. Having them inaccessible when needed is problematic

See question #1.

Seems democratic.

shady people may camp at the park

Shift workers have greater access on their schedule.

Simple and clear

Simple and everyone using the park is "legal."

Simple to understand. Also, Allows use after dark through the fall/winter when sunset is so early.

since parks are publicly funded, it makes sense that they should be open at all hours of the day - also allows for overnight activities where possible.

Some people use the park 24/7, even when it's open. It seems as though non-white people are questioned about their purpose, while white joggers are mostly ignored during "closed" hours. This eliminates that type of profiling.

Some people who work different shifts may want to use the park at different hours than others. It may necessitate more police patrols though.

Someone doing night photography might appreciate this. However, I'd question the safety.

Sounds wonderful but could easily be abused. Noise and Safety would be a concern. Want to hear more from cities that have implemented and their experience.

Stops police harassment

Super straightforward! Some neighborhoods with younger population may use facilities later in the evening or super early morning.

T

Technically more convenient

Tent camping, drugs, crime, noise for any close by neighbors, light pollution (car lights shining into homes), there are no good logical reasons to leave them open 24 hrs

The accessibility

The extended hours would make it easier for illegal activities (e.g. drug deals) to occur under the cover of darkness. This would be good for drug dealers and their customers.

The only benefit I see to having parks open 24 hours is the opportunity to visit them in the middle of the night for astronomy. However, due to the enormous amount of light pollution in Ramsey County, this seems to be a moot point.

The opportunity to sit or walk in a quiet park at any time is appealing

The option to have something to do late at night when others are sleeping and you aren't put can't sleep.

The park is always available to anyone who wants to use it

The parks would be available to those who work non-traditional hours.

Then rule-following folks could get as much park use as non-rule-following folks.

There are people that like to visit parks at all times. They should be allowed to do so regardless of the time of day/night

There is nothing appealing about this.

There really should be no open or closed park hours in Ramsey county (or anywhere in the world). This is open and public land so people should have, and really actually do, the freedom to be on it whenever they want. Park patrol is a huge waste of money because the probability of them catching anyone in a criminal act is probably only 1% because there's not enough patrols, a limited patrol time, too many parks, too much space to patrol. If they're patrolling only by driving around, there's only certain places in the parks where they will drive to anyways.

There's no reason you shouldn't be able to respectfully walk in the park, and it's also a consistent approach

These are not campgrounds. People should be home at night. What are they doing in the middle of the night? Probably nothing good.

This is not appealing at all. We don't need people coming in at all hours of the night. Do not change the hours.

This allows people to use the park during the times when it best suits their needs and availability.

This allows people who work non-traditional shifts such as second shift or bar/restaurant closing time to have an outlet to potentially decompress after work like people working day or night shifts can.

This allows people who work second or third shift ample time to experience the city. I think, like extended hours, it will allow for more winter recreation. This will also reduce the amount of interactions that the police have with the citizens, which we also reduce the likelihood of police shooting or harassing more black people for living their lives.

This can do nothing but cause problems why do people need to be in the park at these times but doing criminal activity

This does not appeal to me. The hours between 11P to 5A are important as a re-set when people are expected to shut down activities and vacate trails, shelters, parking areas. Good down time for park neighbors, and for open space and wildlife.

This is a bad idea. While there are always going to be violators that will use the park outside of the allowed time, by legally opening it 24/7, it encourages misuse and trouble due to lack of light.

This is a great option. There shouldn't be limits as to when the general public is allowed to visit publicly accessible land. If taxpayers are funding the park and it's upkeep, it should be accessible 24/7 so no one is excluded from enjoying the park based on work/life schedules.

This is a little mind blowing to me, but I know people work in the day and there are night owls.

This is a terrible idea. Again Loud parties, vandalism, theft. Too easy for thieves to steal from lake property owners.

This is a very bad idea; especially for residents of ho live on the lake!

This is an even better idea because it encourages even greater access to the parks.

This is better than what we have but probably less appealing than the expanded hours option.

this is not appealing

this is not appealing to me

This is not appealing.

This is not appealing. My home is on the border of Battle Creek Park. It is a beautiful park and a great place to live. We have had increased problems with parties and the use of amplified sound. I would not want this to occur into the evening. Last winter there was also a problem with homeless encampments. Tents were pitched in the trees. Two winters ago a man died because of exposure to the elements. Last Easter a man killed and roasted a goose in the park. I am concerned that this will be an increased problem if the park is open 24/7.

This is not appeing to me.

This is the best option! This is our public space. We pay taxes for this, and should be allowed to use it anytime we want. People should be able to use the space any time and for a variety of purposes.

This is wrong as people would just loiter & more police presence would be needed & if its not light out they would just leave garbage laying around

This isn't appealing - when I consider that parks are usually in neighborhoods - it's important that the homes immediately surrounding the parks know they will have "quiet hours".

This just makes sense as the parks are not being locked or behind closed doors

This makes the park more accessible to the community, without the fear of breaking the law for something has harmless as an early morning or late evening walk/bike/run. Criminals are not deterred by rules anyway and will do what they like anyways. Citizens using the park for a longer period will help deter or report crime. It is also opens up access to those working night shift jobs.

This makes the park most available and means it would be accessible even to people such as stargazers

This might create homelessness hanging out which may be trigger a public safety issues.

This option is not appealing.

This seems like a great option to me, unless the county has some reason to prevent people from using the parks overnight. It would be neat to be able to use parks for night hikes -- listening for owls, etc.

This seems like the best solution.

This sounds great and would allow people with out houses a place to sleep away from traffic and the street.

This will create a security concern to near by neighborhood.

This would allow 2nd and 3rd shift workers to enjoy the park.

This would allow for a wide use of the parks at all hours, some people may enjoy a midnight, or 4am before work dog walk. Maybe fishing in the wee hours of the morning. A 1 am bike ride would be nice. Any legitimate park use

should be allowed anytime. Obviously anyone up to midnight mischief, or loitering teens looking to cause trouble, people vandalizing, etc could still be asked to leave

This would be disastrous!!!!!!

This would be my preferred of the two solutions. Any amount of expanded access creates a more flexible park system that sees more use by a larger selection of people. The families who want to go sledding with their kids before they go to work in the winter can use the park at 5 or 6 am, and the night shift workers that don't get off work until 3am could still go for a jog after work. Both of those groups of people pay taxes and help fund the maintenance of the parks, it would be wonderful if they got to enjoy them with the same degree of access as people with more "conventional" schedules.

This Would be really nice to for a lot of people that work different hours.

This would be the most equitable I think

This would enable people with RVs or tents (or neither) to live in the park. A great way to have a homeless community right in our neighborhood! This would increase the usage of the bathrooms during the summer and enable us to hire round the clock employees to keep the bathrooms and the beaches clean and safe. We could also have social workers that lived in park to help provide services to the people that would opt to live there. Perhaps we could all carry guns then? I assume no one would be checking. I think the appealing aspects will be so for people that do not live near by.

this would increase accessibility for underserved populations, such as people who work non-traditional hours

Those who want to access them can.

Time frame should be 7:00 am to 9:00 om.

To me this is just asking for trouble, esp with the increase in homeless and camping isdyes which occurred throughout 2020

To much opportunity for bad behavior late at night

uncertain

Unlimited access to parks.

Unrestricted access to parks by anyone any time.

Various work schedules

very little unless patrolling expands to match

Very little. As a resident I wouldn't access during these hours, or want my family to out of safety concerns.

Very little. As a woman, and with teenage daughters, it is highly unlikely that we would use the park outside of reasonable hours due the inherent safety issues.

Very little. This will cause problems

Watching comets at night or even camping opportunities

We should be able to walk in a park whenever the mood strikes.

What are people going to do after 11 pm at the park? Not much good happens at 2 am

What will people be doing at all hours of the time overnight. Parks should be closed for periods of time such as overnight.

While this answer may seem a bit far out, hear me out. Having the park open at all hours can help tackle inequitable policing. People are currently using the park at all hours (we all need to acknowledge this) but people of color, low income folks, etc. are at a heavier risk of being penalized by police officers than their white, privileged counterparts.

Will have no impact. In reality, won't materially impact park use regardless of "official hours". People go when they want to go.

Works for everyone. No need to enforce.

Worried teenaged may hang out there and drink

Worse

Worse than increasing park hours

Would allow for anyone to be in the space at any time without involving law enforcement; would allow for obvious general flexibility of park use

Would be very helpful for bike commuters. Some bike routes inside parks are much safer than biking on roads even for people who do shift work.

would open up to more crimes happening and gatherings for whatever reason, and it is hard to get a office to come out to the location to observe whatever it is that is called in

Yes

You can go when you want.

You can walk your dog whenever you want.

You could have sky-gazing programs; night birding (owls!), etc.

You don't have to bother trying to enforce anything.

You don't have to worry about what time it is whenever you use a park.

You don't need to be worried about the time. Anyone can walk through the parks at night.

You don't have to remember anything.

I don't see any advantage to a 24 x 7 hours

Allows night workers to use the park on their nights off without altering their sleep schedule.

nothing as the safety and protecting park property would be much harder

Better access for those that prefer activities in the middle of the night. Not sure what that would be but have an open mind

i can see the value in being open 24 hours for certain populations to access easier. however, it would take more resources to patrol and monitor

Stargazing can be done elsewhere doesn't have to have parks open for a few....

Could use parks for stargazing

Love the stargazing idea

Generally opposed but again, overnight parking for RVs?

Stargazing and moonlit skiing are great park activities!

There are no limitations to when someone can access a park.

Not everyone lives/works in a standard 9-5, so this allows equal access for all work schedules.

No need to have separate distinction between water access sites and rest of the park.

Decriminalizes being in a park

Allows use of dog parks in hot summer months when the middle of the night can be the only safe time for some breeds to exercise.

encourages people to get out even if they don't work traditional hours.

Allows use during non-busy times.

I think if we are moving towards the extended set hours, why not just go ahead and open it to 24/7?

Never have to think about hours or being reprimanded for being in the park too early/late

Nature at night is magical. I have such fond memories of nighttime nature with my family.

Agree with the desire to see nature at night

Eliminates the need for anyone to get in "trouble" for not knowing hours.

Would eliminate need for enforcement

Parks are an extension of our living spaces and sometimes we need the ability to take a late night walk or find a place to just be. Especially as more and more people are in over crowded living spaces.

Parks are accessible to everyone all the time allowing for overnight activities for all ages.

Allows late-night green space recreating for everyone, whether you own your own yard or not.

Parks are really "open" all of the time anyway but law enforcement can currently use the ordinance as a way to discriminate or issue tickets to some but not others.

A neighbor recounted his first date with his now-spouse was a late-night park date. This is prohibited under current policy. He wasn't a ne'er-do-well, nor are others that want to use parks at night.

Accessible when needed.

Can go anytime.

I would have to worry about hours. The successful gyms and health clubs are open 24/7

It's great to have access, but I don't see reasons for allowing 24/7 park access -- what could one use a park for at 2am if not camping?

Its not.

NA

Not appealing AT ALL. Think this through. THINK THIS THROUGH. Why would anyone even be at a park overnight hours if not to engage in something criminal, or to squat?

Not much. What about people who live adjacent to parking lots, near shelters, or other locations where noise (not necessarily extreme, but still bothersome) could be a problem at any hour of the night and disturb the peace and quiet that people would expect at night?

Not much. Only looking for meteor showers comes to mind. This rare occasion could be an exception to the rule.

Nothing

Nothing about this is appealing. The hours encompass darkness

Nothing!

Nothing!! It would bring in drug dealers and homeless encampment

Nothing.

Nothing.

openness for all to enjoy the parks whenever desired

Save resources on enforcement

Park Hours Option B - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions

Option B: Eliminating park hours, making them accessible 24/7.

Please use this space for questions or concerns *and* suggested solutions

-What type of activity will be discouraged? You indicate concerns about disproportionate application of current ordinances, but offer no evidence to suggest this actually occurs. -Are there any local/regional/national parks that utilize this model? Are there any studies or other evidence that is demonstrative of an increase in equity/reduction in crime? -Have local police departments weighed in on this? Your reports and summaries suggest they have not. -What is the frequency of public initiated complaints of ordinance violations to citations being issued? -What tactics can be used to discourage use of the park for criminal activity at night? What is the cost associated with such tactics? Concerns - Criminal activity will increase and become brazen. -Local residents have no recourse for suspicious activity in the park. -Non criminal, but disruptive behavior such as burn outs, fireworks, and other loud and disorderly behavior can occur without fear of discovery given the easy cover of the park. -An increase in property damage and disruptive activity has only increased in the past 3-4 months as it is. Suggestions: -This is not a viable, realistic, or sensible option and I am perplexed as to how a County Parks program even considers an option like this without any evidence that it will decrease crime or increase equity/access when considering the extreme disadvantages this would cause to enforcement and safety efforts.

24 hour opening makes it easier to use the parks for less savory purposes. People might commute through a park at 5 am or stay late playing sports, but not much good is going to happen in the parks at 3am. Even just petty crime, like vandalising a picnic shelter or leaving drug debris on a playground makes the parks less safe and usable for everyone.

24 hour park openings are asking for trouble.

24/7 ..people living in the parks

24/7 access means parks will become homeless encampments and increase hours for law enforcement patrols and costs for patrols.

24/7 hours are more likely to draw crime throughout late night hours, requiring increased police presence, which most do not desire.

24/7 is likely to encourage crime during late-night hours, which will require more police presence which people don't want.

24/7 park access would also need to come with the ability for police to respond 24/7, and definitely wouldn't really be useful or safe if there wasn't lighting and other safety features like maybe blue light phone stations readily available.

24/7 requires additional security and you'd better be prepared to have it available

24/7 will only invite crime.

5am-11 pm gives plenty of time for lawful use while giving law enforcement the ability to make sure it doesn't become a hangout spot for unlawful behavior.

6 am-10 or 10:30pm

Absolutely not open 24/7! Disagree that more people in park will deter criminal activity! Very very few people RECREATE in a park at 11:00 pm. We live 2 blocks from park and can hear what goes on there at times in the dark. Please no...do not keep open all night!

Additional lighting in parking areas and on some trails would help promote safety when it is dark.

Adjust your hours according to daylight saving hours

After bar parties. Loud behavior. The argument of more people being in the park to reduce crime doesn't really apply to 2 am.

Again cannot enforce questionable and harmful behavior to disperse or eliminate potential costly repairs to park features, property for people who cannot be respectful, more calls to already stretched safety departments. Loss of value in visiting or living near parks.

Again, would longer hours encourage people to use parks for things they shouldn't be doing in the overnight hours? Maybe not? I bet y'all have more information about that than I do.

Alcohol and drug use would likely increase in county parks. Already a problem in quite a few parks. Likely would have a problem with increased homeless population at county parks and facilities. This is already a concern at some park facilities.

All parks close at 10pm. Increase police/sheriff patrols to help reduce vandalism and graffiti.

Allow trail users to pass through (transportation)

Allowing parks to be open 24/7 could bring an increase in criminal activity, people hosting late night parties at parks, and allow for homeless to think it is ok to set up encampments which would not be good.

Allows for illegal activities to take place

Alongside the benefits, there is a higher possibility of bad activity that happens from 11-5 AM (this coming from someone who is up until 3 AM routinely at home).

Anyone can be in the park at any time.

Are park hours really enforced? If not, it doesn't matter what they are. If they are enforced, I favor a dawn to dusk limit, except where there are lights. Nothing good happens in a park after dark.

Are there any liability issues for the county if the park hours are expanded, regardless of daylight hours? Are current park hours ever enforced? Do data suggest that having park hours serves as a deterrent to criminal activity?
Concern: lack of lighting in parks if the hours are eliminated

As before, some might have concerns about noise, but the parks could still have quiet hours.

As far as I know, people's concerns center around crime. That's fair--but then address the criminal behavior and the people actually engaged in it. This is what we do with parks during the day--night should be no different. Don't penalize all of us by outlawing normal human enjoyment of nature at night.

As my father always said, "Nothing good happens after midnight!"

As someone who lives near a park that experiences a lot of late night drug activity, I don't like the idea of removing enforcement entirely, or the ability to use hours to approach a situation

Back to the basics: nothing good happens after midnight. Totally unfair to those who live & purchased homes around the parks. 24 x 7 is way too much of an over reach. 5 a.m to 10 p.m. gives more breathing room for usage without being intrusive to those whose property values and safety could be impacted by it.

Bad idea - will result in more tent camps

Because cars get broken into a lot in the parking lots, it would be helpful to increase sheriff patrols and add more lights

Being open 24/7 is just inviting more crime

Big mistake. We live off of Long Lake park and this year there has been racing, sexual attacks, fights and loud parties. Please do not open parks!

Camping in the park Drugs Crime at night. Easier to get away with camping??

Can you try this for a year and see when people actually come to the parks? Most county parks take an effort for me to get to. So it's nice to think I could go use them, but would I really?

Can't tell whether we can keep them safe around the clock. That might require a LOT of staffing.

Changes to the current regulations, especially the > 24 hours access to county parks would be detrimental to all the neighborhoods around these parks. This change would just bring about more crime and unsavory people to the parks at hours when nothing good happens after dark. > We have been told when we are walking on the trails during the day to not walk alone as it is not safe. Opening the parks to longer hours of darkness would only allow more nefarious activities to take place. There is also the > issue of tents, Loud music, parties, drugs and alcohol, etc with > nighttime hours. Under the cover of darkness, thefts would rise on lake property near these parks as well. The police force is already stressed with the current state of affairs, making patrolling them an issue. > As far as the rules now being discriminatory, the rules are for everyone. Therefore, subject to everyone. One wouldn't need to worry about a misdemeanor unless they are doing something they shouldn't be doing. > I am writing to express my fears for the safety and well being of all people in and around the parks. > Thank you for your consideration in this matter

Close the parks after sunset for safety reasons

Closing a park to eliminate criminal activities is not the way to stop criminal activities

Concern - people spending the night, setting up camp. Solution: do not eliminate park hours OR extend patrols through the night hours.

Concern about crime. Hours until 11 gives an opportunity for enforcement

Concern about illicit activities that could be happening in the night

concern about noise and safety of users on trails and on parking lots an open park implies that the park is being watched/oversight provided to make it safe for anyone to use

Concern about noise, trash, fire issues (late night fire pit when you've been drinking)

Concern about noise, vandalism & safety w/o more law enforcement presence and/or improved lighting. Perhaps more volunteers to assist as eyes and ears for law enforcement & increase lighting.

Concern about people camping/living in parks, but could be addressed through regulations regarding permanent and semi-permanent structures as well as greater investment in solutions to underlying causes of homelessness.

Concern is it will encourage all night hang-outs, increase traffic late night, and pose a risk of safety to all who live in the neighborhood and pay taxes to maintain these facilities. We OPPOSE the idea of making this accessible 24/7 and are shocked that ANYONE might even think this is remotely a good idea. Terrible idea, and it will create a ton of problems. It will become a haven for homeless encampments, and campers in the parking lots, leaving waste and

causing trouble that everyone will turn a blind eye to. We have seen WAY LESS patrolling by Ramsey County already, and it has increased the problems for the neighbors already.

concerned about ability to limit activities in parks, especially at night

Concerned about all-night parties and possible illegal activities

Concerned about crime if no overnight security is available.

Concerned about individuals safety if they are alone.

Concerned about potential crime land police not patrolling

Concerned about the dark overnight hours. People in the park perhaps coming into the neighborhoods near by for questionable purposes

Concerned that people would just sleep there, lots of trash

Concerned that the park and facilities could become full of litter from people partying at night

Concerned this could lead to increased opportunities for crime after dark. Would like to see more lighting added.

Concerned with added expense to patrol.

Concerns about crime. Have crime stats posted publicly for each park, so people know the risk and to allocate patrol resources.

Concerns about eliminating park hours are that more bad people (drug dealers, etc) will be using the park during the night hours, or, that homeless might be more inclined to set up camp areas. Solutions might include more frequent security checks. Another solution might be to make only certain parks and park areas open 24/7 for those who are interested.

Concerns about noise and crime after dark. We live near several parks and trails.

Concerns about people camping/living in parks. Or groups being loud and having no way to enforce quiet hours in a public setting that is open all the time. This would worry me a lot if I lived right beside a park. Also, would more police be needing to patrol the areas to monitor after hours? Would the parks get trashed more during the night?

Concerns about people spending the night in the park either in a car or on park grounds

Concerns about using parks for sleeping, overnight drinking/drug use. Would deter me from coming with my kids if people never had to leave

Concerns are drug dealing. While walking in Shoreview (south of 694), my husband and I have seen many more drug deals going down as apposed to when we came to this area more than 30 years ago.

concerns are the usual when allowing 24/7, potential facilities damage, illegal alcohol/substance consumptions at late hours, etc

Concerns with community members using the park space as a party place and their personal trash bins. The littering in some of the parks can be a problem.

Concerns would be safety issues

Concerns: Possibility of more garbage around. Suggestions: more trash bins?

Concerns: this is terrible idea. Who needs to be in a park overnight? If the thought is that by eliminating park hours would somehow reduce law enforcement interactions because they don't have enforce the park hours (i.e. kick folks out), then I think this is wildly naive. I fear that what you will see is a need for even more enforcement because nothing good happens in the dark after midnight. Keep the park hours stated in the current ordinance.

Continue to close before sunset

Cost to light, make safe, patrol at all hours?

Could encourage crime and homeless. Might make the park unsafe.

Could encourage more unwanted behavior and noise during the middle of the night

Could invite more violence and drug sells. Increase use for homeless individuals

Could you please provide a list or chart of public safety's citations at the parks during this meeting? Maybe for the last year or pre-Covid.

Crime

Crime

Crime

Crime and drug use are concerns. Without proper lighting and law enforcement patrols the parks shouldn't be open.

Crime and noise at night.

Crime at night

Crime may be worse

Crime rates will go up, along with the fact that there's no lighting, no reason for anyone to be there at 3am other than shinanigans.

Crime, encampments, privacy issues

crime, homeless encampment

Crime, please using the parks in an unsafe manner

Crime: may need to consider cameras.

crime.

Crime/vandalism

Criminal activity that may occur late at night when there is no consistent supervision

Criminal activity, homeless encampments, noise, loitering

Danger of criminal activity

Designated camping areas would allow for 24/7.

Difficult to patrol and prevent suspicious activity

Disruptive to the neighborhood

Disturbs wildlife. They need to sleep. Some feed at night. Also can disturb breeding. Disturbs neighboring houses/community with noise.

Do not change the hours of usage. If you must increase the usage, I am fine with adding the 5 am opening

Do not like this. Creates too much crime etc.

Do not make the park accessible 24/7...this is just asking for problems, as we are seeing problems now after dark with drug use, drug deals, people parking overnight, loud music etc. More crime going on.

Do you tie a hand behind the back of law enforcement if they don't have a cause to kick a suspicious character out of the park? Would this increase crime, especially things like drug use?

Does anything good happen at 3am? Seems like this could invite trouble and I could understand noise concerns, etc from those in neighborhoods near parks.

Does this mean that there would be more park police patrolling? What are the consequences if park police numbers are increased? How do we educate the people to care for and take care of the parks at all time.

Don't think this is a good idea as too many may abuse this especially late into the night, early morning.

Drug addicts need to be dealt with

Early/late hours will lead to too much noise in the neighborhood. I'm also concerned about people camping in the park. 24/7 access is unnecessary. As a property owner near the park, this would be a major disappointment.

Encourage people to start setting up homeless camps plus the bathrooms are going to be available? What about security issues and noise issues. This is even a worse idea than the previous one.

encourages homeless to set up camp

Encourages nighttime vandalism, encampments.

Encourages overnight campers and partying as well as "meeting up". Increase in unacceptable behavior

Extreme concern over keeping the parks open all day and night. Again, as a twice daily walker in Langton Lake, I have seen things and encountered things no one should see. This will just encourage more of these illegal, yes, illegal activities to occur under the cover of darkness. Not to mention the people that may use the park for legitimate reasons would be in increased danger. I think you would see a significant increase in crime. This is the third summer homeless people have set up camp in Langton. Last summer the people were just by the ball fields and would burn garbage all day and night and make it almost impossible to be in the park. Homeless people were sleeping in the portable bathroom at one point. I personally have encountered a homeless man who made myself and many other uncomfortable. The city doesn't do anything about it.

Feel safety is an ongoing issue now everywhere and parks are particularly problematic.

Feels like it opens up parks to illicit activity with no way to enforce based on closed hours.

For the 5 people that may have a legitimate reason to be in a park all night, let them buy a pass from the county to do so. Law abiding citizens can use the park and the county generates revenue.

Free reign invites parties

Hard to monitor for safety. People could start using the parks for sleeping spaces

Harder to keep safe

Have them open from 5 am to 11 pm with community service litter pickup as punishment for violations.

Having activity on lakes and in parks all night long could lead to noise and other issues that would be detrimental to residents in the area. It would be difficult to find

Having overnight hours seems to be inviting trouble

Having the parks open for 24hrs may result in heavier park usage that could harm the park if maintenance and upkeep is not staffed properly. This would quickly destroy the enjoyment of the parks.

Homeless already trash the parks. Having the parks open 24/7 would be an open invitation to permanently setup camp. No one wants another Powderhorn Park situation with drugs, sexual assault, stealing, trash, and defecation.

Homeless and/or young people hanging out all night

Homeless camping? No thanks, I pay taxes.

Homeless problem

Homeless taking over parks

Honestly not many good things happen in the wee hours of the night so it's okay if the park still has time limits

Hope you are hiring a cop for EACH park. This is a ridiculous idea

Hours should remain the same. Nothing good happens in the dark. No closing times could encourage living in the park and compromise health and safety.

How do we prevent people using the park for nuisance purposes? What is the cost for more enforcement? Better lighting?

How do you prevent troublemakers with these hours? (but the same is true of the 5am-11pm approach)

How will changes to open hours improve equity?

I am a first generation citizen. If I wanted to hang on to every cultural idea and activity, I would go back. You can't have your life here the same as it was at home. Be an American, adapt, simulate, respect the people who lived here.

I am concerned about allowing this, especially for the safety of women and children.

I am concerned about parties in the parks

I am concerned about safety for people at the park at overnight hours: lack of lighting, lack of a lifeguard at the beach, lack of foot traffic to ensure physical safety of people enjoying the park alone but are easier targets of crime and violence. I also worry for our creatures who need the nocturnal solitude for their survival.

I am concerned about security. As a woman I would not walk alone.

I am concerned that unlimited overnight use could increase problems of use for illegal purposes late at night and folks taking up residence in the parks.

I am curious - is there a demand for proposed expanded hours?

I am extremely concerned about 24/7 availability. There is opportunity for bad behavior, cars parked all hour and increased noise. I do not want 24/7 availability.

I am not sure what benefit the park being accessible 24/7 provides. That said, is it a resource drain patrol the park after hours and this fixes said issue? Are there really so many people wanting to use the park at 2 am to foster this. I guess I do not see the benefit to the park being open at all hours.

I am very concerned about safety at the parks, I like the current hours I would also recommend better lighting at the parks.

I believe that both of these ideas are unsafe and promote problematic activity. Is there any proposal to increase monitoring or police protection for these ideas? Does not look like it. I highly disagree with these changes.

I believe the hours open should remain the same from sunrise to sunset; especially as a safety factor!

I believe this would attract the homeless camps

I can understand concerns about noise in the middle of the night. Perhaps quiet hours need to be posted, much like a campground? Quiet hours between 11pm-6am.

I cannot see any legitimate reason a park should be open after 11:00

I do not like the idea or the park being open all night. This might increase the likelihood of homeless people turning parks into a camp.

I do not like this idea. No one needs to be in the park at 2:00 am. You could open up the times more, particularly in the evening. Perhaps keep the park open until midnight or 1:00 pm

I don't see how race and equity has anything to do with this proposal? Are you saying that only non white people are in the park after the park hours?

I don't think parks should be open during night hours. What would people do there at night?

I don't understand how changing the park hours is an equity issue?

I fail to understand why park access is needed in the middle of the night...Prefer set times to reduce noise and commotion around neighborhoods.

I fear people will start using the parks as campsites and tent cities would be harder to regulate

I feel like I imagine teenagers making babies here in this scenario which ... For better or worse. It may lead to, which, is prob this survey, homeless people tenting without a permit situation, and I'm personally ok with it.

I feel this will make the parks much less safe and put an even larger burden on the maintenance and policing people. Nothing good happens in the dark and early morning hours.

I guess my main concern is: what are the real benefits of parks being open 24/7? I can't say it affects me either way, as my days of hanging out in parks at night are well behind me.

I guess my main concern would be that you would not know if someone was lost or injured in the park because there could be many vehicles in the Parking lot.

I have concerns it will invite vagrants and illegal activities into our community

I have never understood park hours. They discriminate against people who work the night shift. If some night visitors are causing issues, the appropriate thing to do is to regulate/enforce the specific issue that these visitors are

causing, not punish everyone for the actions of a few. Thank you for considering making them accessible 24/7. I recognize this is unusual for parks and hope that Ramsey County is willing to take this step to be one of the first in the nation to offer more freedom of movement and recreation.

I have no concern about criminal behavior because criminals will use the parks at any time regardless of posted park hours.

I imagine hours are still needed deter unlawful activity most likely to occur late at night

I imagine some might be concerned about overnight camping, but I don't see a problem with it.

I just think this sounds a little frightening— not sure but it makes me nervous.

I live by a park and the parties would and often do, go on all night. Drinking hour after hour results in fights and speeding off down the road as they leave. Garbage littered for those that come in the morning. Respect the neighborhood!!

I live close to Tony Schmidt park, and hear groups there until they leave. If the park does not restrict hours, then use can be disruptive to neighbors all night long.

I pay high taxes to live on Lake Johanna and do not want the trouble that will come to this neighborhood when people are hanging out late at night in the park.

I question the need for parks to be open 24 hours a day -- except for criminals and drug dealers to ply their trade.

I stated the hours I thought acceptable above.

I think allowing random use of parks in the wee hours invites problematic activities, especially without more park patrols. If people want to use the park for something specific during the 11P to 5A time window, they could make a request for a planned event or program - I'm thinking things like astronomy, nocturnal insect surveys, special cultural/calendar events, personal anniversaries...

I think eliminating time restrictions on park use would lead to increased unwanted activity at the park.

I think for those living around parks more noise and more traffic at all hours would be a concern. People camping out overnight in shelters etc-again more patrols may make this better, but I think all hours open is a little too ambitious

I think having closed hours sets a tone that there are rules. By having open and closed hours that the most basic rule, and it means that as a community we can all accept that rules apply.

I think it would encourage inappropriate activities, although they maybe occur anyway since there is not a lot of police presence in off hours.

I think late night use would be trouble - drugs, drinking, and other inappropriate behaviors.

I think staying open to 11P is one hour too late. I suggest closing at 10P so that the people living next to parks can have quiet time an hour earlier.

I think that there is a legitimate concern that parks would become really attractive spaces for homeless folks if this proposal were to become policy. Personally, however, I think that homelessness and the plight of the unhoused is a problem that should be solved by other means and that hopefully homeless folks will have better options available to them than public parks. That being said, I genuinely would prefer a system, like the proposed one here, in which I knew the homeless people would not be getting picked up by police and fined for being in the park at night. Those fines are onerous for people who have very little money, and obviously many won't pay them. Meanwhile it's a

waste of our taxpayer funds to have the police take the homeless out of the park that isn't being used currently at night and bring them somewhere else that they can spend the night like a public sidewalk. It's a waste of money to move them, creates an unnecessary point of conflict for them and the officer who has to move them, and largely makes literally no difference to the experience of the public. So while I think it's a real concern that homeless folks will gravitate towards the park system, even moreso than they already do, I think that's a problem to be solved by people other than the parks department and I think that even if that comes to be it would be better than the system is currently.

I think the challenge would be balancing the public safety aspect with the right to use the county parks 24/7. Would anyone in the park after dark or 11pm automatically be profiled as "up to no good"? Or would illicit behavior flourish if authorities were reluctant to investigate parties/behavior for fear of "profiling"?

I think this is a terrible idea. I live right next to Powderhorn park and allowing people to live in the park with out support or adequate security resulted in a very dangerous situation for vulnerable unhoused people- particularly young women.

I think this would promote camping over night and many areas are NOT set up for this. These hours would require more patrol by safety departments/police. I think this is not a viable option.

I think while discussing hours, policing of parks also needs to be discussed, as does creating a safe place for houseless people and community members who may need an escape.

I wonder if this would cause a need for increased policing due illegal activities and the need to resolve issues from larger gatherings of people.

I worry that this will cause enforcement issues. I could see people using park parking lots for sleeping or parking RVs

I would be concerned about having the parks open at all hours (with the exception of bike commuter trails listed above). I would think there is only trouble happening after midnight!

I would be concerned about overnight camping being a safety issue. It would be necessary for outreach and services for people who have no home besides a tent.

I would be concerned about people coming into the park that are under the influence of alcohol or drugs. I also would be concerned of people meeting at the park to have public sex or indulge in other adult activities.

I would be concerned about safety and illegal activity happening when people are less visible. Sunup/sundown schedules are better.

I would be concerned about vandalism, and general safety especially since most parks aren't well lit, or are fairly secluded areas.

I would be concerned about what activity would happen I'm the middle of the night

I would be concerned more illegal activity will occur and/or it would invite more people to camp/squat on the park property, which will have adverse effects on health and safety. Roseville has had significant problems with people squatting on park property, which then created used syringes, prostitution, garbage and drug use.

I would not see this as appealing if I lived near a park. I would have safety concerns.

I would think there would be more overnight shenanigans happening.

I would worry about crime and quiet hours.

I'm concerned about parks being used for drug deals and other crimes under the cover of night. Unless the parks being "open" at those times would deter criminals due to the fact that any law-abiding citizen might visit the park if it is open.

I'd be worried about what's going on during the night hours. What happens if someone needs help and no one else is around for immediate help?

I'm concerned there would be activity occurring that doesn't belong in a park setting.

I'm not a fan of 24 hour access because I feel that it increases risk of assault for people in the park in the middle of the night

I'm not sure that there are many Members of the public that interested in using the park in the middle of the night for legitimate reasons. Also, there is a huge homeless population, probably due In part to the opioid epidemic and the expense of housing, but at any rate, the homeless population in Minneapolis is not manageable and it's not very far from Ramsey county. Having some restrictions in hours Could help in the event of a permanent camping community that needs to be addressed in someway.

I'm not sure what reason the parks would be used 11pm-5am.

I'm skeptical overnight use would be safe.

I'm wondering if lighting would be required throughout the night if this was put into place-I am concerned about environmental impacts from light pollution if that is the case.

If a park is open 24 hours- it would seem de unity would be required or video surveillance of major traffic areas-

If a park isn't gated, what difference do the hours make? Personally I will not use Ramsey County parks after sunset. I don't feel safe.

If considered, please describe how it serves park purpose and responsibility to public. Be able to state a public interest.

If I lived near/next to a park, I would not want people using the park 24/7. Our park has access to our lake (Lake Johanna), does this mean that folk could access the boat launch 24/7? I would not be in favor of that.

If I lived nearby, I wouldn't necessarily want people wandering about all night. Seems like there could be a safety concern.

If I was in the park at 2 AM I would either want a police patrol present or I'd be up to no good

If keeping parks/park buildings open 24/7 is going to cost a great deal more I don't see 24/7 vs 5am to 11pm getting a lot more use for a higher price. If price is the same then why not.

If left open 24/7, public parks can become free land for homeless. The local community then bears the cost of the homeless, loses its public recreational amenity (in the form of the park), and may be ill equipped to handle the safety, humanitarian, and hygiene concerns presented. Law enforcement would have little recourse in removing such "squatters" on public lands.

if parks are 24/7 would that mean all activities could be engaged in 24/7- sports, cooking, camping? would this increase issues with houseless people seeking some level of stable space?

If parks are always open and people are always in them, wild creatures will never have any peace or time to themselves. If people can use parks all night long what is to stop groups of loud partiers from partying all night long and disturbing residents who live near the park?

If parks are available 24 hours, what will prevent encampments from popping up? Our parks are not shelters for the mentally ill, etc and should not be advertised as available for those activities. People who live near the parks should be allowed some peace of mind that for at least 8 hours per night, the parks are closed and anyone hanging out in them is breaking a law. No one needs to be using a park at 3 a.m.

If parks were open all hours there might be more trash, and noise during the evening. I would love if my local park had more trash bins and dog waste bags available.

If someone wants to bike in parks at 4 am, they should apply for a license to be displayed on their bike or back—but standing around is not necessary—limited cars are on roads early morning so I suspect biking in parks isn't needed.

if the parks are not currently physically closed after sunset, then it makes sense to legally have them open. However, there may need to be some park patrolling after dark to control larger group gatherings.

If the parks are open all night, I fear the nighttime illegal activity (fireworks; alcohol and drug use; street racing) would worsen.

If there are legitimate reasons to use the park beyond current hours, perhaps the residents can get a written permit from the county.

If this were to happen, I would like to see no youth penalties happening/negative interactions with local law enforcement.

If you are going to cite the sheriff's office on crime, please provide information for how many pedestrians and bicyclist are run down because they don't have adequate trails and paths removed from automobile traffic. Since those violent crimes aren't counted by the police as such most of the time... Even though it's still illegal to hit a pedestrian in the state... there being some laws the police like and some they don't should color the opinions of reasonable people.

If you can't patrol 24 hours does not seem safe.

If you have it open 24/7 crimes happen.

illegal activity or squatters could be a concern. How would this be enforced?

Illegal activity would be a big concern.

Increase in crime, need to patrol area after dark. People start living in parks. Noise for neighbors at later/earlier hours? Need for adequate lighting and costs involved?

Increase in noise which can be disrupting in parks that have residential homes next to or across the street from parking locations.

Increased crime and questionable activity late and night, wear and tear on the park from non intended uses of roads, sidewalks, equipment

Increased patrolling of parks if open 24/7

Invitation to homeless encampments.

Invites homeless

Is it true some seniors were beaten with baseball bats at Keller Park and put in the hospital?

Is there a lot of demand for middle of the night park use? Seems like this isn't benefitting anyone in particular other than perhaps making the parks more attractive for the homeless which is generally going to be very poor for the

County as a whole and the other users of the parks, and drastically increase the cost of caring for/monitoring them. The presence of homeless people will also wildly reduce the feeling of safety for families with small children and single women.

It allows congregation in places that often lead to enforcement issues. I think the police & Parks staff should have a big voice in shaping this - they're the ones that typically deal with the issues (and aftermath) during non-office hours. The general public doesn't always understand the true concerns (safety, vandalism, resource drain, etc.).

It could be problematic allowing free access in the late hours of the night. There is already late night partying happening in some parks. This could get worse if they aren't worried about getting caught.

It gives the impression of no boundaries. Whose monitors the space at 2 am?

It is much easier for PD etc to see activity with limited hours.

It is unclear what park activities could occur in the complete darkness of night. As noted there would be cost associated with providing additional lighting. This change would enable sleeping on the beach, in shelters and other rogue camping activities.

It raises the possibility of criminal activity if not patrolled.

It will become a law and order issue for the residents that live near the park, when vagrants use it to live in. Crime will increase. And limited tax revenues will be spent to get more police to patrol. It has nothing to do with racial equity. It's a behavior issue.

It will draw more resources from police, fire and EMS services to address crime and other medical emergencies inside parks later at night and early morning. To address the increased use of resources the County should implement a tax on neighborhoods where police, fire and EMS respond most frequently.

It would be a place for homeless people to congregate.

It would be nice to see facilities remain open if the parks are open. Perhaps leave restroom doors unlocked & just clean during normal hours? Or shift resources previously dedicated to hours enforcement to swing by facilities instead?

It would become tough to enforce anyone that is squatting or seeking shelter in the parks to disperse.

It would definitely lead to more crime as it would not be able to be policed like it should.

It would have to be policed during this time. There's a lot of trash from parties.

It would probably attract homeless people, but they're people after all, and they need places they can be too.

It's all free land anyway, who the f*** are you to say when I can and can't go to the park?

It's be concerned about people living in the parks or illegal activity overnight in the spaces where kids play

It's not a highly visible area. I'd be concerned people might congregate for illegal or inappropriate things and it's still across from an elementary school.

Keep a set park open to close time. This will also assist law enforcement in keeping trouble out of our parks.

Keep current park hours

Keep Hours as is, Sun up to sun Down. Rules are for ALL people. Only those who break the law need to worry.

Keep hours the same

keep sunrise to sunset.

Keep the current hours

Keep the open times the same.

keep the park hours as posted, there is already a lot of people not obeying the rules and of the park and I have not heard of any citations for said crimes, there is a huge dog park for off leash but there are several off leash dogs in other parts of the park and when you call in nothing is done

Keep the parks open only during the 5:00a.m.-10:00p.m. and provide special access reservations or permits for nighttime activity that is monitored such as viewing meteor showers or other astronomical , lantern walks, wildlife observations, etc.

Keep the present hours. They are sensible and far safer. The comparison of the county parks to city parks, sidewalks, boulevards is ridiculous. Sidewalks are thoroughfares for pedestrian travel, not recreation after dark. Boulevards are simply buffer areas between streets and sidewalks. Most city parks are lighted to a certain time and have basketball courts, softball diamonds or playgrounds where it is understandable that later hours are reasonable. This is not true for the county parks.

Keeping the park hours as they are is fine, but I could see opening the parks at 5 am and closing them at 10 pm. Having a security patrol after closing is a good idea. Again these areas are not well lit & we've had attacks & vandalism after dark.

Label rules and expectations clearly. Heavily fine trouble makers to deter future issues.

Lack of lighting

Lack of lighting during those darker hours could encourage illegal behaviors

Late night racing, fireworks & questionable activity is already happening after hours.

Late night safety would be my concern

Leave dusk to dark hours

Leave the hours as they are. They are fair for everyone. Keep all citizens safe is the highest priority of the government.

Lighting will become a necessity. What strategies will be available to ensure adequate resources for homeless populations? Parks are good, secluded rests for these people but tend to be isolated from resources/aid.

Limited ability to prevent issues from starting at late hours

Limiting hours to daylight or more reasonable hours would be ideal.

lived by island lake park if it had been 24 hours people will start sleeping there

Living near Como park the noise and late night parties would get out of hand quickly

Loud noise late into the night/early morning. Not great if you live by a park and are trying to sleep!

Loud parties & other noise can be complaint based. (Be sure to notify the city of St. Paul because that's where people call the police.)

Make sure the neighbors who live near the park are happy and can use their property and homes the way the rest of us do. For example, not having to shut their doors to loud music or loud groups

Making them 24/7 would seem to reduce your ability to prevent homeless tent encampments

Many city parks are in residential Neighborhoods. Parks being open all night may make it noisy for those living near the park. I'm not thinking of party noise but noise from people talking, driving....

May lead to more late night use and/or partying

May promote people camping out and causing late night issues.

Middle of the night (1am-5am) seems ripe for nuisance.

Middle of the night problems

Might encourage camping in parks without campgrounds

Might offer a place for family to park their campers? Concerns include folks using parking areas as kind of a Walmart dropoff area for their vehicles.

More chance for no good to happen. Nothing good happens after midnight.

More criminal activities in the overnight hours. Harder to regulate.

More lights or cameras can be put to prevent crimes

more opportunity for misbehavior

More work for staff and police to maintain and keep safe.

Most crimes happen at night, so I'm not sure how many above the law people would be there at night.

most problems seem to occur at night. Expanding the hours to 24/7 is inviting trouble.

Mostly concerns. The park doesn't need to be "open" for 24 hours.

Much concern about nefarious dark hours activities. Also add concern about potential rise in homeless or RV-er overnights. Would be less safe and probably more mess.

Must be viewed in terms of cost/ benefit analysis. That % of total Park users over total % of city residents that would be in the Parks if open 24/7 vs impacts on maintenance and security costs due to folks living in hammocks, tents, parked cars not simply biking or walking through parks during early and late hours.

My concern about having the parks accessible 24/7 is that it would provide way too much time under the cover of darkness for people to carry out illicit behaviors. Also, the wildlife living in the parks need a break from the presence of humans!

My concern about these new park hours is the lack of lighting on the paved trails. I would likely not utilize the trails unless they were at least partially lighted. I am also concerned about the parks becoming an unmonitored place to attract bad actors. Police monitoring should be consistent.

My concern is that a park could turn into a campground if it was open 24 hours.

My concern is that if the park is open all the time then there will be families that don't understand curfews or other adults that use the space as their personal overnight party place leaving trash and all that and they can't be kicked out because "the park is open"

My concern is the lack of lighting after dark. Park walking trails need to include adequate lighting for safety.

My main question would be how many people actually need the park open 24/7? If they do, why do they need it, and are there other community programs that could be meeting that need?

Nefarious activities might increase .

neighbors wouldn't like more late night activity

No

NO

No boundaries! Terrible idea: Homeless camps. Overnight parking. Overnight camping. Kids staying out all night. All night parties. Illegal behaviors typically increased at night. Increased risks of driving under the influence. Increased patrol issues for law enforcement. Increased costs to tax payers. All around really bad idea! Earliest open 5:00 am Latest close 10:00 pm Best idea for open/ close times 5:30 am- 9:30 pm. Gives animals and wildlife time to rest, sleep and be safe (including nocturnal animals) without human disturbance.

No lights shining on cars / lighting a path would make me a bit nervous about safety (theft and physical injury due to stumbling). Stadium lights aren't necessary, but path lights and parking lot lights would be nice.

No one needs to be in the parks during dark times. Currently people with bad intentions gather in them late at night using them for drug deals and as a base to do illegal activities in surrounding private homes

No security as it is now. The same people you are trying to make enjoy the parks are the folks who are most effected by this.

No too many people live in nice houses close to parks. If they are open 24/7 you really don't think a homeless person is going to sleep in them? Come on.

No way! Will make it easier for crime!

Noise and concern of traffic in park late at night

Noise and light bc we live right next to the highland park pavilion. It's easier to tell my teens to come home bc the parks are closed.

Noise and safety.

Noise concerns for properties bordering the parks. Nefarious activities might increase. I can offer no suggestions for guarding against these possibilities.

Noise during the night

Noise for the people living around a park could be an issue. Why would anyone need to be in a park in the middle of the night.

Noise levels

Noise may disrupt neighbors. It increases risks of thefts and assaults on nearby residents.

Noise to neighbors

Noise when nearby residents are sleeping. Increase patrols to limit or eliminate disruptive and dangerous behavior.

Not a fan-would invite too much partying. Alcohol use, people sleeping in cars, etc..

Not a fan.

Not a fan. Could invite crime; late night park visits have frequently tended towards parties. Plus, more police hours would be needed.

Not a good idea

Not appealing at all. Can foresee many problems if park is open overnight.... Most groups that are at the park after 11:00 PM are either drinking or up to no good. No families are there then.

Not everyone works 9 to 5 and can use parks during given hours. Some people want to walk or run before early shifts or after late shifts. I could see that picnics and bbqs may not be good for neighbors of the park at all hours. Could you provide safe, well-lit paths but limit gatherings after-hours to 2 or 3 with noise ordinances still in effect? Maybe there could be vehicle tags issued for people that regularly want to park during overnight hours.

Not many people will be out in the park at midnight and not security or park services.

Not much good happens between 11pm and 5am. Parks without lighting are not safe.

Not much to me, as it encourages people to gather with limited supervision and under the cover of

Not sure anyone needs to be in the park at 3 am

Not sure what the difference would be from now. I can walk down to the lake at anytime now, so, do not quite know the difference.

Nothing good ever happens after 2 am

Nothing good happens after 11pm at night.

Nothing good happens after midnight

Nothing good happens after midnight.

Nothing good happens after midnight. This is a bad idea. If you have restrictions on hours it's easier to get rid of people from park if they are being disruptive

Nothing good happens in a park after midnight. There is no good reason to be in a park after midnight. This could lead to more encampments, drug use and illegal activities as that is what predominately happens after midnight.

Nothing good happens in the middle of the night

Nothing good happens in the middle of the night. Crime and gathering during late hours results in drinking and bad activity

Nothing good is happening at 2 am.

Nothing good really happens after midnight. If parks were open 24/7, I assume more monitoring would be needed.

Obviously we may not be able to have any staff or sheriff presence at night. Posting the hours the park is "manned" as different from the hours it's open would give people the needed information to choose if they want to use the park when no official personnel are present.

official "24/7" opens the door to homeless encampments. Extra time in summer could be nice.

Only concern is drug users but then again they all find a way to use anywhere they are.

Only if they are being patrolled during hours without daylight.

Open 5AM to 10PM

Open for more crime if park hours are eliminated. Asking for trouble

Opens parks to times when crime is higher

Our parks will turn into homeless camps, unsafe for all

Our police cannot handle more square footage to patrol. "nothing good happens after midnight"

Our small area is not conducive to a 24/7 plan

Our suggestion is to look to Three Rivers Park System and use their plan for Good Park Management

Overnight hours is asking for crime and people sleeping in the park. It's not a campsite.

Overnight parking and illegal activities would increase and reduce the safety and accessibility of parks

Park hours should remain not much after sunset. People cannot see you to clean up after themselves, in addition in the cover of darkness you're already beyond the point of cooking and grilling and picnicking. Children are no longer on the play equipment, Extending the morning hours would be fine. If you're looking at the concerns for commuters biking in the paths then open the paths up for biking traffic or walk in traffic and extending those hours.

Parks are public, outside spaces. There should be no hours and police use the guise of park hours to harass people. As a person of color in Ramsey County I have had multiple instances of police officers being unnecessarily aggressive with me simply because I was at the park near or after "close".

Pathway usage, like sidewalk use, is not an issue (runners, bikers, walkers, etc.), it's the vehicles that are generally causing the issues. There needs to be a mechanism to be able to remove those that are generally causing the problems, which is between 10pm-5am. What about the residents that live adjacent to the parks? That is part of the reason for the hours in local parks - resident health, safety and welfare. Restricting the hours is not about restricting fair access, it's about the expectation of being able to sleep without someone squealing their tires, using fireworks in a port-a-potty, or playing loud music at all hours. Ramsey County is a fully developed county. These parks are generally surrounded by residential uses and changing those hours would have great impacts to those residents without a lot of solutions if problems arise as they police would not be able to tell others to leave.

Patrolling would be added burden to law enforcement

People 'sleeping' overnight in parks, people partying/ destroying property/ trashing the park, people -traffic noise. Go meet at a 24 hour- gas station, restaurant, your house/apartment.

People do not need to be in County Parks at all hours of the night. I would not be in favor of this option.

People living in the parks . Kids partying , safety of neighbors near park.

People may use it for camping overnight or potentially hiding there.

People out at night when crime is more likely to occur

People throwing parties or hosting events at late night/early morning hours. Could permits to use pavilions, etc. be limited? Or if a permit is issued could the area residents be notified? Also, would this invite encampments? Could we increase homelessness street outreach throughout the county with targeted efforts near the parks?

People using the park doing illegal activities

people wanting to hang out at all hours . . . is this a problem? would it be a problem if law-abiding, people wanted to take a moonlit walk? hang out in parking lot? (could this be an invite to people with no place to go?)

people will camp overnight

People will sleep in their cars. I live next to a park and see plenty of that already. As a parent and person neighboring a park, it's unsafe

People will think they can camp out and sleep in parks

Per the above on having hours. Having hours promotes safety from bad elements that ALWAYS come out at night. Especially, these days.

Perception of nefarious activity occurring after dark (my assumption, having previously been a 16 year old)

Perhaps a concern for safety, although I don't know enough to evaluate if this would actually be an issue

Perhaps limiting the activities that can occur during overnight hours would be a good balance so you can allow people to use them for transportation but limit the more problematic activities.

Permanent police presence.

Persons experiencing homeless have frequently slept on benches or in tents.

Places are most safe when lots of people are present. I suspect safety would become a much more serious issue with a 24-7 time. Drug dealing is already a problem in some parks and this would make it worse. With drugs come guns and violence. A bad idea.

Please do not do this. I walk around McCarrons lake in the morning. There are already people who have spent the night there. It is scary. I have been asked for money. Allowing people to stay 24 hours would increase this and make the parks unaccessible for families.

Please do not do this. The parking lot near Lions park already has many nefarious activities happening at night and allowing anyone to be at the park at any time of night is a safety concern. Again, almost every citizen will not use the park after hours so creating potential safety concerns to maybe help a few people use the park for legitimate reasons at night is not worth the risk.

Please do not leave parks open 24 hours for safety sake

Please do not this or our local park will be flooded with crime/folks sleeping in the park or dealing drugs

Please see above.

portions of the park open. it seems unsafe for late night /early morning swimming . open 24/7 probably means stretching our police force thinner then it currently is.

Possible increased crime. People spending the night in parks.

Potential crime and so would need more policing

Potential crime, drinking and drug use in the park late at night

Potential crime. A solution could be to promote use. Add fire pits and lighting in park areas to make spending later hours more appealing.

Potential for crime, loud noise including music, alcohol and smoking, possible camping USA seriously concerning.

Primary concerns would be increases in vandalism to county property and illegal activity occurring under the cover of darkness. Vandalism not only impacts the county image and beauty of the park but also requires taxpayer money to repair. Illegal activities put our citizens in danger. I also believe there would be drowning deaths in the parks with beaches. Daylight hours allow for good Samaritans to either help or contact authorities if a dangerous situation occurs.

Problems begin after dark sets in and open access all night is unacceptable, encampments would gather and require law enforcement presence.

Questionable events that could occur beyond 12 am

Really? Do you not even have a clue as to what will happen? Will be crime and mayhem. You know that. The animals are fine - it's the humans that will abuse the opportunity.

Recommend 6:00 am to 10:00 pm year round

Safety

Safety and lighting concerns during middle of the night. As a woman and mother I wouldn't allow myself or children to be out well after dark, but I understand this isn't a concern for everyone.

Safety and vandalism concerns

Safety concerns

Safety concerns on less people being out in hours where there are less people out.

Safety in the parks in the early morning hours might be a problem.

Safety issues. Both worried about being attacked at night and also if you were to fall/get hurt it would difficult to be seen.

safety, homeless congregation, park vandalism

Safety.

Safety. Illegal fireworks. Noise.

Same answer as noted before. What positive activities might take place in a dark park?

Same as above - easier to hide negative activity with darkness.

Sanitation?

Security and trash build up would be a problem. We already have problems with finding trash in playgrounds, overturned garbage cans, and garbage in lookouts sand other areas. Taking away the ability to regulate gatherings in parks between 11-5 would likely make these problems much worse.

Security is the biggest concern - increased park patrols could help, along with lighting on more frequently-used paths or paths used for commuting/errand travel.

Security issues

See above

SEE ABOVE

See above

See above - Noise ordinances could help control rowdy late night groups.

See above.

See above. Not safe.

See above. Terrible option.

See comments above about vandalism and undesirable activity already happening in the Battle Creek Park. Having a park open 24 hours is asking for trouble. Really not needed and this reduces security for nearby neighborhoods. I have lived a long time in my neighborhood and the amount of crime and shootings we have now is really sad. It makes me want to move away.

See note above. Solution: leave hours as is.

See question #1.

Seems like there would have to be a lot more staff to monitor the parks 24/7.

Seems to raise the possibility of public safety issues and cost for law enforcement

Seems to welcome overnight issues

Set hours are desirable

Set park hours increases safety for visitors

Sheriff's office discretion: Someone walking a dog, biking through, jogging OK-Someone sitting in a car or otherwise Lurking - NO.

Should be ready for initial abuses by having park patrols available to respond to calls violating other city ordinances.

Similar to leaving them open until 11 PM at night, having them open 24 hours a day without adequate lighting and trash receptacles and oversight seems like it will result in higher vandalism, more garbage, Another undesirable outcomes

Since there is not much foot traffic at these times, there is a huge risk of crime.

Some areas might not be safe at night. Full dark hours patrols might help.

Someone at the park in the night is only going to cause problems.

Sound carries across the lake

Sounds like a terrible idea. I don't want people sleeping in parks, which is what would happen if you made them 24/7. Don't make parks a backup homeless shelter.

Specifically, why are you proposing extension of the hours? What benefit to the community is there to extending the hours? Both options A and B are an extension of existing hours. Why isn't the current hours an option? If forced to choose, Option A is preferred. Concerns include: Keeping the park open when there isn't daylight has several safety factors: - people will go swimming at the beach without daylight posing greater risk of drowning - people will launch boats on the lake after dark posing greater risk of the wellbeing of the lake (how can they check for weeds/mussels without daylight?) - people will go on the ice after dark and won't be able to see weak spots posing

greater risk of breaking through/death (last year a 6-7 ft hold was kept open on the ice near the beach-someone would fall in without daylight) Suggested solution: Leave the current hours as they are.

Stay with half hour before and after the sun. I'd like to see a list of valid, honorable, activities we should encourage teens to do in the dark in our parks !!!

STOP LOOKING AT THINGS THE OLD WAYS become a mature city and open your eyes and your ears to the times we are in, get real, get over yourselves. this is the peoples city

Stop shutting the gates, leave the parks open.

Suggest to limit park hours for overnight hours; solves by setting park hours accordingly

Sunrise to sunset is great! It changes with the seasons and provides various options for busy people.

T

Tax dollars going for men to use. Most woman do not go out after dark because of safety issues.

That would be an invitation for homeless people to camp here. I can't think of any park I've ever used that is open 24/7. There is no reasonable way to patrol or police a park open all the time.

The coverage provided by darkness and plant life may attract more illicit activities

The current hours the sheriff's department patrol the parks do not cover the entire time people could access.

The demand for recreation space in the overnight hours is so low that the risks of increased crime and problems clearly outweigh the benefit of opening the parks for that time.

The idea that any open space that is paid for and maintained by public funds would be restricted for use in given times is ultimately just costing the public, the county, and anyone involved their limited resources. Let people use the park whenever they want to.

The idea that people will aggregate after 10 pm and deter misbehavior is wishful thinking.

The park hours are perfectly fine the way they are. Again, answer the question.... 1) Who are the nocturnal humans you are trying to serve (please state for the record in your meetings so we can share on social media and all marketing materials. 2) What nocturnal activities are you trying to encourage or accommodate? Please state for the record in your meetings for documentation.. Solutions....the hours are perfectly fine. The hours accommodate the changing seasonal times of darkness...no need to be in the park in the dark.

The park hours at least imply that there is some oversight. Would worry about homeless people or groups of youths or fishing people hanging out and drinking all night, creating disturbance and leaving trash (rather like Mears Park downtown). People would camp if overnight was allowed.

The parks belong to all of us. No need to close them

The parks have animal life and they need time with no people. What is there to do in a dark park in the wee hours?

The parks near me are not well lit and therefore can leave people vulnerable after dark, especially those waiting for transportation or walking.

The parks need established hours. If nothing else, it's a safety issue. Who would patrol/monitor the parks 24/7? What would this cost???

The State, County and Cities need to address homelessness in a direct approach. Trying to disguise a cheap solution in the form of longer hours is short sighted and dishonest.

The worst thing, people could do anything overnight. If you don't catch them in the act you couldn't stop them.

There already seem to be some issues with noise, crime, and more in parks, and this would grant freedom reign. Unless there are patrols signed up to supervise the 24/7 windows, it does not seem like a good idea. I would post hours that can be managed.

There are certain times where late park hours would be beneficial but it should be for events and specific monitored activities

There are lot of inappropriate activities going on in Park. We need to restrict it. And the best way is it limit no of hours.

There are many people who destroy/damage park property (stealing copper wires from essential pathway lighting, breaking/spraypainting public artworks, leave behind excessive amounts of trash that usually ends up in the lakes/streams

There are too many places susceptible to damage to allow a blanket "open policy" to parks.

There have been massive problems in Roseville with squatters, increased crime (drug dealing/usage) and prostitution. Having the parks open 24/7 will increase crime, increase noise, and increase the amount of law enforcement resources needed to patrol the parks.

There is a concern for crime or vandalism, but people are intl the parks at night anyway

There is no need for a park to be open 24/7 unless there is camping facilities on site.

There is no reason a park needs to be open l'm the middle of the night. Concerned about the ability to patrol 24/7 and control suspicious activities later in the night.

There is nothing positive or beneficial that can occur with overnight hours. Long Lake regional park is already going downhill. My children sifted mountains of glass shards from the lake shore this week, and litter is strewn about. 24/7 is only going to invite more unsupervised loitering. I cannot think of a single benefit. Homes around our park systems, Hanson, etc, will lose value if these parks become unruly. Police resources are already strained, and this would make it more difficult to manage and leave open more opportunity for inequality (e.g., a closing hour can be strictly enforced, but 24/7 leaves openings for selective enforcement of unwelcome behavior overnight).

There may be late night noise or other disturbance issues.

There may be more crime but it's all crime that would have happened somewhere else in the city.

There may be some lighting issues though some of the trails would be better if lit.

There should be a push for good lighting and services overnight.

There should be hours so that vandalism can be address as breaking the rules.

There should be some guidelines on park hours.

There shouldn't be a need to have to park 'open' 24/7. We understand most parks don't physically close.

There will be constant trouble with parks being used as a meeting place to conduct illegal activity after dark. Parks would not be safe!!

There would need to be adequate patrolling of park areas to keep crime down during less busy hours. Would there become a problem with homeless encampments?

There would only be trouble.

There's already a lot of disturbing behavior happening in the park in late night hours including drug use, fireworks, sex in vehicles, and hotrodding. Bad idea to eliminate all park hours.

There's no reason for someone to be there at 2 am or 3 am or 4 am....

There's something to be said for "nothing good happens after midnight". What reason could groups have to be in the park late at night or in the early morning hours? Wouldn't this put more wear and tear on the path and require more upkeep? Maybe if we could guarantee people would clean up after themselves?

There's no need for this.

Think of the effect on adjacent properties and the opportunity for illegal and raucous activities.

This concerns me about dangerous and damaging things after midnight to early morning hours. I live in the neighborhood very close to the park and have already experienced some concerning things.

This could become problematic if guests are playing music loudly or otherwise being loud and/or acting inappropriately at unreasonable hours. Installation and monitoring of cameras coupled with routine police patrols could limit this type of disturbance.

This does not address the actual usage concerns; i.e. what people are doing when they are at the park. To address that, clearer rules, more signs, and a public education campaign would be more helpful.

This is a bad idea.

This is a bad idea. It would call of inappropriate late night gatherings and neighborhood disturbance

This is a really bad idea and will only result in more vandalism and destruction of property.

This is concerning, because it could encourage the homeless to set up camp and live in the Tamarack woods, which may make people feel less safe hiking by themselves.

This is just asking for trouble. Who do the parks serve in the middle of the night? What purpose do they have for being there? What are they doing? Are safe things happening at those times?

This is less appealing because there could be more crime during late night hours.

This is not appealing because it may invite people to stay too long or even try to sleep at the parks

This might draw in more bad behavior in the middle of night.

This might invite unintended consequences such as camping in parks or undesirable activities in the parks at night. Having hours gives law enforcement a simple, easy basis to eject people out of the park.

This opens the door to various incidents and crimes, as well as various other issues like littering and noise. Let the people party/play until dark and then send them home. This has ensured safety up to now. Have you ever stumbled thru a park in the dark and felt safe?

This option does not relieve homelessness or substance abuse problems by creating more open spaces at night and rather than spending on affordable housing, spends money on dealing with the lack of housing by moving people to public parks instead of homes.

This option treats citizens as adults, instead of children who can't think for themselves.

This park closure time encourages people to use the park after sunset. I'd rather the hours be tied to sunrise and sunset.

This seems like a safety hazard. If someone goes through the park during dark or less busy times of day/night and gets injured or lost its going to take a longer amount of time for someone to find them, provide medical help or realize a person is missing.

This should not permit unregulated overnight camping in the parks. It should not enable loud or disruptive activities (parties, etc) in the middle of the night.

This Survey sounds like a solution in search of a problem.

This will encourage law breaking and other nefarious activities. Who would use the park at 2 am? Very likely people that would be violating the laws.

This would allow more opportunity for transient misuse of public land. "Closed to public hours" would help deter improper use of parklands and give law enforcement a rule to oust those who would camp on park lands. Camping creates waste and nuisance to usual park visitors

This would be a disaster

This would be a terrible option. Nothing good happens after dark.

This would be an awful decision. It would bring a lot of homeless people to the city. It would allow for more drug recreation and other recreational activities that we do not wish for in the city. Do NOT do this.

This would be horrible. It would be a gateway for homeless encampments and the resulting social problems - crime, drug use, pan handling. It would reduce park usage.

This would cause a headache for park personal to keep park clean

This would create noise and more opportunities for crime overnight

This would make me feel unsafe. It seems purely cost-saving so that it doesn't need to be monitored? I do not like this option at all.

Though I'm not the majority, there's very little reason people need to be in parks from 11PM to 5AM. That said, if there are times the parks are closed, rules need to be enforced the same for young black kids and jogging white ladies.

To many problems can happen after dark. Not enough officers to have to patrol these areas. Extend to an hour after sunset. I like how the hours this way go along with the with the seasons in Mn.

to much happens after midnight that isn't legal in the after 11:00

Too difficult to monitor.

Too easy for people to camp / take residence in the parks

Too high of crime possibility. Hard to patrol all night.

Ultimately the dog park portion is for the dogs more so than the humans. The humans sometimes work odd hours and being limited by set hour restrictions takes away from the pets activity space. The prime location of the park is

surrounded by apartments, townhouses and limited yard space. The park is a safe-haven for countless dogs to exercise, socialize and run free even if they are still contained.

Unsure on the demand for a park without lighting at late hours, feels like it would lead to more vandalism, however without them being locked that's just a guess..

Very difficult to maintain safety in the middle of the night

Very late night crime

Very little that is positive happens in the middle of the night in the park. Unless there is a legitimate need, I think this is a bad idea.

Very opposed

We already have plenty of issues in the park at night. Allowing people to be there 24/7 seems like it will just increase it. There is a neighborhood right next to the park, and it can be loud with people over there.

We already have too many kids/teens unsupervised in parks at night. Thus gives them more opportunities to get in trouble.

We deal with a lot of traffic and speeding on Emil. At these peak times I see no enforcement. People don't abide by the requirements now. At least if there is unlawful activity we can call to have this checked out. Nothing good happens after hours. The baseball, soccer parent who is in a hurry to get kids to game have NO respect for the people walking biking on our street.

We desperately need a dog park in MacGowland/Highland Park. I'm a dog lover and owner of two. But Ppl use other parks or open spaces (like SPABaseball field) as an OFF LEASH Dog Park. Two consecutive times I was there recently a bigger dog started charging at my tiny 18 lb mini beagle/JRT mix. First x when asked the owner did call her dog...2nd time owner wasn't even from around here...his date apparently knew about the space....the pit bull like featured med size dog came racing out of the group with its wide mouth wide open came a foot away from my little dog (apparently owners not watching instead chatting) I literally was horse from screaming I had to pick my dog up by her leash off the ground. Mama instinct kicked in and I just started swinging her around in circles. Then I hear from the girlfriend, "This dog is very safe" (Don't ever say that, I was bit by a dog and had a dog that bit a postal carrier (& had to be put down) after neighbor moved away - guarding instinct kicked in high gear) Dogs are animals w instincts not rational brains. Boy friend says, "This is an off leash dog park" I said No it's Not" & mentions St Paul Ordinance & SPAs in letting the community enjoy their grounds at all. No apology and they only wanted to hear what they wanted to hear.

We do not need the disturbance of park goes after 8PM. If there are no hours, parks will become vice dens with homeless encampments, drug dealers and felons cruising these areas.

We don't need people in the park for any reason after 10.

We have animal friends and neighbors and want to make sure our nocturnal friends have access to use space without human interference.

We love close to the park and do not like the idea of anyone being able to be there at all hours of the night. What is so important that it needs to be done at 3am?? Nothing.

what about safety & vandalism during dark hours?

What are the benefits of this option to the county/city? What are the benefits to the community? I am not sure how many are chomping at the bit for 24 hour park access. Safety seems a concern.

What happens when the park closes?

What happens with illegal activities at night and what about the actions of littering and property destruction? The parks are already littered and poorly maintained, this will make it worse.

What is the cost for additional patrols? What about a homeless population issue?

What problem does this solve or what issue does it address? Who wants to use the parks all night? For what purpose?

What reasonable use of the park from 11pm to 5am are you trying to allow here?

What will be recourse if there are noise or trash or other nuisance-type issues? What's the safety plan? Potentially surveillance cameras would be an asset in this scenario (and the other) and funding from the federal government is possible.

What would be purpose of extending the hours to 24/7? Maintain the current hours.

What would be the benefit of adding hours between 11pm and 5am? That doesn't seem necessary.

What would people be doing in parks in the middle of the night? If people need to commute by bike between 11:00 pm and 5:00 am, perhaps we could have a pass, similar to cross county ski pass.

What's the motivation for year round opening and who uses the parks at 3 am?

What's to stop people from camping overnight in parks if they're open 24 hours?

When it is dark cars are more vulnerable to crime.

When it is dark, it allows opportunity for crime to happen.

While I realize that most parks don't have gates to limit access, there's still a perception that people should leave the park at some point. I'm concerned that 24/7 would encourage squatters. Extending hours from 5-10 or 5-11 feels adequate.

While I see the appeal of the *option* to use parks for running in the early morning, getting confidence that it's actually safe to use parks compared to well lit city streets is a different discussion

While you may not be enforcing hour violations, there may be other crime or safety scenarios that would require patrols around the clock? Cost and people-power could be an issue.

Who needs a park at 3am. Nothing good happens after midnight. my momma always said nothing open after midnight but legs and the er

Who needs to go to the park at 2 am?

Who needs to use the park at 3am???

Who needs to use the park from dark until sunrise? I think only people who are going to cause trouble.

Who would want to be in a city park middle of the night other than those wanting to do "bad things". If I had a teenage son or daughter I would be concerned about where they would be hanging out and in what park at 3 or 4 in the morning.

Why does the park need to be open when it's dark, that seems to be asking for trouble

Why is it necessary to have the park open 24/7? The only ones in the park after 11:00 PM will be trouble-makers and teens breaking curfew.

Why would someone need to use the parks between 11 pm and 5 am, unless they were commuting home from an 11 pm work shift? This will make it easier for all sorts of unlawful behavior to flourish in parks. There will not be more law abiding citizens using the parks to slow the unlawful behavior down during the overnight hours.

Why? You will encourage homeless people to camp out in county parks. This will discourage others from using the parks similar to what it did in some areas of St. Paul with Mayor Carter's consent. Allowing people to continue to party on parks adjacent to lakes will create noise pollution for those of us who live in the community because noise travels over water.

Will be overrun w drug deals crime and homeless people. Horrible idea

Will need more patrolling and increase taxes

Will Park Police or SPPD actually be patrolling or monitoring parks between dusk and dawn? There are real potentials for safety concerns.

Will people be camping / living in the parks?

will people choose to camp there? Is that okay? Make sure there are places for people to leave refuse or that becomes a problem. Have patrols check park at intervals for safety and wellness.

Will the sheriffs be able to patrol at all hours? Will lighting be added to high traffic paths? I'd suggest "call boxes" but I'm not sure of the efficacy of those in practice. While I enjoy the darkness I also think high traveled paths should be lit, especially for people commuting by bicycle or walking.

Will they be policed 24/7?

With 24/7 availability, there is more opportunity for vandalism, homeless populations encroaching, and people misusing amenities.

With minimal park lighting, there is the assumption that a minimal number of people will use the parks, recreationally, between 11pm-5am.

With no lighting in many parks, and limited time parks can be patrolled may pose a risk to people using the parks for legitimate purposes at late or early hours.

With no patrolling in the middle of the night, much more prone to illegal activities if people are legally allowed to hang out all night

With no restrictions, my concern would be that criminal and/or other behaviors that violate park regulations would take place.

With the proximity of this park location (very close to 2 large population urban areas) the hours should continue to be as they currently are. What honest worthwhile activities are currently precluded from happening during the existing hours. I strong oppose extending the park hours.

Without lighting this would seem to increase opportunities for vandalism and other crimes. What are the parks crime stats?

Without park lighting, it may not be safe in all parks or in all parts of parks—thinking of trip and fall situations. Crimes against park patrons could happen at any time of day, so I am less concerned about that in this case.

Would allow for people to begin establishing a camp in parks with no ability to enforce. Even if there was no tent.

Would be best paired with 24/7 Park patrol.

Would be concerned for safety of all people using the park at odd hours in the night.

Would be helpful to provide increased nighttime programming and outreach to make the parks used and safe at all hours.

Would be invite for vandalism

Would definitely need lighting and open restrooms. Would there be enough activity to deter criminal activity? How much extra police/sheriff patrols needed?

Would lighting be added for safety? How would the lighting affect wildlife? Would vehicles be safe in parking lots after dark (since there are already issues with break-ins)? Would women feel comfortable visiting after dark, or would this only increase access for men?

Would like the parks closed at night for safety and ease of enforcement

Would patrolling them also need to be 24 hours? Seems prohibitive to me.

Would promote the parks as a place for those experiencing homelessness to create encampments. While I am FOR having safe places for that, it generally doesn't end well for the campers when these happen in parks. Will lead to conflicts with police, as the current response seems to be forceful removal.

would require much more intensive monitoring to ensure parties, noise, fireworks, etc. rules are followed.

Would there be patrols all night? I am very concerned about things happening when it is dark. I also don't think we need to add to light pollution by lighting all the parks.

would this allow camping in unauthorized areas? Might this encourage folks without homes to camp out or park in the parks long term. How would the parks be monitored to ensure no overnight parking or camping out?

Would this create additional opportunity for encampments to take hold in the county parks? Need to ensure that residents can feel safe while using the parks, as a woman, using the paths and hiking trails after dark is not something that I would feel comfortable with. More patrolling seems costly, I suspect theres a very small element that would cause trouble and may be difficult to patrol.

Would this increase crime in the park?

Would this increase crime, specifically vandalism?

Would this increase the amount of police presence in parks? I am concerned about more sheriff's office or local law enforcement patrolling within parks and the harm that they cause to my bipoc neighbors and fellow park users.

Would this make camping in the park legal?

Would this make providing services to homeless who are resistant to help more difficult?

Would this permit camping in the parks? Would park patrolling hours change? Are there any expectations that maintenance costs would increase with expanded hours related to trash and litter?

Would this weaken the ability to hold people accountable for vandalism and other damage to park property?

You are inviting trouble.

You will have folks setting up camps with a 24/7 option. Disputes over reserved shelters when someone is sleeping in it.

You will have homeless people living in the parks

For the county parks that are on lakes, there is more danger in the dark (soft ice or waves,etc)

The current hours accomodate all seasonal dusk/dawn

24 x 7 doesn't make sense...the current hours accomodate daylight and dusk. Nothing good can happen in the middle of the night

I can see the value of being open 24 hours for certain populations to access easier. However, it would take more resources to patrol and monitor.

Need to maintain the mission to promote health, safety, and enjoyment of everyone and to protect park property. A 24 x 7 scenario would not do this.

What activities need to be done in the dark?

What can't you do before 10 or 11 o'clock that you would need to do at 3 am?

maybe consider permit use for night use? (Star gazing parties etc...)

Would there be police coverage in the middle of the night?

There are many concerns to this and it seems to go against the mission. Safety, property damage, and crime are is a big concern.

No secure, would be costly in terms of providing security and maintenance.

What activities would be promoted ? or needed

What problem or issue does this address?

safety concern - will staff be around 24/7 to manage any issues?

When am I going to sleep if I'm at the park all night?

Who wants to use parks all night? What do they want to do?

2am, concerns...

noise related issues for neighbors

need to maintain paths and trails in the evenings in a different way

I'm concerned about loud noise late into the evening.

Other laws still exist about noise and illicit activities

Possibly limiting how long people can reserve the park spaces for to help with late night noise.

How would this affect police monitoring - will this require police to stretch their resources to monitor the parks?

Probably the same concerns during the dark hours concerns as in the last page.

Agree with same concerns. Need more safety features such as lights, blue phones. If police presence is increased, there would need to be equity/inclusion training so people are not unfairly targeted.

Does removing park hours take away a simple tool authorities can use to usher people away from the park without issuing a ticket?

Blatant disregard for the intended purpose of park.

Concern would be potential for people to begin camping and safety of them if they do.

I agree this would be difficult to enforce.

this would allow for star gazing and other night time events.

Over-arching safety concerns and concerns that local law enforcement has not been engaged when they control the parks. Do not understand what "issue" we are trying to solve. Safety is extremely concerning given I live in the area and note suspicious behavior routinely after hours EVENT WITH current hours.

Ample lighting and appropriate signage to ensure compliance
enforcement and park staff

People also live by these parks and are extremely concerned for neighborhood safety based on data.

Better to protect the parks by closing at sunset.

having set hours encourages family time at home will there be any security available during these 24/7?

I support longer park use hours, especially in the winter, but as a resident who lives up against park property, I don't see a need to have 24/7 access, especially overnight hours.

Limit the hours to 30 minutes before and after sun rise and sun set.

My suggested solution is to keep patrols the way they are. When patrols have found people in the park after hours, how many times has it been a nice little family having an outing?

Need cameras in the lots and prosecution of people breaking into cars.

Parks should not be open 24/7.

People staying overnight Already a lot of late night illegal activity. (Perry park too)

Stepwise approach may be best. If the 5am to 11pm hours are not sufficient, and there's no downside based on the expanded hours experience, we could move to 24/7.

Vehemently opposed! Concerns are the safety of of park users and homeowners, and introduces overnight camping. Degradation of the park and woods and impact on wildlife. Again, how many people have requested this?

What are people going to be doing that late at night? Will neighborhoods be safe?

Who came up with this stupid idea?

Would this mean people could camp in the park? I would suggest a time limit of time spent in the park, such as 8 hrs

Other ideas for park hours

1. Require registration or identification to use parks during open times (potentially longer than the current open/close) 2. Open certain or different ones at extended times throughout the season, based on demand, availability of patrols, and ability to operate at best level.

10 pm at night.

10 pm closing time preferred

10 pm noise curfew regardless of hours.

11P to 5A only allows for 6 hours of quiet time in and near the parks. I am a regular visitor to Battle Creek Park, and am delighted to see the many people (diverse population) who walk and bike in that park. They live nearby, and should be entitled to 7-8 hours of quiet time in their apartment homes that ring the park.

24/7 is the way to go. Not everyone has the luxury of recreation during normal hours.

30 minutes after sunset in the summer. 10pm close in the winter

5 a.m. to 10 p.m. seems reasonable. People living nearby deserve consideration as well. Noise ordinances are often ignored.

5 a.m. to 10 p.m. is a reasonable time for the parks to be open, any time of the year.

5 a.m. to 10p.m.

5 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. should accommodate all people who are seeking a legitimate use of the park.

5 a.m. until 11 p.m. year-round seems like the most reasonable solution. Unless there are personal circumstances of others that I'm not aware of that make this limiting.

5 am - 10 pm would be reasonable

5 am - 2200

5 am to 10 p.m.

5 am to 10 pm.

5 am to 10:30pm

5 am to 11 pm April 1 to Oct 31 6 am to 10 pm Nov 1 to March 31

5 or 6 am to 9 or maybe 10pm

5:30 am-10pm year round.

5:30am- 9:30om Or continue with the current 1/2 hour before sunrise and 1/2 hour after sunset.

5am opening presents challenges for maintenance.

5am to 10pm

5am to 10pm

5am to 10pm or 5-am to 9pm

5am to midnight

5am-10pm

5am-10pm

5am-10pm

5am-11pm is the right thing to do.

5am-9pm

6 a.m. to 10 p.m. are very reasonable park operating hours.

6 am -10 pm Summer 7am - 6 pm Fall, Winter

6 AM to 10 PM would be fine.

6 am to 9 pm

6:00am is early enough and 10:00pm is late enough.

6am - 9pm seems reasonable. These are daylight hours for most of the summer.

6am to 10 pm might be a better option.

6AM to 10PM is better for noise control in neighborhood parks

6am to 10pm would be a better option.

6am-10pm year round

6am-9pm all year would be a reasonable update to the hours

9:00 or 10:00pm seems a reasonable extension of hours, as winter hours are very short right now.

9pm or 10pm curfew. To allow the maximum daylight enjoyment hours (summertime) at a consistent, year-round level.

a

A hybrid solution might be to open some parks 5am-11pm and to have a few parks and/or park areas open 24/7. If this occurs, I encourage strong consideration of making some of these areas to be accessible but to have no lights for amateur astronomers.

Absolutely not. Are you serious? Everyone knows more noise and crime happens later nights, overnights, and early mornings.

Again, I believe each park's operational hours need to vary based on what amenities the park has. Insecure dark areas should close when the space is no longer habitable for sight.

Again, keep the present hours.

All approaches have their pros and cons. LE knows I. general what happens in these parks and when, both good and bad. I am inclined to support any reasonable approach advocated by LE.

All parks open all the time

Allow leashed dogs in outdoor picnic. Areas

As described above, a mixed approach with set but expanded hours for parks generally but opening water access sites 24/7 would be a third option that I would prefer over Option A as-is.

As mentioned earlier, I would recommend that parks be open between 6 am and 10 pm. If someone needs to commute via biking through them, they could show proof of working. Or let parks be open until 11:30 pm if that is why they are being left open late.

As suggested above, I could see a justification for opening the parks earlier for reasons of early workouts, but not keeping them open later. I would also suggest that trails be opened for commuting. My guess is they are used anyway.

Ask the question- how can we decrease the number of men that are violent against people? How do we call out men for their violence? Why would we spend more tax dollars on creating a space for men to hang out?

Assure there is adequate lighting and security in the parks/parking lots. Security cameras, law enforcement patrolling the parks/lots frequently throughout the day and night.

Automated gates to close the park when outside operating hours.

Both options are poorly thought out and do not help foster a crime-free or safe neighborhood community.

Cameras, lights, gates, more security personal. In the last year there has a shooting, drug dealing, robberies and littering running rampant in our park. Please enforce the rules you have before you start changing them!

Can we just have summer and winter hours? Keep the summer hours the same and increase the winter hours to 7am-7pm or 7am-8pm, etc.

Change the closing time till midnight

City and County park hours should be the same to lessen confusion as to which park you are in.

Clean up after yourself, family, friends. Be quiet, respectful of other park users and neighborhood. No smoking or drinking. Making the city liable for driving while intoxicated ? Kids/animals/my family playing at park, don't need to be around drugs and the trash people leave behind.

Close parks at 10pm except to people who are using trails rather than lingering.

Close time 10pm

Consider special extended hours seasonally, or possibly during a trial period. Change is hard, but maybe seeing how the community responds to extended hours and what new uses / utility comes from trial changes.

Continue dawn to dusk hours with exemptions for specific activities such as biking through. Or amend to 1-2 hours before dawn to 1-2 hours after dusk to align with time to use the park during seasonal shifts.

Could the trails have 24/7 hours but parks have narrower hours (like 5am to 10pm)? Could there be different winter and summer hours?

County parks should match the park hours of the city they are in

Create a "park pass" that would create a sense of ownership to users and a greater sense of responsibility to the overall safety of the parks. No other suggestions. A consistent park hours from 5-6a to 10 p is reasonable. Current hours are restrictive, and are currently not enforced anyways. An increase in access hours is welcome, if it would create actual enforcement. Unrestricted access 24/7 is mind-boggling..

Create a special permit for anyone who wishes to use the park beyond the posted hours of operation. If someone really wants to use a park beyond the time currently stated in the ordinance, let's allow them to obtain a permit. This way there is accountability to some degree, in case there are issues.

create free encampments as safe zones. Follow toronto as an example with poorta potties, hand washing, food tents, trash removal, fire safety, gathering spaces - - - IF YOU WONT BUILD HOUSING FOR THE DEEPLY POOR THEN YOU CANNOT SWEEP SAID PARKS. IT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

current hours are very constrained and need to be updated, Option A seems feasible, although a bit more extended to allow through midnight will facilitate night time recreation

Dark parks are an invitation for young people (or others) to do inappropriate things. Please keep them closed at night.

Dawn to dusk makes sense but if consistency is prioritized, then perhaps set hours, for example, for October - April (8:00 am-10:00 pm) and May-September (6:00 am - 11:00 pm) would make sense.

Dawn to dusk with seasonal changes in the hours

Different hours for summer/winter. Bicycle traffic allowed to commute during closed hours.

DO NOT appile any homeless people camps to be setup.

Do not open Ramsey county parks up to more criminal activity, homeless camps, drug use, noise pollution, bu having the parks open past 10pm

Don't change anything! It's a beautiful park. Don't try to fix something that isn't broken!

Drug dealing and other crimes are not recreation

Dusk to dawn seems the most logical

Earlier morning hours seem reasonable. Would only extend park hours at night by an hour or so for safety issues.

Extending the morning hours would be fine. If you're looking at the concerns for commuters biking in the paths then open the paths up for biking traffic or walk in traffic and extending those hours.

First idea (5-11) seems fine, maybe even start more limited and open in mornings later, but not evenings later. The evenings are where all the costs of this policy change arise. No one is getting up at 5am is going to abuse the park.

Fishing piers at county parks need to be left alone by park closing officer's unless something looks suspicious please check it out

Have a permit option for activities beyond the reasonable timelines so people pay to be in the parks after or before hours.

Honestly, I had no idea that park hours were set as such. I have used the Battle Creek trails until 10pm or later many times with no issues. I think the bigger concern is preserving park property for all to use and enjoy safely. If controlling park hours is the best way to do that, then I suppose this is a worthwhile activity.

hours driven by natural daylight are the most practical manner in which people should be using parks. bike commuters generally don't need park rule adjustments in order to commute. maintain daylight hours on parks.

Hours should be until 10pm and getting the park if possible

Hours should perhaps depend on the environment in which the park exists - those in residential areas should close earlier than those in primarily non-residential areas, so as to minimize disruptive activity. The county should also recommit to enforcing the ordinance with regards to amplified sound and other disruptive activity, which is enough of a problem during daylight hours but becomes even more problematic when residents in the areas surrounding the parks are trying to sleep.

How about having summer hours and winter hours? Summer could be longer, given the longer daylight hours. And shorter in the winter

How about open from 1 hour before sunrise to one hour after sunset?

I

I am in favor of expanding access to be more inclusive. I feel there should be appropriate steps taken to aid in the public safety like ensuring all parking areas are illuminated after dark, working with neighboring residents to identify problem areas for monitoring or more frequent patrols.

I believe it is reasonable to expand the park hours in seasons other than summer. 9:00 or 10:00pm closing time vs 30 minutes after dusk could work.

I can see how extending park hours to one hour after sunset is reasonable, but other than that, why does the park need to be open so long before sunrise and so long after sunset?

I do feel that parks should be closed overnight for safety reasons and to help enforce quiet hours for neighbors.

I don't walk or allow my children to walk in park after dark as it doesn't currently feel safe due to people living in the park currently. They argue and fight and yell at people to leave during the day, swearing at us, smoking pot and picking fights. The police said it is public land so the homeless can use it to live in, so increasing hours to open all the time gives that even more openings. I am not ok with that. I want to feel safe in the park and be able to walk in it, too.

I don't see any problems with the existing hours. Maybe it should be addressed on a by location basis.

I have asked local police officers what they thought of the proposed times and every one of them stated the around the clock proposed hours would be a very bad idea. I would not agree on any proposed hours for later than 10 pm or earlier than sunrise, or perhaps 6 am.

I have stated my questions. What activities are you trying to support or advocate....that happen in the dark ?? There are no options needed. The hours are common sense.

I know about city sidewalks as I live on White Bear Avenue and have many people making noise all night long, especially now in the summer with windows open. I would rather see efforts put into keeping our streets safe for all of us, having more police patrol for speed, keeping noise levels down (motorcycles). Would this change cause a budget difference? Would there need to be more money put into parks. If so, I would like to see money put towards opening closed rec centers. Prosperity for example, nothing happens there, no softball, tball, soccer, like in the past. Let's create space for our youth to get involved. More teen programs. Give kids something to do other than walking the streets and making noise across White Bear Avenue in the evenings.

I like 5-10 best

I like how it is now.

I like stargazing but need later hours to use the parks. Maybe open til 2-3 am?

I like the 5am to 11pm

I like the hours that are set now. We have a lot of dark hours in MN and with no lighting this is a safety concern.

I like the idea of consistent expanded hours (so no one is left guessing what counts as sunrise/sunset). 24 hour access will make it easier for park property to be damaged/ made less safe for everyone. I can't imagine Ramsey county really plans to provide meaningful security to parks late at night.

I like the idea of having the parks open 24 hours a day. However, I would be worried about unsheltered people not having a place to sleep if any of them seek refuge in the parks at night.

I like the park being open from 5 am to 10 pm.

I live next to a Regional Park. I'd prefer a closed gate each night at a set time. I am concerned about the night time activity I notice: fireworks, loud gatherings (including a crowd earlier this summer that needed to be broken up by police), car racing.

I Love the idea of extending the hours past sun up and sun down- but for those who live around the areas, for maintenance and animals- I'm not sure 24 hours/7 days a week is the best option.

I prefer 24/7

I see no reason why the current hours (sunup to sundown) need to be adjusted.

I suggest making the parks accessible 24/7 and then respond to problems that may occur by adjusting those hours if necessary for those specific parks in which problems develop.

I suppose that people who might cause trouble may go to the parks at night regardless of posted hours. Teens and twenty somethings would be allowed in as long as they weren't causing trouble in the 24/7 model. To me it all depends on those doing the patrolling.

I think 10 pm is a fair park closing time.

I think 10pm is a reasonable closing time.

I think 10pm would be a better cut off time

I think an hour after dark and before sunset would be sufficient to accommodate those using the park with good intentions.

I think current hours are fine, but option A is a compromise and still enforceable.

I think enforce noise, drug, gun laws, the laws prohibiting tents and sleeping and don't bother kids making out on the playground in the dark.

I think having the parks open 5 a.m. through 10 p.m. is OK.

I think more hours are better but all night is NOT ok.

I think opening up earlier for runners and active people would be wonderful. But not closing later or a 24/7 policy.

I think that at least trails should have no hour restrictions. People are just passing through a place here, so concerns about noise wouldn't apply.

I think the 5am opening is a great idea.

I think the current hours are reasonable.

I think the current hours are the best as no one needs to be in the park after dark

I think the park hours are fine as is. No need to have people there before sunrise and at night. I agree that that leaving it open 24/7 or late at night could cause an increase in crime. I think that the issue is more around the building/equipment hours rental.

I think the parks should be a open a little later than sunset as that is very early in the winter but they don't need to be open all night.

I think the parks should close at night.

I would be in favor of expanding hours to run up to one hour past sunset.

I would close the park's at 10 pm.

I would propose a 5:00-10:00 park hour mandate

I would recommend a volunteer group of "keep our parks safe" individuals who would stroll through the parks on a routine basis and report suspicious activity to the appropriate authorities. When I lived in Detroit, these type of solutions were gentle yet effective.

I would run the hours 5 am to 10 pm.

I would say you could make the hours until 12 am, gives it a bit more flexibility.

I would suggest no change but more help for those living by Shoreview parks.

I'd recommend 6am to 10pm

I'm in favor of parks being open 24/7 because people will use the parks regardless of the posted open times.

I'm not sure what it means to have limited hours for an unsecured park? Just that people could be asked to leave?

If 24 hour access to the park is chosen as the new park hours patrol should increase at night, not to a crazy extent but just enough enforcement to feel safe but not enough to make people uncomfortable. I do agree more with the 5am to 11pm schedule as the early mornings to late night schedule works well. I feel the 24 hour park would encourage more people to stay out late night in parks which could lead to questionable acts being committed in the late hours of the night.

if bike commuting is hampered by trails being "closed" by park hours, make all trails/paths open 24/7 but limit off-trail/path allowable activities

If there are some groups that want occasional evening options, (ex. star gazing), perhaps they could apply for a permit and pay a SMALL fee that would cover police driving through and checking occasionally.

In comparison, 24-hour access offers greater potential for programming (possibly in partnership with other agencies or private providers), but also has the greater costs.

Increased hours in the winter to accommodate people using it after 5pm. How about April-Sept the parks are open until an hour after sunset. The rest of the year they're open until 8pm.

Install cameras and open the parks 24/7

It can be tested at some parks first and based on the experience, can be expanded or canceled. I am by the Mears Park and I am OK if someone sleeps at the bench as long as they don't harm anyone else.

It could stay as is. Allow special permit for a nominal fee but that sounds like a headache.

It would be fantastic to have more off leash dog spaces. Is it feasible to allow off leash dogs in all parks between 7pm - 7am?

Just in general I'd like to see more lights in parks.

Just thinking out loud . . . I think set hours is best. . . posted - and obvious

Keep 05:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and add permit/reservation capability with neighbor participation in the decision for specific events that need to occur after 10:00 p.m.

keep current hours in place for summer open up hours for October - April (eg to align with seasonal change in restricting overnight street parking rules during snow plow season in Vadnais Hts) for 6am - 10pm or similar to noise ordinance

Keep current hours, improve lighting and have a better police presence.

Keep current park hours

Keep hours as is.

Keep hours as they are currently

Keep hours as they are is the best suggestion.

Keep hours as they currently are and provide more affordable housing and social services

keep hours the same and enable a year long or life time permit for night use. That would keep people who cause trouble out of the park as they most likely wouldn't apply for a permit.

Keep it as is? Or 6am-9pm?

keep it as it is. 11:00 am to 21:00pm

Keep it specific times before/after sunrise/sunset. While the actual times do change throughout the year, it's really not hard to understand the language & reasoning.

Keep it the same as it already is.

Keep it the same? Why change something that seems it doesn't need changing? Focus on the up rise in crime around here

Keep it the same. Nothing keeps people out of the park but people need to be respectful of the neighborhoods around/near the park.

Keep it the way it is, but allow overnight parking.

Keep it the way it is. Vandalism, youth ignorance, and drinking all rise when the sun sets.

Keep park access open during daylight only, then police know if someone is hanging out at 1 am is up to no good.

Keep park hours already imposed.

Keep park hours manageable. Nobody needs to be there after 10 or before 6.

Keep posted hours

Keep rule as is.

Keep the current hours. They've worked fine for years.

Keep the existing hours. They provide for equal access for everyone regardless of ethnicity while respecting adjacent properties.

Keep the hours as is and keep monitoring the parks at night. Changing the hours is just asking for trouble because far more people will use it to do bad versus the people who will use it, if ever, to do good. Once the park hours change, I doubt they would ever go back to the current hours. So please consider this carefully and how it will effect the people who live by the parks and also the residents who use the parks during the day. Thank you.

Keep the hours the same. It works very well as is.

Keep the same hours. I would think tax payer dollars should be used to find other issues and areas for greater concern to deal with.

Law abiding citizens who have a legitimate reason to be in a park all night could purchase a pass to do so. The county generates revenue and hopefully we keep the parks safe. I don't think we need to open opportunities for more reasons to need the police when the police have enough going on. Just my 2 cents as a concerned citizen.

Leave hours as is

Leave hours as is

Leave it as is

Leave the current hours as they are.

Leave the hours as is!

Leave the hours as they are

Leave the hours as they are. Folks should understand they are closed due to not having lights.

Leave the rules as is. There is nothing wrong with them. Keep the parks safe for all people.

leave the rules As-Is!

Legitimate users of parks do not use them before 8AM or after 8PM. We need parks to be policed during these hours. A good idea would be to set up cameras for round the clock monitoring and to ensure the hours.

Limit access hours.

Limited passes could be applied for authorizing access for individuals that have a strong need to do so, which could be spelled out. They agree to following rules during these times, are open for being monitored and accountable for their actions. Could log into a sight when accessing and those ineligible to access could be ticketed/fined similar to parking violations.

Listen to the people who live directly adjacent to the park.

Longer park hours, maybe such as 6 AM to 10 PM in the summer could be acceptable and facilitate more use of the parks, as long as it comes with installation of adequate lighting, which is a significant expense, and adequate trash disposal and park oversight. When something happens in a park the response time is very long and the problem is rarely mitigated. I live near Battle Creek Park and while it is a magnificent park, the response time to any complaint related to the park is often incredibly lengthy or non existent. The park needs larger or more trash receptacles, more signage indicating use of trash receptacles, and clearer signage regarding abolished sounds - as well as clearer information online. Without adequate lighting, used of Parks in the dark will result in more illegal activities

happening in our Parks, more homelessness, and more disruption to actual use of the park by the community. And without better supervision and clear and convenient trash containers, parks will continue to be full of trash that pollutes the landscape and that leaves county staff to pick up after people.

make park hours 5 am to 10 pm. If park hours are 24/7 police patrols should be extended.

May- Sept 5:00 or 6:00 am-11:00 pm Oct-April 5:00 or 6:00 am-8:00 pm With extended patrols to make it a safe option. I also think cameras in the parking would be a good option if we can't have more patrols.

Maybe early morning until 2-3 am.

Maybe have a close between 1 AM and 5 AM?

maybe winter / summer hours ?

Maybe winter and summer hours or just 5a to 10p year round. Whatever it is enforce it. No riff raff

Maybe winter hours and summer hours to accommodate the differences in daylight

MN state parks have year round park hours 8am - 10 pm. These seem like reasonable hours. I think 5 am - 11pm is more than generous for recreational purposes. Past that, you could just be asking for trouble. Personally, I feel uncomfortable in the parks late at night. Even when I've hiked the state parks later after dark, I tend to be on higher alert.

More police patrols. The parks do not need to remain open as late as 11 pm. Early open hours invite less crime than late hours

Much more lighting!

My suggestion is to use common sense and come to realize that the good of all citizens whether they are black or white and all are equal.. We believe Safety is the defining deal maker. Therefore, let's keep hours for the park activities in the daylight hours. This is the time when the majority of citizens are using parks!

My vote is to keep hours AS IS. Ppl already moving away into SEVERAL counties N or even different states bc of incr crime TC Man charged with beheading a women in traffic w machete style knife. Shakopee this past Wed 7/28/2021.

N/A

Need more security

Need to step up patrols in parks at night. I have been threatened after dark just driving past mccarrons lake

Neither! Keep current times based on daylight

No after 9 pm under any circumstances.

No reason to change

None

normal hours

Not sure what the rationale is for posted park hours. I'm not sure if the original issue was liability related to users injuring themselves at night, or of it is just a way to limit use of the park by homeless, or people of color- if that is the case, I think that is a policing and social safety net issue rather than a park policy issue.


Nothing good happens late at night in a park.

Nothing is wrong with the current ordinance, it doesn't discriminate against anyone, woke is a joke.

Open 24/7 must be one of the dumbest ideas that I have ever heard. Completely shortsighted. Welcome homeless folks, illegal drugs, and sex...all hours of the day.

Open 24/7 with improved lighting and safety patrols.

Open 4am - 11pm

Open at 5am. Close 1/2 hour after sunset would be enough except to access ice in winter would be permitted. Parking for ice access permitted but remaining in park area is prohibited .

open regional trails 24/7 and expand hours for other parks

Open/close between 10-6 or 11-5 make sense

Option A sounds good.

Option C: Keep park hours as is (half hour before sunrise and a half hour after sunset) - This accounts for the significant changes in daylight hours over the course of the year.

Park hours could open 1/2 hour before sunset and close 1/2 hour after sunset.

Park should be open from sun-up to sun-down (might have 30 minutes on either side of that). There is absolutely NOTHING GOOD that will come from making this 24/7. Let's be honest with ourselves, what positive activities could possibly take place in a county park between 11 PM and 5 AM? Really???

Park should close at 10pm and the idiot who came up with the idea of 24/7 park hours is just that...an IDIOT. That person should have to live next to the future homeless encampment that will surely come with 24/7 access.

Parks offer safe off-road trails for non-motorized transportation users that are often more convenient than other on-road options outside of parks. Use of the trail system within parks for transportation purposes should be allowed 24/7, as some people bike/walk to work at all hours (particularly lower wage shift workers) and detouring around closed parks can be lengthy and inconvenient for non-motorized users. Consider regulating the activities that can occur overnight rather than criminalizing everything.

Parks should be open from dawn until dusk. It provides the greatest good for the community.

People can meet at 24 hour gas station, restaurant or their dwelling.

Perhaps a two-tiered solution makes sense - have all parks open 5 am-11 pm, then have identified corridors/portions of the park available 24/7. For example, for Battle Creek the entire park could be open 5 am - 11 pm, and then (at least in my area) the paved path between McKnight and downtown St. Paul could be open 24/7, along with the main trails and playground area north of Upper Afton (where there's a bit more moonlight/openness versus the portion between Lower and Upper Afton.)

Perhaps consider closing parks at Midnight instead of 11PM

Perhaps limit 24/7 user hours to specific parks or rec facilities such as boat launches and trails but close others to allow for closer monitoring of activity at a lower cost.

Permit general use during the 5-11 period as proposed. Permit travel through the parks on defined (paved?) trails by foot, bike etc to allow "night shift" workers to commute, etc. Allow overnight use permits for those wanting to

perform non disruptive activities (stargazing, nocturnal nature education programs, and so on) but restrict them to predetermined areas and dates.

Permit transitory usage of trails and sidewalks in parks to 24/7. For nontransitory usage and usage of park amenities, parks should be open 5:30 - 10 in lit parks. For non-lit parks, retain the half hour structure from Mar. 1 to Oct. 31. Nov. 1 to end of Feb., have hours of 6 AM - 8 PM.

Please allow leashed pets in picnic areas

PLEASE harsher rules against smokers. It's hard to enjoy a park with people smoking non stop!!!!

Please have restrictions for common sense, peace and quiet for residents next to the parks and peace of mind for anyone at the park. Ordinances are important and sometimes we need restrictions in access for the greater good of the whole community — I say this as someone who identifies as BIPOC.

Please inform me as well as the public just whose idea this is for 24 hour open parks.

Please use set park hours

Preference would be option A, unless expanding hours to 24/7 could come with safety upgrades as well

Prob still won't go during dark because I'm a woman and do not want to be mugged or raped.

Propose open 5 am until 10 pm

Proposed options are harmful to current residents. Higher crime, and more frequent harmful accidents are bound to occur

Provide free permits to those who need access to the park beyond open hours. Reason could be travel/bike to work, night time photography, etc.

Put in automated gates that will not allow people in after a certain time, like 9 or 10, at the latest.

See above comments about hours

See no reason to extend hours a reasonable option would be 5am to 8pm

See response A

Sell car/bike stickers to users for admittance to the Parks and tag violators.

Set a beginning time as 1/2 hour before sun rise or 6:00 am whichever occurs later for opening and 1/2 hour after sunset or 9:00 pm whichever occurs later.

Set hours is the way to go.

Should be NO overnight parking on the boulevard, more patrols after dark to check on crime, drug deals, drug use and overall misuse of the park. Beaver Lake park is getting to be more unsafe after dark.

State parks have hours of 8am-10pm. Understanding the reason for their choice might help inform a choice made for county parks.

Stay home and read a good book or play a board game like checkers !!

Summer time hours 6am-9pm. No 24/7 hours.

sunrise to sunset seems the best of suggested ideas

Support a trial of 5 AM opening but not extending hours beyond 10 PM except to 11 PM on Fridays and Saturdays. Let this trial run for a year and then survey residents again....and include any data collected from wildlife biologists, law enforcement and park staff before finalizing.

T

Take the money that's wasted on superficial and ineffective park patrol and spend it on cleaning up and/or maintaining the parks.

Thank you for asking for feedback and solutions. I look forward to seeing where this goes.

Thank you for taking the public's concerns about hours seriously. Having limits is reasonable, especially when there is an accompanying cost and impact.

The beach is disgusting and very disappointing. Was there yesterday and my kids were pull into glass out of the water. Picnic tables have trash everywhere.

The current hours have worked fine over many years. There is no need to change.

The current hours of operations are working, but should allow access to those that are wanting to be physically active on the off hours.

The new "no parking" signs at the Rice Creek dog park also pose many issues. The signs essentially limit the amount of people that can use the park while also giving officers more opportunity to ticket people simply trying to enjoy a park. The signs are a very recent addition, and they're an unnecessary one.

The other idea is to keep things the way they are now and offer permits for those who wants to use the park beyond current hours. If someone really wants to take night photography or use the trails late at night, they can make an additional effort to get a permit.

The rules are currently working and create no problems. I do not want people to be able to launch boats and run around on the lakes in our community at all hours of the day and even up to 11:00 am. It will increase vandalism and theft from homes adjacent to the lake when people can enter from the public parks and travel around the lakes after dark. I do not see how this aids or helps anyone to expand park hours? What justification do you have to do so? How does it impact use of the parks by all races and ethnicity? All the rules apply to all people and how does it create bias?

The simple solution would be to maintain the current hours of operation.

There is a section of woods at Tamarack Nature Center that is gated and locked off near the play and climbing area that is supposedly just for classes. It is a beautiful part of the woods that my kids have always wanted to go in after they finished class there. Could you please open that up for public use when class is not in session? I do not see anything in there that could be harmed from allowing people access to it when class is not in session.

There is no pressing need to changed what worked so well - from Dawn to dusk is easy enough to remember and common sense.

There is nothing in the current ordinance that is discriminatory. Woke is a joke.

These proposals need to be decided. However, neither of them address the underlying issues of limited park resources and lack of enforcement of park rules while people are at the parks. Without lifeguards on duty, nobody is available to enforce rules and safety. When restrooms and facilities are closed, people use park ground in ways unintended. Without park personnel presence, people tend to use the parks in unintended and potentially hazardous ways. In addition to deciding park hours, I recommend (1) looking at current park rules and making edits for clarity/readability, (2) looking at current parks signs for how effective they are - both in terms of location and

content; possibly emplacing more or more effective signs, (3) building short, informative online classes and tools for people to use to become familiar with park resources and be able to participate in water and land activities safely and in a way that respects other's usage, and/or (4) making personnel decisions - either hiring more staff, or employing current staff in a way that provides better public visibility.

This park closure time encourages people to use the park after sunset. I'd rather the hours be tied to sunrise and sunset.

This survey seems to suggest that people of color get up earlier and stay up later than white people, and want to use the parks at 6am and 10pm?

This would depend on the reason for re-addressing the hours currently set. I'd be fine extending them to 11:00 PM but certainly no later, unless you want to police it 24/7 - and that's not going to work. Are you trying to please a few people at the detriment of the many?

two sets of hours, daylight saving and other

Uphold park hours, close park gates during closed hours.

Use the daylight option. Place cameras in problem areas to help catch culprits & prohibit repeat offenders.

Using the gates/adding automated access to the parks to restrict vehicle access during 11pm-5am would greatly reduce what generally causes the problems. That would still allow access to the paths for those who may need odd hours for their training, leisure biking/walking and commutes. I feel that is the best compromise for allowing access while taking the areas of concern into consideration.

Wargo and most nature centers aren't open 24/7. I'd hate to see parts of it destroyed.

We could possibly say no loitering after 11, but leave the trails open for commuting to and from work.

We don't want to encourage tent cities in our parks The police would need to be present 24/7.

we have nice parks on Ramsey County. Access is already good. I could see allowing earlier access because that is not likely to lead to more vandalism or crime or other undesirable activity in or near the parks.

We need to declare park as smoke free zone. Specially play area, play ground, seating areas, beach and area adjacent to Pulte homes.

We use the Turtle Lake Park 4-5 times each week, most of which are early morning before work. We are not negatively impacted by hours tied to daylight. Without park lighting in place, I would continue the current policy tying access to daylight. If there are park lights in place, then I feel better about Option A above.

What security will be in place

When did teaching our young how to clean up after themselves (leave the place better than they found it), respect boundaries, freedom from with (vs pushing at their energy mirrors i.e., others and therefore becoming victims of themselves. I sure am thankful for my "privilege.". Parents who expected nothing from anyone, worked two jobs at a time each while raising their OWN children - waiting until they were 30 before getting married and having children (the 6 would have surely been 12). Loved to dance in their rare spare time, didn't smoke, drink...and by EXAMPLE taught us to be global citizens not victims of the world. Didn't "go to bat" for us as we all knew we wouldn't make choices necessitating it. We were held to account from day one and all started working by age 11 or 12 (paper routes, babysitting...and on). No bundle of money waiting for us - we all studied hard, put our selves through high school (had to pay our own high school tuition) and beyond. We were encouraged and expected. Lowering the bar would have done none of us any good - glad they didn't. Feel for those who struggle through life because 1. Belief in struggle 2. Low standards 3. Lack of belief in self.

Why can't the hours be left as is. Another option would be 6 am - 9 pm.

Why can't there be different rules at different parks? Parks that do have some lighting or amenities that are used in the dark (running trails, ski trails, etc) could be open more safely than other parks that don't have lighting.

Why is this even being suggested/ nothing but more problems for community and law enforcement this would take time from more important things to do for the community like keeping crime down instead of patrolling parks at odd hours to prevent crime there

Why not open park early..... 5 am but close it at 9 PM or even 10. Certainly, do not close later

Will there be patrols at night?

Winter hours (Nov-March) and summer hours (April-Oct) that don't rely solely on sunrise/sunset

You are inviting serious problems not closing by sunset

You could establish regional trail hours. That could allow commuting at any time if that is specifically your concern.

Your racial equity concerns are bogus.

Future homeless camp? Overnight camping? This is nuts!

Keep hours the same!

Limit the hours to 30 minutes before and after sun rise and sun set.

No need to change the current hours of park availability.

Open 6 AM to 11 PM for all parks is fine (I think it should be 10 PM) but 24/7/365 is blind sighted. This will not reduce crime, which in the end will not reduce Ramsey County costs. This is not good policy.

Please consider 5am-10pm for park hours year round.

Push button lighting (press button, get lights for 30 min)

Smoking and Tobacco Use Option A - What's appealing about this?

Option A: Prohibit smoking and tobacco use within 25 feet of any park building, outdoor event, playground, beach or nature center grounds.

What's appealing about this?

25 feet seems like a good enough space away from any park area for smoking/tobacco use

2nd hand smoke stinks! Literally and for health reasons.

a

A decent moderate option.

A good first step with a phased in approach

A light breeze can share cigarette smoke quite a distance. Reducing ability for many to fully enjoy their park visit.

a non-smoker and allergic to smoke , why any option

Absolutely should be doable.

Agree it's good to be respectful of others and not detract from their enjoyment

Agree with this ordinance , but difficult to enforce

Agree.

Agree. Smoking is a fire hazard

All can enjoy and spend time at the park

All health reasons stated above.

All of it

All of it

allows for a stroll with the dog and an occasional cigar

allows more flexibility for smokers

Allows people to distance themselves from smokers, as they wish to

allows smokers areas to be able to do so, within reason

Allows smokers to still be within view of the facilities without their smoke drifting to areas with other people.

Allows tobacco users a location

Any and all limits to tobacco in parks is appealing. I hate having to remind my children not to touch the cigarette butts they find on the playground.

Any attempt to limit smoking in public is appealing.

Any limitation is better than none, but this is complicated and will be hard to enforce.

Any prohibiting of smoking is appealing to me. The littering, loitering, and smell impacts me wanting to use parks.

Any prohibition of smoking anywhere improves the health of everyone.

Any tobacco restriction is welcome

Anything that limits smoking is appealing.

As a non smoker, I would like to limit my access to secondhand smoke. This would keep the smoke out of the most heavily used spaces.

As a past health care worker, I would totally support no smoking. I was at a park near Mounds Boulevard the other day for a senior luncheon. There were people smoking in the park, and it was annoying as we were trying to eat our lunch and listen to a program. I would agree to no smoking in city parks. Who polices this. If citizens are to do it when they see this happening, what are we do to. Call the police? Even at the State Fair with firm restrictions, there are people smoking all over. So many seem to obey any of the rules.

As a smoker who also uses city parks and facilities, it is appealing because it does not prohibit it outright.

As someone with asthma who cannot be smokers, this is helpful but rarely enough. Most people do not abide by it and wind can carry the smoke.

At least you're trying

Avoid people smoking around kids

Bad idea

Basic requirement for community health/safety.

Being considerate of others around and not near food.

Benefits the health of the community in the areas people are most likely to be congregating.

Better air for non smokers

Better air quality

Better environment for groups using shelters

Better than being allowed everywhere.

Better than current policy - creates more smoke-free spaces.

Better than nothing

Better than nothing but still affects me and my kids when at the park.

Better than nothing, I guess?

Better than restricting it more.

Clean air

clean air

Clean air

Clean air- no dirty butts

Clean air. Less littering.

Cleaner air for people in those areas; possibly less litter (cigarette butts).

Cleaner air where people are

Cleaner air. Less chance of fire caused by cigarette buds

Clear

Clear rules and expectations where most people gather

Consistent with businesses and general industry practices

Currently, when using some of the parks, the cigarette and marijuana smell when walking by the pavilions in use, can be really bad.

Decent

Decreased annoyance of second hand smoke

Decreases second hand smoke

Difficult to enforce - - who judges 25 feet anyhow? Many people can't tell that distance . . .

Don't care about this.

Don't have to walk through smoke

Don't have to walk thru smoke to get to buildings. Not to mention fire safety and the mess left when people don't dispose of them properly

Don't you already do this? Well, at least some of the MN State Parks have designated smoking areas. Nonetheless, this is not appealing at all. Stop trying to police people's personal choices. There is nothing equitable about this option because we all know the people who will get stopped, ticketed and fine are going to be predominately people of color. It's just another reason for a "Karen" to stop and harass them in the parks. Smokers are easy targets to pick on and make laws against because you want to feel like you're doing something beneficial for the public.

Dumb

Eliminate smoking near most people

encampment? Literally makes me sick, so I'd feel more comfortable in the parks

Enforceable.

Even 25 feet seems too close. From the perspective that I worked in a restaurant when smoking was allowed and was exposed to second-hand smoke when public smoking was more prevalent, we have made much progress and do not want to go backwards. Considering children/teens, also, I support at least 25 feet, prohibit completely is also preferable.

Everyone benefits - healthy air for all!

Everyone can be happy

Everyone can enjoy the fresh air

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything - smoke smell travels

Everything involving fresh air. If we listen to science, smoking should be prohibited altogether, everywhere.

Everything is appealing about this. Smoking is bad for everyone and the ashes/cigarette butts litter our environment and are harmful to our natural environment.

Everything is appealing to this. Prevents liter and unsafe air for growing children. My child has asthma, a heart condition and a disability. Sample is awful for him

Everything, I am an ex-smoker. As much as I understand the desire to smoke, I was recently at Lake McCarrons park and folks were grilling, drinking and heavily smoking in many common areas.

EVERYTHING! I don't want to go to the beach, playground and leave smelling like smoke.

Everything.

Everything.

Everything.

Everything. I bring my grand kids to parks and don't want them to see or breathe in smoke. I don't either, for that matter. Quitting was the hardest thing I ever did (20 years ago!) and I don't appreciate having to walk through someone else's haze of smoke.

Everything. It's a public park- if you want to smoke /vape do it on your own private property.

everything. Secondhand smoke is dangerous and there is no way to escape it when someone nearby is smoking.

Everything. Smoking is a health hazard

Everywhere

Fair to everyone involved

Feels better than both below options. It's outside, lots of vape smells like strawberry.

Fewer cigarette butts on the ground and safer environment for all

Fewer cigarette butts on the ground in the parks.

Fine with this. I am often bothered by smokers as I walk through Tony Schmidt park.

Following state guidelines

fresh air and hopefully no cigarette butts

Fresh air! More accessible for people with disabilities and breathing issues

Gives distance from common areas where most people are not tobacco users while still providing close enough distance for someone to still be able to watch their children while using tobacco.

Gives people some freedom

gives some space to be free of other's smoking

Go smoke at home away from your kids and pets.

GOOD

Good for people's health; especially those who do not want to have 2nd hand smoke exposure.

Good for public health

good idea

good idea

Good idea. Smoking is a health risk that we all pay for. Also, most smokers that I observe litter.

Good rule. It appears to prohibit tobacco use where it would interfere with the enjoyment of the parks by those who don't smoke.

Good to keep it away from people having events outdoors

Good, better to eliminate entirely as bad for health

Good.

Good...

Great for anyone with asthma, allergies, sensitivities etc

Great idea

greatly reduces exposure to secondhand smoke and trash from tobacco use

Healthier air for park patrons.

Healthier environment, fewer odors.

Healthier. Less chance to inhale second hand smoke.

healthy

Healthy for everyone especially kids

Healthy living

Helps limit second hand smoke.

Helps minimize second hand smoke.

Hopefully keeps smoke clear of the spaces where kids gather and prevent cigarette butts from ending up on the ground.

I agree

I agree that 25 feet should be far enough.

i am against smoking in the park unless smoing inside their vehicle in the parking lot

I am amazed at how distasteful it is to be around smokers, even when they are at a distance. This option is not at all appealing.

I am an older person who values my health in order to enjoy quality of life.

I am not a smoker but feel people should be able to smoke somewhere other than parking lots. This seems a good compromise.

I am not a smoker, and am sensitive to the smoke created by smokers. When I am in nature, I want all around me to be smoke-free. The risk of fire, the litter of smokers' paraphernalia is dangerous. Do not allow smoking anywhere near the grounds.

I am so sick of seeing cigarette butts all around the parks and walking paths I use. I also don't want to be around secondhand smoke, although I know that's hard to police outside. But if there's no "safe" place to discard of cigarette butts then smoking shouldn't be allowed.

I came from Sd and this is what rules were. With the added not anywhere near children's events

I can breath - love it!

I can go to the park and know that I won't be encountering smoke.

I could breathe better in parks

I definitely don't want to have to breathe people's smoke, etc when I'm at the park, so off course prohibiting it in the area where I can't "just go somewhere else" is appealing.

I dislike breathing smoke as I do not smoke.

I do not want to be outside at a beach and have someone smoking near me.

I don't have to smell smoke when I'm coming out of a building.

I don't really have an opinion. I don't smoke, but I've never had an issue with this.

I don't see a need to add any additional restrictions

I don't want cancer.

I don't need tobacco - others do.

I don't see current rules or restrictions as a problem

I don't smoke but better that people can smoke outside in the open

I don't smoke. So less smoking the better

I don't want gatherings of smokers even 25' from playgrounds

I don't want it around me or my children

I don't want to breathe anyone's smoke so I think it's great

I don't feel there is a problem as long as they are outside.

I go outside for the fresh air. I am very sensitive to smoke of any kind and even avoid camp fires. There would be fewer butts littered about.

I hate being around any type of smoke and it aligns with the "health" benefits of parks and natural areas. People will continue to smoke in their cars, throw butts on the ground. Ugh.

I have chronic cough, made worse by any kind of smoke, even outdoor smoking. With this, I could visit facilities and events without hacking.

I like prohibiting it around playgrounds, and around events. It is good to give people spaces where they can enjoy a smoke-free environment.

I like the idea of limiting smoking, but I don't see how it can be enforced. McCarron's Beach is supposed to be alcohol-free, however, people frequently drink at the park.

I like the idea of this - my only concern is that smokers usually don't follow these regulations (anywhere, not just at parks or near buildings).

I like this as I do not smoke and I do not like the smell. Also, maybe kids frequent parks and breathing in smoke is not good for anyone's health.

I like this idea but how will it be enforced?

I like this policy, I don't want my kids seeing it.

I like this proposed ordinance because it can help to keep second-hand smoke away from children using the parks.

I live across the street from a county park. Often I can smell marijuana being used by people who are parked in the parking lot. This is a very strong smell and I can smell it across the street. This is something I would like to not have to smell.

I love this idea. I do not want to be sitting at the beach and the person next to me is ruining my time by smoke coming over into my breathing area.

I love this! I hate going to a park to enjoy a bit of fresh air and then having stinking cigarette smoke wafting all around me. It is also much better for children to see people enjoying time outside without smoking.

I quit smoking 9 years ago.

I spend time outside to breathe clean air. This would support that!

I strongly dislike smoke of any type, so I love this.

I support this. These are high-use locations and I don't want non-smokers to get second-hand smoke.

I think it should be prohibited because it is harmful.

I think that is doable.

I think that it makes sense that people should be respectful in their smoking and do it away from others due to concerns about second-hand smoke. To be honest in my experience using the parks, many are already pretty respectful about their smoking.

I think this is good. But I have not really observed much smoking in the park. Mostly drinking and drugs.

I think this is good. It allows people the freedom to smoke at the park while also keeping it away from children and areas where more people would be.

I think this is great to limit exposure to children using the park

I think this is adequate. I feel it discriminatory to limit smoking throughout, but do feel we need to protect spaces used by children and frequented by others.

I would like to see smoking restricted, but prefer Option B.

I'm not a smoker so all around this would be appealing to me. If it's allowed then you can promote proper disposal of tobacco products.

I'm not a smoker, but I also don't think smoking outdoors 25 feet away from the above described areas will truly inconvenience or pose a threat to others in the community. A public BBQ or fire pit produces far more fine carbon particulate emissions and that doesn't seem to bother people as much. This leads me to conclude that the tobacco rules exist to exclude a certain demographic deemed "bad" and not actually address a true community health concern.

If enforced it could potentially keep smoke away from those who don't want it

If this would be adhered to and could be monitored, I think it greatly benefits users of the parks who choose not to use tobacco products. Tobacco users consider it their right to use; however, by exercising this "right" around other people means those other people no longer enjoy their right to be free from tobacco. Also, cigarette butts are filthy, and often times they are discarded wherever, and it becomes a big, stinky mess.

If you are not a smoker you don't have to smell the second hand smoke of those that do smoke.

It allows those that wish to enjoy nature and smoke tobacco while limiting the potential for second hand smoke usage around gathering sites.

It gets the smoking away from where people will be stationary or in the area for longer periods of time

It helps with health and safety from fires.

It is a band-aid; not a solution but it is better than allowing smoking everywhere.

It is a definite guide. Many folks are allergic to the aerosols of these products.

It is a start but I really feel not strong enough.

It is a start.

It is a step but I prefer option B

It is a step, but not far enough. No person should be subject to SHS or young person should see adults using.

It is clear and concise but allows WAY too much area for smoking.

It is kept away from children

It is perfect thank you

It just should be left like this for the sake of children.

It keeps the commonly used areas free of smoke

It keeps tobacco use away from public places.

It limits smoking in and around facilities.

It makes the space safe for all.

it only offers at least some protection against smoke, it is not as appealing as the the other option

It promotes public health.

It protects crowds from secondhand smoke while still allowing people freedom to smoke elsewhere if they choose as smoking is still legal & isnt dangerous to others if outdoors away from crowds.

It protects the health of the collective that may be in contact in the popular areas/meeting grounds.

It provides clear guidance, but strikes a balance between usage for those who use tobacco products and those who do not. However, even within 25 feet, the second-hand effects of smoking are prominent for everyone around, even those who distinctly do not want to be around tobacco smoke.

It reduces the likelihood of young people, and any people, from using tobacco products in the park. This is good.

It seems a possible way to keep people (especially kids) from being exposed to smoke...but 25 feet is not very far.

It would be great to prohibit it all together in park spaces

It would bring it in line with other areas, particularly school zones and government buildings. It would also allow the creation(s) of designated smoking zones.

It would facilitate non-smokers being able to enjoy the parks.

It would not be around the doorways and entrances if it is enforceable.

It'd keep smoke away from the kids which would be great

It's a good step forward. It will reduce the smoke at events and areas where people are congregated, as well as reduce fire danger during droughts.

It's a public health concern and better for overall health.

It's a start

It's an outdoor park.

It's good to have restrictions, but I think I would increase it to 50 or even 100'.

It's good to keep smoke away from where there are going to be people gathering

it's not

It's okay.

It's outdoors. People are going to smoke regardless if they want to.

It's super annoying to be at a playground or beach with my children and smell smoke. So any restriction is great.

It's very reasonable.

It's a good start

It's a start.

It's appealing because I don't like smoke, but smoking is legal.

It's away from where the majority of people would be.

It's better for everyone health and is consistent with other tobacco use laws for buildings. It helps air be cleaner around kids in particular.

It's better than people smoking everywhere.

It's good

It's necessary for public health and safety.

It's no fun to be trying to enjoy the outdoors only to smell cigarette smoke.

It's not just a safety issue, but also an aesthetic issue.

It's not.

It's too vague. Who is going to measure 25 feet?

its appealing because at least it gives some buffer.

Its better than the current rule.

Its okay but still smoking on walking paths, walking by big clouds of smokers work my kids is NOT appealing

Its true, most people don't appreciate 2nd hand smoke. And this proposal would limit that exposure.

Keep it away from kids

Keep smoking use away from public space.

Keeping parks smoke free is desirable in my opinion.

Keeps away from most people

Keeps everyone safe yet still allows people to smoke.

Keeps it mostly away from kids

Keeps parks clean, love it.

Keeps people happy. Smokers and non-smokers. Keeps a separation between them

Keeps smoke away from buildings/bathrooms

Keeps smoke away from kids, and other people using the public areas.

Keeps smoke away from kids.

Keeps smoke away from people who are trying to enjoy the outdoors.

Keeps smoke out of public spaces or people don't have to get second hand smoke lungs. Smokers can still enjoy the park. Not saying they should smoke, but if they aren't in anyone's space and people can clearly avoid them. They should be able to enjoy nice spaces too.

Keeps smokers away from non smokers while allowing smokers to still feed their habit.

Keeps smoking away from children and second hand smoke away from others.

keeps smoking away from family play areas

Keeps the area clean

Keeps the litter down

Keeps the smoke away from people who have issues with it.

Keeps the smokers far enough away but close enough to whatever activities are happening.

Kids and families enjoying the park should not be exposed to smoke. People who want or need to smoke should do so in parking lot or in their own car.

kids safe and nonsmoking should be best option for kids.

Less areas to smoke the better

Less butts near people?

Less cigarette butt litter and more enjoyable for non smokers.

Less cigarette butt litter in parks and waterways! Less tobacco exposure for children at playgrounds, including modeling the behavior

Less disgusting, unhealthy smoke

less interaction with second hand smoke

Less smoke.

Less smoking and tobacco use, fewer second hand smoke opportunities, reduce visibility for youth that are using the parks.

Less smoking near where people congregate

Less trash, odor, fire hazard

Lessen litter and fire potential. Promote better example to children.

Limiting exposure of tobacco use to the public / those who do not want second hand smoke exposure. It would also keep these areas clean of cigarette butts, etc.

Limiting exposure to secondhand smoke.

Limiting second hand smoke to all the people around the person smoking

Limiting smoking is a good idea.

Limits near others without banning.

Limits the odor and discomfort of breathing unclean air in a location that celebrates clean air and nature while still allowing freedoms to those who choose to use.

Limits tobacco use.

love into more butts on the ground but will be hard to enforce

Love it!

Love it! I don't want smoking anywhere, ever, so I'm a huge fan of getting it more and more out of the St. Paul community public places

Love it.

Love the concept, but there will be no actionable enforcement. Cigarette butts are a problem in our parks.

Love the idea of keeping it as far away from others!!!!

Makes it more difficult for smokers to find places to smoke and keeps it away from other people, families, children

Makes the park more enjoyable for others

Making health for people and the environment matters.

More reasonable than the other proposed options.

Most buildings already have this expectation.

My health and the health of others, especially kids.

My kid has asthma and is triggered by smoke. My other kid used to pick up cigarette butts and try to eat them. Not allowing smoking in these places keeps the parks accessible for kids like mine.

N/a

n/a

Na

Need all non smoking - I have grandkids and use parks all over - they try to pick up cigarette butts!

Nice to not have to breathe in second hand smoke of those incredibly stupid people who still smoke despite the common knowledge of how bad it is for you. These people are making the choice to smoke for others

Nice, since smoking can be intrusive.

no 2nd hand smoke near the people

No change in policy.

No cigarette butts. Cleaner air.

No health hazards except to the poor souls who smoke. Less irritating than a recreational fire, barbecue grill etc. allows a lrgal activity to remain legal

No one wants to be around smoke these days-the farther away the better

No one wants to smell or inhale second hand smoke.

No smoke

No smoking

No smoking at all in parks nothing is appealing in this

No smoking at all unless in parking lot away from grills and beach.

No smoking at all.

No smoking period.

No, slippery slope.

No! No tobacco allowed that close. What example are we setting for children??? Why must you cave on this??!

Non smokers shouldn't have to deal with second hand smoke.

Non-smokers don't have to smell it

Non-smokers should be able to enjoy their activities and arriving/leaving without encountering smoke, while smokers are still able to imbibe without needing to leave the park.

non-smokers wouldnt have to smell the smoke around structures

None

None

None

None for none smokers

Not a good ideas, because when you are out public is because we need a fresh air. We don't want other unhealthy stuff.

Not an appealing option

Not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing - this still allows smoking in the park, on the trails, etc.

Not appealing at all.

Not appealing at all. If it's allowed anywhere, people take advantage.

Not appealing at all. Once you let people smoke anywhere, there's no control.

Not appealing.

Not appealing. Should be non smoking.

Not breathing in smoke

Not dealing with smokers right next to us at a beach.

Not enough is appealing.

Not getting second hand smoke

Not have to inhale smoke or vapors

Not having to breathe second hand smoke.

Not having to worry about smoke and litter from the butts

Not much

Not much : we would still have the smell , second hand smoke and litter everywhere else in the park

Not much.

Not much.

Not much. Regulation should be more restrictive.

Not smelling smoke, fewer butts

Not.

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing - just prohibit smoking altogether - it's healthier

Nothing - let's keep first and second hand smoke away from public land!

Nothing - no smoking, just like public shopping and eating. Parks should be healthier places than those.

Nothing - smoke can travel further or is offensive in the air near these facilities

Nothing -- It leaves far too much room for arguing the legality of smoking just about anywhere.

Nothing at all

Nothing but headaches trying to actually provide enforcement. Like a dog chasing its tail. For example, who are we supposed to call if somebody lights up. The county? (Tee-hee.)

Nothing except to smokers

Nothing is appealing about this option

Nothing is appealing about this option.

Nothing is appealing about this to me.

Nothing is appealing about this. Tobacco you should be prohibited in public spaces that are run by the county. If you were planning on opening Up smoking and vaping in tobacco use to the county courthouse is in the library's also you could consider this and take a vote from all Ramsey County residence.

Nothing—there is nothing safe, necessary or needed for this. Makes all events and landscape cleaner and safer.

Nothing,

nothing, dislike this option. I don't like tobacco products and don't like breathing others' smoke when I am trying to enjoy a park

Nothing, It stops people from using the parks, I understand tobacco use is looked down at, but smokers should have the right to enjoy the parks as well as nonsmokers. it is still something people use. It also taking smokers rights away. Just because a person smoke they should not feel that they can't enjoy the parks and playgrounds. it feel discriminating.

Nothing, now you can pick the cigarettes out of the lawn, bushes etc.

Nothing, would be hard to enforce

Nothing! Allowing a proven health hazard is totally wrong.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing. Doesn't help much if at all.

Nothing. Going to mark off a 25' perimeter and put ash tray receptacles all around that edge? Yuck

Nothing. I don't think smoking should be allowed at all.

Nothing. In my opinion, tobacco use should be prohibited on all park property.

Nothing. Just prohibit smoking altogether.

Nothing. Let people work out any conflicts themselves.

Nothing. Most people ignore the signs. Their freedom to smoke ends where my lungs begin.

Nothing. No smoking at all.

Nothing. No smoking in parks should be the rule. Those that don't smoke should not have to deal with secondhand smoke. Equity for all means clean, healthy air.

Nothing. No smoking on parks!

Nothing. No smoking period.

Nothing. No tobacco or vaping or marijuana use would be my preference. It's public space- smoking should be done in personal space

Nothing. People smoke all over Langton Lake Park.

Nothing. Prohibit smoking everywhere

Nothing. Smoke at home we already have more than enough less than "fresh" air. (MN smog blown in from forest and other fires.)

nothing. smoking shouldn't be allowed

Nothing. The secondhand smoke thing (especially outdoors) is largely BS.

Nothing. There's should be no smoking allowed anywhere

Nothing. This is the worst.

Nothing. Tobacco is harmful to anyone near it, it should be completely prohibited.

Nothing. Tobacco products do not only hurt the user, they hurt everyone.

Nothing. You are outside

Nothing. You still end up smelling the smoke.

Nothing...

Nothing....are you up on current weather conditions? We are in a drought. Tossing any kind of burning tobacco on the ground provides the chance of fire.... NO SMOKING....that is the option.

Nothing...most smoking areas are nowhere near buildings and other areas where non-smoking traffic passes by, why allow it to be around children and others who may have asthma or other breathing problems?

Obviously, most of the population would not prefer to be near smokers.

Of the two options, this is my choice, unfortunately, some people still choose to smoke and they should be allowed to enjoy our park systems too. After all they pay taxes too.

Ok

Only the part about prohibiting tobacco use.

Option C is best

outdoor spaces should be free of obnoxious odors and unhealthy behaviors. Others should not be subjected to smoke.

Park patrons at these locations can enjoy mostly smoke-free recreation.

Park visitors won't have to breathe secondhand smoke

People are going to smoke in parks whether other people like it or not. "No smoking" signs definitely haven't stopped me. Prohibiting smoking will give non-smokers the sense that they can go up to smokers and try to give them a lecture about how people can't smoke in parks.

People can enjoy nature without breathing toxic fumes. No cigarette butts on trails.

people not having to be around smokers

People's space would not be invaded with smoke

Picking up cigarette butts may be more concentrated in a designated area.

Places that are likely to have more people will be safer from a secondhand smoke/vapor perspective and be more enjoyable.

Places where people congregate will be smoke-free, but smokers will still have other options nearby

Please do not allow smoking.

Please prohibit tobacco everywhere.

prefer a completely smoke free area, promote healthy lifestyles, remove risk of secondhand smoke

Prevents smoking near people

Prohibit smoking as stated above in Option A. However all smokers & vapors must be of legal age to buy tobacco & use it. It's reckless to allow underage people to smoke on public land.

Prohibit smoking in public places at all times. People can smoke in their cars or on their boats or in their homes.

Prohibiting smoking is the best solution.

Prohibiting use of tobacco would enhance the enjoyment of all nonsmoking park users which would be the majority of park users

Promote a healthy lifestyle

Protects and respects the health needs of children and young people, sets a good example to discourage smoking.

Protects everyone's health.

Protects people from second hand smoke in areas where people are most concentrated

Provides a space for those to smoke to do so while ensuring others are not exposed to second hand smoke

Public health, no bad smells

Reasonable restriction

Reasonable to protect non smokers.

Reduced 2nd hand smoke in enclosed spaces.

reduced litter. Let's face it, smokers litter. They throw their butts on the ground and especially at a beach, turn the sand into one gigantic ash tray.

Reduced tobacco use within the parks. Cleaner parks.

Reduces exposure to second hand smoke.

Reduces smoke and underage usage

Reducing exposure to second hand smoke.

Reducing smoke exposure - guys health reasons and the stench.

reducing smoking and the visual presence of smoking in areas.

Reduction is appealing, but likely difficult to enforce.

Reduction of second-hand smoke around kids

Removes commercial tobacco and smoking from most areas frequented by youth

Restricting smoking by park buildings is positive for the health of non smokers.

Restricting smoking is good, but it probably can't be enforced.

Rule is clear.

Safer and cleaner

Safety and reduction of second hand smoke.

Safety for kids. Roll model for kids. Clean air for all who seek to be in nature.

Safety of our children.

Same as most places

Second hand smoke exposure limited.

second hand smoke is disgusting

Second-hand smoke causes me some respiratory troubles.

Second-hand smoke is bad, and especially so for people with asthma. I agree with prohibiting its use in the specified areas.

Second-hand smoke is harmful to all people, but especially children who are playing in the parks, and as this is a place that is frequented by children tobacco use should be banned.

Second-hand smoke is not only annoying, but harmful to others' health.

Seems good but discriminatory to only allow smoking or tobacco use to those for the purposes of ceremonial, cultural or spiritual uses.

Seems like a realistic ask

Seems pretty 1990's, smoke up where you want. That is not very appealing.

Seems reasonable

seems reasonable.

Seems reasonable. I don't think the vast majority of smokers abuse their privilege to smoke outdoors.

Seems the most enforceable.

Sets a good example of not smoking for health concerns in certain areas.

should be off limits because cigarette butts are all over or people just throw them wherever even when fire danger is high

Should limit exposure to secondhand smoke in areas most likely to have concentrations of people, especially children.

Should still provide a space for smoking but have plenty of space for non-smokers

Sick of people dropping cigarette butts everywhere

smelling tobacco smoke is disgusting

Smoke carries so far— maybe 50 yards?

Smoke goes away from children.

Smoke is bad for the health of the smokers and those who are near them. Children and all should be able to use the park with limited exposure to smoke.

Smoke is smelly and annoying . No one wants cigarette butts, etc.... Around

Smoke no where on grounds

Smoker-parents could provide reasonable supervision of their children.

Smokers are going to smoke most seem willing to move a distance away. Why make it any more contentious than that

Smokers would still be able to get a fix, without having to completely exit from their family/group. I believe this is sufficient in protecting non-smokers. I am an ex-smoker.

Smoking and Tobacco should be banned everywhere.

Smoking can be bothersome to individuals.

Smoking harms everyone in the vicinity. Private businesses can ban smoking, I feel it's in the interest of public health to be able to restrict it on public property as well.

Smoking is a public health concern and should be restricted to certain areas in public spaces. Allowing folks the freedom to smoke outdoors if they choose makes sense, as long as they aren't causing issue for others.

Smoking is bad for anyone's health, not just the person smoking.

Smoking is bad for people's health and people should not be subjected to smoke

Smoking is gross and unhealthy.

Smoking is nasty and I hate having to breathe around someone who feels entitled to smoke anywhere.

Smoking is obnoxious and a health concern.

Smoking is stupid.

Smoking outdoors does not need to be regulated

Smoking should at least bit be allowed in these areas for public health reasons.

Smoking stinks! Better modeling for kids.

Smoking stinks. I thought I was a closet smoker, but I stunk so bad I couldn't get away with it

Smoking sucks

Smoking/vaping is dangerous. It should be discouraged.

So using tobacco spiritually doesn't cause second hand damage?

Some control.

Some of us would appreciate

Sometimes tobacco may be used as part of a ceremony in a natural setting. This should be allowed.

Sound fair

Sounds consistent with the city and private property restrictions

Sounds good

Sounds good, if it could work.

Sounds good.

Sounds good. It will allow people to smoke but not be near other people that could be bothered by the smoke

Sounds like a good idea

still allows for smoking outdoors but protects others from second hand smoke

Still allows people to smoke, but away from places where children are more likely to be.

Studies show negative effects related to secondhand smoke so it promotes a healthier environment for all.

Support any prohibition of smoking due to the negative impact on air quality and it being a source of litter

T

That it's not around small children or young/elderly public

That we should not have to be exposed to smoking from others as we try to enjoy a park

That we would know which areas to avoid if we want to avoid smoke.

That's fine but 25 feet may be too much.

That's only 7 yds from a building and smoke travels within that space and butts are a problem

The further away from peopl, the better.

The health and safety of non smokers

The prohibition

There is nothing appealing about this.

There's regulation

These are all places children congregate, so it would keep tobacco products and smoke away from them.

These places are where groups convene. I prefer no smoking areas, myself.

They aren't smoking inside the features, but see comment

This could limit the number of cigarette butts in parks, and allow more people to enjoy the fresh air, which is a major part of what is appealing to me about a park. 1 person smoking at a park can make it much less enjoyable for many people, so this would alleviate that concern.

This creates safer spaces for individuals with asthma and respiratory sensitivities while still allowing individuals to engage in behaviors they are legally allowed. This should be signed and encouraged however not policed.

This feels reasonable and would allow everyone the ability to not be standing near someone smoking.

This helps to give space to those who do not want to be around smoke.

This is a good idea, it is the normal for now. It will keep the "riff raff" out.

This is a good idea.

This is a great idea

This is a reasonable compromise for accommodating tobacco users.

This is a start but not good enough. Smoke drifts and for kids/people with breathing issues this makes it difficult for them to enjoy the park.

This is an implemented practice around most businesses and public places, but it encourages butts being left in the shared areas.

This is appealing but who is going to enforce it?

This is fine.

This is going to be a nightmare to enforce and smacks of busybody politics

This is good enough. As a former smoker, I'm not a fan of smokers (who are addicts, after all) being treated like pariahs.

This is good. People don't want the smoke in and around buildings or playgrounds.

This is much more appealing than allowing smoking in the parks. However you omitted Vaping as well which is just as harmful. Prefer to have no smoking or vaping

This is nice option. Keeps smoke from blowing into your face when at the park for an event.

This is not appealing

This is not restrictive enough

This is only appealing to tobacco users.

This is only inevitable. I honestly thought this was a rule already. Parks are a public hot spot and youth gathering area. Youth smoking prevention is key.

This is protective of non-smoking citizens.

This is really the minimum needed to keep the parks pleasant and safe

This is so nice! I don't like being near people blowing smoke and prefer for my kids to not be around that.

This is the only option of the 3 listed that I would choose. There is no reason for outdoor parks to have more restrictive ordinances than state/local does.

This is very appealing. Smoking laws continue to evolve to protect those who don't smoke or being exposed to second hand smoke. I would increase the distance to 100'

This is what 90% of all city parks do. And would match.

This isn't a horrible idea since smoking isn't allowed in certain buildings anyway or near certain outdoor public gathering areas.

This isn't anything hard to get used to as it's pretty normal for buildings in general. I smoke, and this is a completely reasonable suggestion to me.

this limits smoke exposure in the most crowded places and exposure by kids

This makes sense and seems consistent with smoking limitations at private locations. Seems the least onerous for smokers.

This option A will create a healthier environment

This option maybe more challenging to enforce and for people to follow. What if they are 24ft away from a building but there are people close by?

This plan is reasonable

This protects nature and structural buildings from fire. I personally do not want to be sitting on beach and smell cigarette or other smoke

This protects the health of people who are enjoying the parks amenities.

This seems like a bare-minimum, the other options are better.

This seems like a more balanced option. 25 feet allows those in said areas to have plenty of room away from smokers yet doesn't make it so a if a parent is a smoker they aren't forced to leave children unattended

This seems like the best option you have. I wouldn't ban it anywhere and I'm a former smoker.

This seems most reasonable.

This seems reasonable.

This seems reasonable. If I don't want to be too close to someone smoking (blowing smoke), I choose to not be too close to them for my own sake.

This seems the best compromise of the three options.

this sounds good, parents can still watch and quickly get to kids at the park from this distance. people smoke or vape and ive noticed medical vaping on my walks. this is ok to me. it gets people who may otherwise be stuck at home out with their families moving around.

This sounds perfect, if it can be enforced.

This will limit the amount of smoking happening and people are more likely to move to a designated smoking area than they are to leave the area of it is banned in the whole park.

This would help remove cigarette trash on the ground around these areas.

To me, walking through cigarette or cigar smoke defeats a mood of going to a park for healthy outdoor activity.

Tobacco is a killer. Don't encourage it.

Tobacco is gross.

Tobacco it's a carcinogen and needs to be banned.

Tobacco should be banned on all park property.

Tobacco use is not illegal. Use at 25 feet away from any public even should alleviate concern about secondhand smoke. Use of chewing tobacco does not affect others.

Too difficult to enforce. I would like to see it not sold anywhere period. Smokers have to be stupid people, really. Option 2 is better if you want to change something.

Totally agree. I don't want second hand smoke in areas that I go

totally fine

Under no circumstance should people be allowed to smoke near children. There should certainly be prohibitions on smoking.

Use of tobacco and smoking should be prohibited in all Ramsey county parks.

USED TO B A SMOKER QUIT 3 DECADES AGO...I don't think smokers should be treated like patrias. But 25' isn't enuf & Ppl have different perceptions of 25'. A place needs to be clearly marked w paint. spray or otherwise. HAVE DESIGNATED SMOKING AREAS AWAY FROM BLDGS, EVENTS PLAYGROUND ALL OF ABOVE.

Very appealing to keep smoke away from children. However since deputies won't stop the illegal use of marijuana in the parks I can't see them enforcing any tobacco regulations

Very appealing with the number of children using these areas. The smell of cigarette smoke on a summer day is unappealing, and the number of cigarette butts on the ground is also unappealing.

We can get exit a building without being assaulted by a cloud of smoke. It gives space to escape the building and the smoke by allowing an alternate route away from the building.

We have these same limitations now.

We need to change social norms about tobacco use. Adults and children would no longer be exposed to secondhand smoke at entrances, beach or at the park and there would be less tobacco liter. However, it is time to expand the policy to other areas.

Well it's something.

Well right now, if someone carelessly tosses a butt at Battle Creek or at Woodview you're going to have a grassfire. No one needs to smoke in a park. No one. Go out to your car or go to a parking lot. Why is this even a question.

Who wants to be next to people who are smoking or vaping? It is not healthy and most people go to parks to get outside and enjoy and recreate. Why encourage smoking or vaping and unhealthy life style.

Will greatly reduce people being impacted by second hand smoke, especially children.

Would allow everyone to enjoy breathing fresh air while out and about.

would allow smokers some access with possible limiting consequencem

Would approve of this. Smoking anywhere in crowded public, even outdoors is annoying.

Would make those areas of the park appealing and accessible to non-smokers & families with children

Would prefer further limits on tobacco use

Yay! Cleaner air! Please do this!

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes - I feel prohibiting smoking everywhere is unjustifiably restrictive because outside smoke vanishes quickly. Prohibiting smoking within 25 feet of active areas is reasonable to provide a smoke free environment for park users.

Yes please! Unwilling people should not have to be exposed to second hand smoke. I have had cancer once; I don't want to get a different kind because people smoke near me. Plus it seriously smells awful.

Yes please. It's so disgusting having to stand on the beach watching my children swim and get exhaled smoke wafting in my face every 3 seconds.

Yes this should be enforced. We do not need tobacco smoke in these areas and become second hand smokers.

Yes, please.

Yes, please. Smoking is offensive in park spaces and messy. This might also deter recreational marijuana in parks and parking lots.

Yes, this seems feasible. If we bar tobacco-use, we should bar sugar-use (soda and all that other s*** folks bring to the park), it causes more harm. People are learning healthy practices. Let's model it and yes, keep the air clean for the children, they don't have a choice.

Yes, would be helpful to those with chronic health issues (asthma, CHF) and for children. Also nice you exclude ceremonial practices.

Yes! Allows for enjoyment by all users

Yes! As a non smoker this is great, I should not have to smell see it taste others who are partaking

yes! I love not being subjected to second hand smoke

Yes! Less risk of fire or leaving garbage behind

Yes! No pollution in parks!

Yes!!

Yes. Healthcare is too high. Smoking causes cancer. Proven fact. .

Yes....in fact make it smoke and tobacco free!!!

You can enjoy nature without the stench of tobacco smoke.

Young people would not be tempted to give smoking a try if there were consequences for illegal use.

Nothing appealing

No appeal

We need to protect our kids from things we know will harm them, this is better than nothing.

Total ban on all combustible products. No exceptions.

Limits exposure to smoking and tobacco.....but 25 ft may not be enough

Nothing. Too open. Smoking almost everywhere.

I favor Option C - I've spent dozens of hours with boy scouts picking up trash - primarily cigarette butts. Need to include ALL combustible products in the ban.

Allows people to better appreciate the nature they are there to see without contamination

Less potential for cigarette butts.

Parent's who smoke/vape can be closer to their small kids. Convenience.

Nothing. Parks are a place to promote health and wellbeing and should not be a place for people to smoke.

Prohibiting sets a good example for youth that smoking is not healthy

Help with littering and fire hazards.

Awesome. Smoking is unhealthy for everyone. And many smokers litter their cigarette butts.

Fresher air to breathe.

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing.

Safer for kids

Should not be allowed

Sure. I don't care too much about this.

This is designed to be inclusive, which is appealing, and keep smoke away from key areas.

This is fine. Second hand smoke will usually dissipate by then.

Yes

Smoking and Tobacco Use Option A - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions

Option A: Prohibit smoking and tobacco use within 25 feet of any park building, outdoor event, playground, beach or nature center grounds.

Please use this space for questions or concerns *and* suggested solutions.

100% tobacco free grounds-

24ft is too close to buildings used by children etc.

25 feet away from these areas still gives a lot of area for tobacco users to use tobacco while still being in a common space around children and other people who are not used to being exposed to 2nd hand tobacco use.

25 feet doesn't necessarily take care of the secondhand smoke problem.

25 feet is not very far

25 feet may not be sufficient in a strong wind. It is also hard to tell someone to stay 25 feet away because not everybody has a great idea of how far 25 feet is. Limiting to a specific area (such as parking lots) is much more clear.

25 feet might be hard to estimate. Designated smoking rates might be clearer.

25 feet might be hard to judge. Still allows people to smoke near others.

25 feet would still allow cigarette butts to litter beach sand and nature areas. It is not a significant distance for keeping harmful smoke from the anyone.

25 ft is an arbitrary number....some folks may say they don't know how 25 ft looks like

25 ft is not enough and people will ignore it anyways

25ft away from playgrounds? What a joke.

25ft in theory makes sense but it's a lot easier to just have a black and white rule or designated area. That way hopefully limiting clean up area instead of 25 perimeter all the way around.

50 feet?

a

A permit should be required if tobacco is to be used in a park. Plus, there should be a way to communicate to other park goers that permission is given to the tobacco user.

All tobacco / nicotine / cannabis / alcohol must be named - this helps limit the number of undesirables

Allow it in cars. How would this be enforced?

Allowing smoking will directly prohibit my use and ability for my family to use park spaces. My family was affected by covid and do not have a wide capacity anymore, even in open spaces. Smoke even 100 feet away, is noticed.

Almost impossible to control

Already proven to be a serious health risk, exact opposite from the purpose of a park.

Any limitation is better than none, but this is complicated and will be hard to enforce.

Are park shelters considered buildings? I wouldn't enjoy having people smoking near a shelter I was renting.

Area for smoking could be limited to a small area, but smoke won't honor those borders. No smoking should be allowed in draught times as we are currently experiencing.

As a non-smoker, I prefer smokeless environments, even outside. BUT, smokers have kids that should be supervised, proximity matters. Problem is smoker's rubbish - butts, etc. will be everywhere.

Ban all smoking. I should not have to walk my children through a cloud of smoke in order to reach the playground

Ban in parking lots as well

Ban smoking

Ban smoking all together, as you do in most other County facilities.

BAN SMOKING ALTOGETHER IN THE PARK -- IN ALL AREAS AND AT ALL TIMES.

Ban tobacco use everywhere. Most park users do not want to traverse a minefield of butts on the ground. In addition, secondhand smoke is dangerous.

Be sure to clarify on all signage that ceremonial use remains allowed

better is to have not tobacco use at all (option b is close)

Better than no ban, but people smoke on sidewalks and then we have to walk through it. Gross.

better to make it a complete ban because who is going to measure the 25 feet?

but then smokers might not come to parks. and we are outside already, so maybe they can have a smoking area?

can be tough to estimate that distance where does vaping fit in? can lead to littering at edge of smoking-allowed zone (should have place to discard butts at edge of smoking area)

Cannot police

Children can still see people smoking

Cigarette butts all over

Cigarette butts and possible fire risk from ash or a cigarette disposed of that was not properly put out.

Cigarette butts are a huge part of litter found everywhere. Reducing where people can smoke will not reduce the amount of litter, just where it is.

Cigarette butts, ash trays... ick!

Cigarette butts, exposure to second hand smoke for children, pregnant women, anyone who is sensitive to this. Increased fire risk would need to be monitored.

Cigarette smoking should be banned in all parks during droughts. Cigarette butts should be packed out. They're dangerous to birds.

Compliance.

Concern - this is not enough. Solution: prohibit smoking and tobacco on park property altogether.

Concern is that even though I don't smoke, I don't like government always getting in citizens' faces.

Concern that creating any new regulations around tobacco use gives police a reason to approach, some one who is otherwise following the laws, and as we've seen recently multiple times in Minnesota every interaction with police is an opportunity for violence, or structural racism.

Concern: more litter. Encountering groups of smokers when in more isolated areas of park.

Concerned about smoking starting grass or forest fires.

Concerned about tobacco use on trail systems.

Concerns that it infringes on people that don't want to be around smokers/smoking

Consistent enforcement of this is my sole concern, particularly with a distance related tie to it.

Contributes to increased littering and risk for exposure to secondhand smoke

Could be hard to regulate

Current rules and regulations about tobacco use in county owned public spaces should remain in effect

designate a smoking area far from gathering places

Difficult to enforce this one

Difficult to enforce when it's outside a park.

Difficult to enforce. People will exploit.

difficult to measure/enfore

Do not allow smoking in park.

Does not help reduce littering of cigarette butts around park grounds.

Does the county really want to support unhealthy behavior, disease, littering and potential grass and treefires?

Does this push use to cars/parking lots etc? Having to deal w/ the smoking and tobacco use is annoying in general, but are there consequences of pushing it under cover (i honestly have no idea).

Doesn't spot getting stuck by someone on a trail or other places and having to breathe their smoke

Dog may try to eat cigarette butts.

Don't want smoke in the parks at *all*

Don't smoke in parks.

Don't treat us like children

Don't want any smoking due to second hand smoke concerns

Eliminate all smoking. It is very distasteful to see other people's cigarette butts laying around especially in light of Covid 19. Butts do not decompose for many years.

Eliminate tobacco use completely.

Enforce it.

Enforcement is a concern

Enforcement is always an issue since smokers seem to feel entitled to sicken the rest of us. There would need to be some kind of staffing, especially in restrooms.

Enforcement would be challenging

Enforcement would be difficult and I would not want people to be harmed by police for something trivial like this.

Essentially means you can smoke anywhere and all park users and adjacent properties are exposed.

Feel like this will be hard to police, some may obey the rules which would be better than none

Folks who smoke are addicted to a legal substance. They need consideration!

For people to not smoke in the parks, this would have to be monitored and patrolled/enforced. I am not sure how this could happen.

Greater fire risk, resources needed if littering becomes a problem

Hard to enforce

Hard to enforce

Hard to enforce 25 foot rule.

Hard to enforce, many have no concept of distance

Hard to enforce.

Hard to enforce.

Hard to enforce. Open to interpretation of distance by the public. Smoke carries a long ways.

Hard to know where safe place to smoke. Slippery slope to smoke closer to park than rule intended

Hard to police. Does it cover all picnic tables placed throughout?

Harder to enforce the 25 feet rule.

Have a smoking area.

HAVE DESIGNATED SMOKING AREAS more than 25 ft more like 50" AWAY FROM BLDGS, EVENTS PLAYGROUND ALL OF ABOVE. definitely further away even for playgrounds. Kids don't need that bad example.

Have designated smoking areas with good ash trays.

Have places to dispose of cigarette butts just outside of the pavilion.

Have smoking areas ?

Honestly shouldn't allow for any tobacco use or smoking of any kind. People throw their cigarette butts and makes the parks gross

How and who will enforce this?

How easy is this to really enforce?

How is it enforced? A sign does nothing to prevent violations.

How to enforce

How will this be enforced equally? I could see that this could become a vendetta against a person based on race, religion, etc. will there be signs showing an acceptable smoking distance? I can also see conflict arising due to the distance and the wind and the smell many other aspects of smoking that may bother someone.

How would it be enforced?

How would this be enforced?

How would this be enforced?

How would this be enforced? Could be some disagreements about the appropriate distance unless it is clearly marked where 25 feet actually is "no smoking in this zone". Might be easier to create designated areas for smoking with appropriate containers for cigarette butts.

How would this be enforced.

How would this be enforced. Is this a problem? Is tobacco smoke more toxic than smoke from grills?

I am concerned this would be enforced inequitably and would be used to discriminate against BIPOC individuals

I am opposed to smoking on any walking paths, being stuck behind a smoker with small children in a stroller for example. Lets be better for our communities.

I believe smoking and vaping should be prohibited everywhere!

I disagree about vaping though, I don't find it necessary to ban vaping anywhere outdoors. Vaping isn't the same as smoking and I don't like the idea of banning things that are superficially similar to other things when the science is not decided on whether it's really harmful or not

I do not think that smoking should be done in a park at all. I often see cigarette butts laying all over the ground. I have had my small grandchild almost grab them & if I hadn't been watching, she definitely would have had it - and probably straight in the mouth! Smoking can be done outside of the park grounds. My only request is that if smoking is allowed anywhere - there should be butt disposal containers. At least if these are present, there are usually less butts all over the ground.

I do not want to have to pass by a smoke screen set up by a smoker sitting on a park bench that is more than 25 feet from a prohibited use area.

I do think littering cigarette butts is a problem everywhere, but since people are going to smoke whether it is or isn't allowed, the best thing I think to do is make a sign asking people to throw away their cigarette butts.

I don't know if it would do much good because in my experience smokers don't pay much attention to the rules unless there is an official standing by to enforce them.

I don't mind smoke outside.

I don't really have an opinion. I don't smoke, but I've never had an issue with this.

I don't want to be out in nature and smell others smoke. Fire and litter issues.

I don't go to a park to be inundated with smoke. 25 feet is not enough

I don't smoke but it's no illegal. Let them be

I don't smoke, but it should not be an issue outdoors.

I don't think tobacco should be allowed at all within the parks, because it stinks and there could be people who would seriously be affected by secondhand smoke. On the other hand, it's hard to enforce and shouldn't be used as a reason to punish people either. Receptacles for ash/cigarette trash need to be made available so that litter doesn't become an issue if tobacco products will be allowed in county parks.

I hate being around tobacco or vaping at all.

I hate having the mess of the smokers.

I have to adjust my walking time (already limited due to gender) because of smokers - all men by the way. Plus I pick up their butts.

I like fresh air when I'm enjoying a public park. Tobacco use/smoking feels like pollution to me.

I like the idea but without some sort of enforcement it won't do any good.

I love keeping smoking out of parks and near parks.

I prefer option B.

I still don't want myself or my kids to breath second hand smoke anywhere in the park.

I suggest full on ban to all smoking/vaping/tobacco use on park grounds. In addition to trash/litter issues, the second-hand smoke is not only harmful to bystanders' health, it is unpleasant. Personally, I have a sensitivity to smoke so I instantly feel nauseous and get a headache from second hand smoke, no matter how far away the smoker is. And I want to be able to enjoy the outdoors and not have to be within 25 feet of a park building or event to get that protection.

I support this idea 100%

I think it shouldn't be allowed anywhere. The wind carries smoke and is then breathed in by anyone around, including children. It also increases litter

I think it's unnecessary as the amount of smokers has dropped significantly.

I thought this was in place already.

I worry about even more cigarette butts, there are already so many in the parks. I worry that people will push these boundaries and inch closer to the prohibited areas.

I would recommend that people who want to use tobacco do so in the parking lot or in their cars. Otherwise, no tobacco use.

I would suggest having designated smoking areas in addition to prohibiting smoking in specific areas.

I wouldn't mind this if you could find a way to have smokers clean up their butts

I'd support 25ft. from buildings and playgrounds. Tobacco use is legal for 21+ in MN, as is alcohol use. If beer and wine are allowed on the beach, in picnic areas and at outdoor events, so should tobacco use.

I'm not a smoker but smokers pay a lot of money to smoke and should have right too.

I'm not a smoker, and I don't like smoke. Nevertheless, smokers should not be excluded from public spaces as long as their smoking is not affecting others. There should be areas where smoking is allowed, and not far from the areas typically occupied by visitors. These could be either designated smoking areas, or simply whatever is outside of the parts where smoking is prohibited...

If smoking is generally allowed this seems hard to enforce.

If smoking is outdoors, it's fine.

If the purpose of these ordinance changes is to be more equitable, why would more restrictive policies be on the table? Sounds like looking for new ways to criminalize behavior.

If there's a need for ceremonial spiritual smoking- related to an event occurring at county parks- I'm not against this- but perhaps a request when renting a space could be required to ensure it's a legitimate exception

If this rule is written it will likely be another unenforced rule, so what is the benefit?

If you allow this people do not follow as is. Children should not have to be exposed to second hand smoke!

Impacts people's freedom somewhat, smoking out not near anyone outdoors seems like less big a deal.

Impossible to enforce

In long lake park this is not a problem

Increase in litter, chance of fire. Underage people in unsupervised area participate. Who will guarantee rules will be followed? Cost?

Is 25 feet enough? What about just all park grounds?

Is it enforced?

Is posting signs going to be enough. How does the city get the word out. Like the speed limit on Saint Paul streets. Many of my suburban friends have no idea there was a change. Who pays attention to speed limit signs?

Is there any issue with fires from lit cigarettes? That's the only reason I can think of that would warrant being more restrictive than this.

It doesn't take into account use of paths/trails within the park - I don't want to be walking through tobacco smoke while on a trail. Would prefer something more restrictive.

It is going to be hard to define.

It is not really a concern. Creating excessive laws CREATES criminals.

It is placing more restrictions on freedoms.

It is REALLY HARD to enforce a defined distance. Most people have no idea what 25 feet looks like

It likely leads to trash, butts, and more being scattered everywhere

It might be difficult to enforce

It seems like it would never be enforced.

It seems more confusing for staff to enforce.

It would still mean that people could smoke on trails, etc

It's a bit vague and will lead to people ignoring it.

It's surprising how much smoke can bother. Eating at restaurants with outdoor dining, I have been bothered by secondhand smoke, especially if there is wind blowing in my direction. (And I don't have asthma or anything.)

It's almost always a non ticketed and voluntary compliance

Its not healthy, Cig butts are everywhere, you're enabling them

just ban it but then again hard enforce even when you say something to off leash dog owners they pretty much tell you to go to ???\$

Just ban tobacco products in the parks

Keep no tobacco use in parks so everyone using the parks can enjoy them. Smoke carries long distances and inhibits easy access if you have to pass by someone smoking

Keep rules the same as now...

Litter generation of wrappers/packaging, cigarette butts, etc. Fire risk during droughts. Defined smoking areas with trash and ashtrays could be provided in areas easily accessible to fire trucks.

Litter. Cigarette butts left around

Littering and fires in more open park spaces.

Make it further than 25 feet. I can't stand walking through a cloud of smoke to get inside something

Make it no smoking at all

Make smoking illegal-countrywide.

Make sure there are butt receptacles

May discourage some use. Who enforces this; some people may be reluctant to ask others to stop using w/in area

May not do enough to prevent litter from improperly discarded butts.

Might be hard to enforce.

More fire potential, litter with pipes, papers, butts. Causing safety concern for visitors, wildlife. I would not visit a park or reserve facilities with potential second hand smoke or having to see items associated with tobacco use discarded throughout trails and beach areas. People are lazy and would not hold onto butts, papers, packaging to appropriate away.

More likely to have tobacco waste in our parks. It's also a fire hazard, especially in drought years like this one.

Most people don't know how to gauge 25 feet.

My concern about this option is that people can still smoke on paths etc. This is harmful to all, and especially to those with sensitive lungs, eyes, etc.

My concerns apply to all 3 proposals. Smoking does not, by definition, disturb the peace. It may be bothersome to people who may also be using the park, but they the options to move away or ask the smoker to kindly move. Because smoking is not an immediate danger to anyone, this issue should be treated differently than the issue of

park hours, which can easily create an atmosphere that encourages behavior that is disturbing and unsafe in a more immediate sense. Of the 3 smoking related proposals, this one is most enforceable. My suggestion is to create smoking areas, complete with signage and butt disposal.

My concerns have been stated. For safety reasons: NO SMOKING

My lease is similar except it is no smoking within 50 feet of the duplex.

My only concern would be that some parks, like mears park are so small that this would apply in virtually the entire park. This would be a great option for a park like battle creek, but for workers trying to take a quick smoke break and have a little walk around mears park to ease their stress, this would essentially eliminate that use case. I don't think that's a good thing personally, and I don't even smoke.

N/A

Need to define in any statute the terms ceremonial, cultural or spiritual practices, otherwise anyone could say their smoking is permitted because of one of these 3 allowances.

Nine. Restrict tobacco in public parks period

No concerns.

No concerns. There is literally no negative side to having a smoke free area.

No need for this

No one honors the 25 ft rule, the smoke doesn't honor the 25 ft rule. It just means go smoke everywhere.

No one is going to measure 25 ft exactly. They will likely err on the side of less distance. Wind can blow smoke to the playground. Stubs left within 25ft of a playground can easily get picked up by kids running and playing. Plus, this allows smoking on trails and when you're trying to be healthy and get some fresh air on a walk, you don't want smoke in your face.

No one obeys these signs. This proposed ordinance will have the practical effect of allowing smoking throughout the park.

No smoking

No smoking allowed would be great, just like inside a school area or airport

No smoking anywhere

No smoking anywhere.

No smoking in parks

No smoking in parks. People go for fresh healthy air. Should not have to smell others peoples smoke. Disgusting dirty habit.

No smoking in the entire park. People don't want to expose themselves of their children while they are walking the sidewalks or playing in open areas.

No smoking period.

No smoking should be allowed anywhere. The smoke carries much farther than 25 feet and our most vulnerable community members shouldn't have to avoid park because of smoke

No tobacco should be allowed

No! Keep my parks tobacco free!

Nobody ever obeys a 25' rule. Wind still carries smoke into the protected areas

Nobody knows what 25 ft actually looks like. People won't know that they also have to stay clear of things other than the buildings - too complicated. The smoke moves around and still ends up on the playgrounds and in the buildings.

Nobody pays attention to the 25 ft rule

Nobody walks around with a 25ft tape measure. If the legality were to be called into question, someone could smoke a whole pack before law enforcement would show up to enforce the law.

None

none

None

Not all vapes have nicotine or tobacco, and claim that on the product. Some also have THC or CBD.

Not enough

Not enough space. Smoke travels far

Not far enough away!

Not limiting enough. Smoke travels further than 25 feet so secondhand smoke is still a concern. Where will cigarette butts go? Are there designated receptacles for them?

Not really a problem, are we adding more restrictions that don't add real value.

Not restrictive enough

Not restrictive enough. Parks are often used by kids, who are then forced to walk through smoking groups on paths, etc.

Not sure how it will be enforced. Maybe additional signage and education campaign?

Nothing. Let people work out any conflicts themselves.

Obviously air pollution is a concern with being in a park, but I think it's unrealistic to expect smokers not to smoke.

Of course it's still possible to be doing something and get stuck near someone who is smoking in this scenario.

offer quit smoking clinics, hypnotism classes, health care in the parks by POP UP

One of the reasons people go outside is to breathe fresh air and smoking impinges on that. I'd suggest a 20' minimum from non-smokers and 35' from any assembly, shelter or occupied picnic table. Cigars should be banned from any park property.

Only concern is it might be hard to remember the exact rule?

Option A

Option A seems too hard to enforce, a bit too vague and open to misinterpretation by smokers.

Outdoor smoking is not the same as confined indoor smoking and people do not have to be near a smoker by simply walking away. Many have lived to a ripe old age living with smokers in the old days. This day and age is filled with the victim mentality and basic children in old bodies whining about other peoples' sins when they are filled with ugly ones of their own!

Outside is ok.

Parks are a place for respecting the irreplaceable natural elements we share air, earth, water

Parks are for healthy activities and fresh air. No tobacco use anywhere in the park.

People already do not follow the rules. Why make them vague and hard to enforce?

People are everywhere in a park so this option does not address the fact that exposure is everywhere and airborne pollutants drift.

People are not good at judging distance. Either designate certain smoking areas or ban it completely.

People don't follow the rules as it is. Give them an inch and they'll give take it all. Who is going to measure the 25 feet?

People don't listen to this

People ignore the amount of footage a sign indicates. It's a joke. This is not a strong enforcement strategy to prohibit smoking on public grounds.

People may not respect the 25 foot limit

People might dispose of butts other than appropriate disposal containers. Difficult to enforce.

People still throw cigarette butts everywhere. And in lakes.

People who smoke often don't care about rules

People will more likely smoke wherever they want if its allowed in the park

People won't listen anyways.

perhaps a smoking allowed area?

Persistent smokers may try to challenge the 25 ft, especially in winter when smokers are often seen right outside the doors. This then puts enforcers in an awkward position to ask people to move. Option B removes that subjectivity.

Place ash bins at 25 feet away to make disposing of butts easy

Please ban smoking from our parks.

Please enforce this diligently

Please make sure "vaping" is included as well!

Policing this is hard. Garbage can should still be available to encourage throwing out of butts.

Prohibit cigarette smoking due to concerns about people throwing cigarette butts on the ground, both on and off walkways.

Prohibit smoking and tobacco use within 25 feet of any park building, outdoor event, playground, beach or nature center grounds.

prohibit smoking due to its visual nature, and leave other tobacco use in place.

Public health

Putting smoking far away from potential trash bins near buildings may promote littering. Solution: put tobacco (cigar, cigarette...) trash bins away from buildings or maybe only allow smoking in a designated area. Prohibiting all tobacco use, such as with chewing or dip tobacco, does absolutely nothing to promote health. People will simply do the dip or chew somewhere else and there is no second hand risk from dip/chew.

Restrictions take away personal freedoms, so designated smoking areas would be appropriate

Second hand smoke is just as bad as those who wish to smoke themselves..

Seems unenforceable.

Signs should be prominent for enforcement

Smoke free parks.

Smoke has more tendency to drift outside, no one wants to breathe it. Also don't like finding cigarettes everywhere

Smoke in the air is unhealthy for all living beings. When I am outside I do not want to breathe in someone else's smoke. I want to breathe fresh air if at all possible. We have enough pollution in the air as it is. People need to keep their smoke to themselves, period. They do not have the right to disturb other people's health and comfort with their smoke. Promote non-smoking in parks, promote clean air in parks, help people remember that they are not the only ones using the park, that other creatures do, too, and also deserve clean air. Also, people who smoke tend to throw their cigarette butts on the ground so wherever they are allowed to smoke there will be butts left behind.

Smoke induced asthma is real for many. There should be no smoking allowed.

Smoke still carries and will be smelt in other areas of the park. I have witnessed very few smokers who actually honor these (stay back x # of feet) signs.

Smokers don't police themselves very often

Smokers leave their butts all over, it's gross and bad for the park.

Smokers will ignore this.

Smokers will still throw their butts wherever - this option would disperse them off the beaten path where they are less likely to be picked up.

Smoking and tobacco use should not be prohibited in all park areas. Part of enjoying the parks, staying healthy and enjoying the fresh air is compromised when subjected to other's smoke.

smoking anything should be prohibited

Smoking areas would need to be maintained by park staff, more rules to enforce.

smoking can still travel 25 feet.

Smoking has not been an issue, but seems logical too keep away from playground, swimming area and shelters.

Smoking is legal and should be permitted outdoors within reason. Prohibiting smoking creates barriers for certain demographics of park users and is inequitable. Provide designated receptacles for cigarette butts to reduce litter, reduce fire risk, and create a visual indicator for where smoking is allowed.

Smoking outside doesn't hurt no one. Black peoples wanna smoke outside. Dont ban it.

Smoking should be 100% prohibited in parks.

Smoking should be prohibited in parks and on all public property. Government has a duty to promote public health.

Smoking should be prohibited like it is most everywhere else. Your right to smoke ends at my lungs.

Smoking should not be allowed in or near any park. If someone has to smoke, then they can move outside of the park to protect those who do not smoke.

Smoking should remain banned in parks, period, full stop.

Smoking, tobacco, vaping should NOT be allowed at ALL in parks. It's not necessary and it's damaging to everyone's health

Smoking should be banned.

So people could smoke or vape on the paths or walkways that are 25 feet from a building/playground/beach..? I don't want to be walking behind somebody on a trail/walkway inhaling their smoke.

Some smokers may object to being 25 feet away from the playground if trying to watch their kids while smoking. But seriously... that shouldn't be a big problem

Still can smell smoke and often tobacco chewers spit on the ground.

Still creates situations where park users are subjected to second hand smoke. What is the penalty for smoking? Who is it enforced against? How is it enforced?

Stop removing liberties

Stop trying to control what people do outdoors. They are outside. Smokers' taxes are paying for the parks, too. If people are so concerned about smokers because it's violating their air quality, they'd do something actually beneficial for the environment like giving up their cars and not driving anymore because of carbon emissions. Maybe you shouldn't allow cars into the parks anymore because they pollute way more than anyone smoking does. People just have to walk to the parks now. If it's truly a health concern, maybe you should be checking up on what people are cooking at the parks, too. Hamburgers, beers, chips and hotdogs are not healthy foods. Police that! The leading cause of death in America is heart disease and your diet affects that significantly. Yet, we're not going to address that or take away the excessive sugars and fats available in our every day grocery products. These smoking restriction ideas that institutions want to implement are just visages of health concerns. If you care about health, give up your funding so it can be designated to universal healthcare. If you can't do that, then stop trying to make rules outside of your realm.

Suggest Option B.

Suggested solution: option C

Suggestions - have areas for cigarette butt collections

T

Take there bad habits to there home

The ban on smoking should not be lifted. Perhaps one area of the park, far away from other people, could be designated as a smoking area.

The smoke travels thru the air and can completely ruin the experience of non-smokers. I have found this to be true in many situations. It will lead to potential conflicts

The smokers won't listen. You should place those tobacco trashcan things 25 feet away. Maybe have a little cover, like at a bus stop.

The state has a no smoking ban, let's go with that.

There are too many opportunities for it to be abused

There could be confusion about the details.

There is literally no clinical evidence suggesting that second smoke outdoors is a health hazard at all. The only reason to restrict outdoor smoking is to cater to people who are offended by the *sight* of people smoking. I have no interest in smoking in parks, but I think we should be honest about why we're interested in controlling it. Health has nothing to do with this.

There will be (as there are now) cigarette butts all over the park. This is not safe or healthy for the other park users especially children

They could start a fire if they throw the cigarette on the ground.

This can be hard to measure/guess by smokers. Likely to create some confusion about how far, is far enough. Also creates very fluid boundaries since you could arguably just go smoke out in the woods and cause a fire. Plus, we all know there is a lot of marijuana smoking already happening in the woods at Long Lake park.

This does not go far enough. I'm tired of my kids and I being overcome with cigarette smoke when we're trying to enjoy the park

This is a personal choice and not a healthy one. Why should smoking be allowed anywhere?

This is difficult to enforce, and similar rules for business entrances are widely ignored. You'd probably have to literally paint lines on the ground. It also doesn't address trails, which are less than 25 feet wide, so should be added to the list.

This is hard to enforce and I doubt any real accountability or deterrence would occur with this.

This is more difficult to enforce than restricting to parking lots

This is too complicated. Simplify it - no smoking anywhere on park property.

This is unnecessary

This likely won't limit litter or exposure.

this may present fire risks, particularly in the dry season.

This seems complicated rule and easier to take advantage of the rule

This seems difficult to enforce.

This seems improbable in that most of park activities require mobility throughout the park so a tobacco user would be constantly passing near people or events while smoking

This sounds like it could be hard to enforce. Will people understand 25 feet? Will there be a circle painted around each facility. Just sounds like a headache to enforce.

This would be difficult to enforce and youth would still see people smoking around the parks.

This would cause litter in our parks

To be honest, I don't care about this. I don't smoke, but don't mind people smoking outside.

Tobacco litter might still be a problem, but it's likely that people who litter wouldn't care about this policy anyway.

Tobacco smoke and litter are the worst. Ban them from park grounds entirely. Tobacco use is an addiction, and no matter what rule is set, smokers always push the boundaries. And smoke goes where the wind blows it, so you always seem to end up downwind from someone.

Tobacco stench carries for more than 25 feet and just opens opportunities for disputes

Tobacco use is greater among low income and people of color so this could make it more difficult for those who need the parks most wouldn't be able to use them.

Tobacco use is legal over the age of 21 in MN, just as is consuming alcohol. I'd see not allowing tobacco use within 25 ft. of buildings or playgrounds, but otherwise it seems more politicized than concern for health. If beer and wine are allowed on the beach, in picnic areas, and at outdoor park events, tobacco use should be as well.

Tobacco use should be completely prohibited.

Tobacco use should be limited more

Too close to the public and children playing

Too complicated. Not enforceable unless boundaries around all prohibited areas are clearly defined. Leaves most of park area open to smoking.

too detailed. Will people have measuring tapes to see how close they are or yellow lines around buildings?

Too hard to figure out where someone can smoke

Too limited and also complicated.

Too wishy washy. Does smoking 26 feet away really make a difference?

Unlikely to be enforced or enforced only with certain populations

Users would still have to come into contact with second hand smoke in most park areas.

Van all caping and tobacco products

Very difficult to enforce.

Very few people can properly assess 25 feet. I suggest putting butt disposal devices easily accessible and obvious 25 feet from buildings and other fixed areas this rule applies to so it's easy for someone to know where they are supposed to be and provide a visual for how far 25 feet is.

Very hard to enforce. Hard to understand clearly. Imagine the sign that says this...

Very over reaching

Very supportive of this option

Video monitoring and policing with fines.

We all know tobacco use is unhealthy...why would we allow this on park property, playground, beach, etc.?

We have a police problem in this country. We use the police for EVERYTHING, and the police are trigger happy. I'm not anti-police, but I think we need to be very careful about what we make illegal, since its the police that ultimately enforce laws. The law is a very special thing, and we shouldn't miss-use it. I pretty much guarantee you that if you make it illegal to smoke in the park, some idiot will call the police on some other idiot that doesn't want to stop smoking. Then the police have (or might) to respond to this.... quiet honestly minor problem. If you think this won't happen, you aren't familiar with how incredibly bored suburban cops are. Years ago, suburban cops would stop my 20 something white friend for... walking down the street after midnight, when he couldn't sleep. Night after night, until finally the whole force was familiar with him. So police BS isn't just racial, it's boredom, and they will respond to stupid crap like smoking in a park. This is: 1. Bad for the police, since it largely wastes their time with enforcing petty laws. 2. Bad for the people who are in the park that broke some minor law, since now they have to interact with the police every time some Karen calls the cops. 3. Bad everyone in the park when the police get called, and suddenly have to destroy an otherwise nice atmosphere. 4. Bad for everyone else, since now police time has to be spent on Karen's minor little BS smoking issue rather than actual crime. Honestly, do you want the police to shoot someone over a smoking incident that got escalated into something far bigger? I don't.

We need to prohibit park users from smoking or vaping to protect public health.

We need to think about the safety of our children playing at the beach or in the shelters. Not a good idea.

We nonsmokers still have to walk through and breathe in smoke to get to our destinations

What about vaping? Is this included in smoking?

What if it's a windy day? Is 25 feet sufficient? Do people observe the distance requirement?

Who is going to clean up butts from smokers? Few smokers take their ciggy butts and place them in a trash container. Why encourage people to smoke or vape which is unhealthy/

Who is going to enforce this?

Who is going to enforce this?

Who is going to go around and police the 25 feet? Seems like you are asking for trouble.

Who is going to patrol this everywhere?

Who knows how far 25 feet it ?!?

Who wants to monitor this one? Good luck with that!

Who will enforce this?

Who will enforce this? It seems a bit of a problem to have rules that are unenforced.

Why 25' ...and then there will be cigarette butt collection containers at 25' mark? No there won't be so don't do this.

Why smoke at the park? Go outside the park to smoke. People are there to be active. Lots of kids around. There's no need to smoke or vape in the park!

Will there be cig receptacles?

Will this be enforced? Or is it a guideline?

Would be confusing and difficult to enforce, a complete ban would be more effective.

Would it be enforced? By who?

Would prefer option of prohibiting everywhere but parking lot. Inhaling second hand smoke while exercising on trails raises health concerns, especially to asthmatics and those with other underlying conditions.

Would still allow smoking in parks.

Would this be enforced? By whom?

Would vaping be allowed? That might soften the blow to smokers. I am thinking about Moms that need to keep an eye on their kids.

Yes - I feel prohibiting smoking everywhere is unjustifiably restrictive because outside smoke vanishes quickly. Prohibiting smoking within 25 feet of active areas is reasonable to provide a smoke free environment for park users.

You have much more pressing issues than to worry about who is smoking tobacco. how about pot? Meth? Crack? because that's what people are smoking in our park.

You should specify vape is included in this prohibition.

Too close, for our children to be exposed to second hand smoke

And no fireworks!!!!

We would still have tobacco litter in the parks.

Enforcement of distance minimums has been a failure with buildings and the Clean Indoor Air Act.

People would still be exposed to SHS

People's health are still impacted - both user and nonuser

Trails are narrow - have to pass people smoking/vaping.

Some may find this discriminatory against a group of people.

young people seeing people use normalizes the behavior.

Discriminatory enforcement risk

How is someone to know where 25 feet is? Seems like a random distance.

Are County buildings all smoke free?

Would push smokers to the trails, but there aren't places to safely dispose of butts there.

Difficult to enforce. Who is measuring? Makes staying out of "trouble" complicated.

Unsure where the boundaries are around the specific areas listed. Like the beach - is the boundary the sand??

This would be difficult to enforce.

Good luck enforcing this. Is there really going to be a "cigarette patrol"?

Really quite impossible to enforce.

Does not set a good example for youth.

Young people and families should not see adults smoking right next to them.

Duluth tried this a few years ago with the Lakewalk. No one complied; no one enforced it.

This will not address the problem of tobacco litter in the parks.

I agree that this would be difficult to enforce but doesn't negate the idea of having the ordinance.

What is 25 feet away from these areas? Will the smokers be in the way of walkers, bikers, etc.

do not allow smoking or tobacco use in nature's parks and settings designed for kids to safely play

Limit to parking areas. Kids don't need to see and smell smokers

People don't know what "25 feet" really looks like in practice; so this gets really hard to enforce. When you have kids playing on a playground, then they decide to play tag and move over onto the grassy area where there are people smoking and using tobacco, do the people then need to move 25 feet away from the kids? I would like to see our parks tobacco and smoke free!

Spots could be set up for smokers.

Sure. I don't care too much about this.

We've just spent 1.5 years proving people are terrible at estimating distance and caring for other people.

Smoking and Tobacco Use Option B - What's appealing about this?

Option B: Prohibit smoking and tobacco use everywhere except parking lots.

What's appealing about this?

A better guarantee for keeping my family safe when going out to parks. I do have a few smoker friends and it doesn't seem fair to give them zero places to smoke.

A good common ground solution!

A parking lot doesn't burn, so risk of fires from discarded cigars or cigarettes are reduced. Even with plenty of butt bins placed around the lot, there would still be some littering, so picking up from a parking lot would be much easier than grass.

A simple prohibition is easily understood and hopefully more enforceable.

Absolutely nothing is appealing about this option. What about forest fires, littering, subjecting those who are immune-compromised, have asthma or children to smoke??

Again keeps litter down no cigarette butts all around

Again-as far away as possible-they can smoke on the street and not even in the parking lot where I may have to walk by them

agree

All health reasons stated above.

All of it

All spots need prohibit smoking and tobacco use. If you need to use it, use it at home.

Allows all to attend but doesn't distract non smokers

Allows law enforcement to suggest smokers move to the designated area (parking lots) rather than issuing a citation or making the people leave the park

Allows people who feel a need to smoke an optional "smoking area"

Allows smokers to use the parks with little or no second hand smoke exposure.

Allows some use but limits area to be more controlled

Also fine with me but you'd probably get more pushback.

Any prohibiting of smoking is appealing to me. The littering, loitering, and smell impacts me wanting to use parks. This type of rule is easier to apply to all groups.

Any tobacco restriction is welcome

As a non smoker, everything, but we my concerns.

As a non-smoker, prohibition except parking lots is preferable.

As above, this isn't unreasonable.

As someone with asthma, this is the best option. In addition, this would help with cigarette butts NOT being in nature on trails, animals would STOP eating cigarette butts, etc

At least it is contained to one area

At least it limits use in the park area

At least no second hand smoke, but still leads to litter

At least smoke would be away from areas kids are playing.

At least you're away from the park itself

Avoiding the littering (people just throw them on the ground), and fire concerns. Knowing we don't have to deal with the smell or asthma concerns anywhere in the park (except the parking lot).

Bans smoking in park

Benefits the health of the community in most park settings while still allowing a place for tobacco users to get their fix so they can stay longer, enjoying time with family, nature, etc

Better

Better

Better although people will still leave their butts all over

Better because more inclusive of park areas

Better but not there yet. Parking lots will have places to safely dispose of cigarette butts so they don't start fires and they are usually far enough away from congregation areas that the smoke won't bother the attendees.

Better but still not restrictive

Better choice due to limited range of smoking, but still not desirable.

Better than above.

Better than allowing it everywhere but I prefer option C.

Better than first option...as a

Better than last option

Better than nothing but no actionable enforcement. Cigarette butts are a problem in our parks.

Better than Option A but why would you allow smoking in parking lots? Make it like school grounds and prohibit smoking on all park grounds, including parking lots.

Better than smoking in any other areas but still a fire hazard.

Better than the 25 ft option!

Better than the 25feet proposal. This could satisfy a few parties.

Better than the first option.

Better to breathe

Better to limit it to parking lot but still carries potential for park damage through inappropriately discarded products.

Better, but also eliminate parking lots

Better, but still not good. Smokers will hang out next to our cars.

Better. More family friendly. More clear cut rule

Better....

Better.... But I like option C best.

Blanket protection for park guests; no having to guess "25 feet" distance. I approve of this - parking lots and cars are pretty common for other spaces

Cigarette butter would only be found in parking lots

Clarity

Clean air

Clean air and could help people quit smoking

clean air.

Clean air.

cleaner?

Clear criteria for smoking and non-smoking areas.

Clear limitation that doesn't rely on people understanding distance. Allows you to place proper waste receptacles. Still allows participants to engage in their choice behavior/keep an eye on kids, etc. without too much disruption.

Clearer than 25 ft rule, cleaner air for the rest

Complete ban is easier for enforcement. Also would greatly reduce tobacco waste and litter in the parks.

Compromise. Freedom to use facilities without second hand smoke.

Confined it to one space

Confines smoking to a certain area

Contain Smoking to cars

Could be a designated smoking area, sure.

Decreases second hand smoke and trash

Designated smoking areas

Doesn't seem like this would be followed

Doesnt matter as much to me.

Don't have to sit next to someone who's smoke is blowing into my space.

Don't like any smoking.

Don't care about this.

Don't smoke in lots either. Filthy habit affects others

Easier cleanup

Easier for nonsmokers to stay away from smoke. Easier to enforce. Healthy environment for larger portion of the park.

Easier to Breathe in most of the park

Easier to control the location of where versus an arbitrary line.

Easier to enforce

Easier to enforce and determine acceptable areas to smoke. No arguing about what 25 ft is.

Easiest to enforce. Consistent with regulations for most public space.

Easily defined and reasonable protection of the health of other park users.

Easy cig-butt disposal.

Easy enforcement

Easy enough for non-smokers to avoid parking lots but smoke can travel with the wind.

Easy to remember. Easier to enforce

Easy to understand and enforce.

easy to understand, less subjective

Eliminates exposure for kids for the most part.

even better

Even better - this could reduce litter in the parks (fewer cigarette butts) and limits use to clearly defined areas

Even better! We can breathe everywhere!!!!

Even better.

Even better.

Even better.

Even less trash, odor and fire hazard than just disallowing near buildings

Even more appealing with the number of children using these areas. The smell of cigarette smoke on a summer day is unappealing, and the number of cigarette butts on the ground is also unappealing.

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything is appealing about this. Smoking is bad for everyone and the ashes/cigarette butts litter our environment and are harmful to our natural environment.

Everything is appealing. Again clean air and less butts littering the park.

Everything! Great solution.

Everything.

Everything.

Everything. - also seems safer given fire risk.

Everything. Get rid of use in parks. People can go figure out somewhere else to do it, no need to have non-smokers deal with their habit.

Everything. I'm at a park to enjoy nature, and get exercise. Walking/running through the smoke is nasty! Those addicted can still have some place to partake.

Everything. Smoking is a health hazard.

Feels like a compromise.

Fewer cigarette butts on the ground in the parks.

folks will do it anyway

For me, The fewer encounters with smoke the better. Some sympathy expressed at this time to addicts.

Fresh air. Accessibility for people with disabilities and breathing issues. People can still smoke in car

Fresh air. No litter of cigarette butts on trails or in the grass or playground areas. No secondhand smoke exposure for me or my children.

Further limits areas where people could be exposed to second-hand smoke.

Getting better.

Give smokers a place to smoke

Gives smokers someplace to smoke.

Good

Good balance of giving at least some option.

Good for public health

Great idea

Great. Make life harder for smokers and hopefully make them quit

Having a designated smoking area is good for those intelligent enough to choose not to pollute their lungs

Having a designated spot to smoke.

Healthy and pleasant air quality for park patrons.

Hopefully keeps smoke clear of the spaces where kids.

I actually think that while this is better than smoking IN the parks it's going to mean parking lots are full of smokers and possibly a pain for families

I believe this would curtail smoking illegal substances near others and letting those smokers hide in the park where they might get careless with fire.

I disagree with this

I dislike breathing smoke as I do not smoke.

I don't like it but smokers gotta be able to smoke somewhere

I don't really have an opinion. I don't smoke, but I've never had an issue with this.

I don't see a need for any additional restrictions

I don't smoke, but for those that do smoke I'd rather have a designated area. This will cut down on sneaking a smoke.

I don't see the value on continuing to allow tobacco use in recreational areas

I don't want to have to confront people who cannot measure 25 feet.

I feel this is a good middle ground. I am not a smoker but this seems to allow those who would like to smoke a designated space.

I find this option to be less appealing than option a as I have the same concerns, that many parks won't fit this criteria at all.

I go outdoors to smell fresh air, not tobacco smoke.

I guess this would be an option for those attending games, etc. However, if parks are there to help support healthy behaviors, should we have smoking anywhere. I can see at Phalen for example, people would not smoke in the park, but then getting to our cars may cause us to walk through those who are smoking.

I hate smoking and this will make me not have to deal with it.

I like Option B best. Clear rule, easy to enforce.

I like the idea of no smoking allowed but I don't believe smokers will follow the regulation given past experience in park clean ups.

I like the idea of not having to smell second-hand smoke in most places in the park or have to see cigarette butts littered all over the place.

I like this as well. Ensures no aromas on the trails.

I like this better than the other option, for the same reasons listed. It also is very clear, no interpretation of what they have to be 25 feet away from and how far is 25 feet.

I like this better. Smokers can smoke in the parking lots, granted they dispose of their butts properly.

I like this idea, let smokers smoke in the parking lots in their cars

I like this the most. People will not adhere to this rule, maybe move to this. I personally would appreciate this greatly.

I love this! I could handle walking through a parking lot knowing that I wouldn't have to worry about smoke while enjoying the rest of the area.

I prefer to be away from smoke whenever possible. It's very clear.

I realize that smokers need somewhere to go to smoke and parking lots probably make the most sense.

I say everywhere, even parking lots. It's a public park, used by many people, especially ones with children.

I shouldn't have to smell other people's smoke. It infringes on my enjoyment of the park.

I support tobacco free parks, and this is closer.

I think I like this best. I am a non smoker so smokers might be interested in a more lenient policy

I think of people dispose of cigarette butts properly, and stay away from playground, buildings and beaches, I'm fine with smoking allowed.

I think this is a good balance for smokers and non-smokers.

I think this is great to limit exposure to children using the park

I very much like the idea of limiting tobacco use so that others are not exposed to secondhand smoke. This option still provides an option for smokers and those exposed would only be exposed for the small amount of time that they would be in the parking lot. I think this is a great idea and should be implemented.

I won't be out on a hike and smell second hand smoke. It's annoying now. With this, you can leave the area quickly and now smell it. You still can't avoid it.

I would be happy if it was not allowed anywhere.

I would have appreciated at least having this option, so that I wouldn't have felt completely unwelcome. But this could make parking lots uncomfortable for non-smokers to navigate.

I would love this...never have to walk through smoke. No cigarette butts.

I would not have a problem with this, but I tend to be more courteous than most people!

I would prefer no smoking anywhere on park property, but this sounds like a good compromise.

I would prefer no smoking. But People can go smoke in their car if they really need to.

I'd welcome this change. I use a wheelchair and have to pass through a cloud of smoke to enter many buildings (smokers rarely stay back from the doors) and smell stinky ashtrays; my hair smells like cigarettes for the rest of the day. It's disgusting.

I'm ok with this. But I don't smoke.

Ideal option. Reduced litter.

If it is prohibited in all areas there is no question as to where one can smoke. I am concerned about discarded butts in the parking lots.

If people need to smoke they can in the parking lots.

Impossible to enforce

It accommodates smokers

It allows smokers to get there fix without bothering those of us who don't smoke.

It allows those who need to smoke to still participate in functions at the park and sneak away to the parking lot for a smoke break, without getting close to the playgrounds or walking trails.

It creates a very specific place for smoking.

It don't make sense.

It get's people to their own seperate vehicle

It gives people somewhere to smoke but not litter parks.

It gives space for those who "need" a place to smoke

It is a band-aid; not a solution but it is better than allowing smoking everywhere. It is marginally better than Option A.

It is a way from where people would be.

It is an easy rule.

It is better than option A but still inadequate.

It is clear where the limits are. Families with children, people recreating, etc. will not have to breathe in second hand smoke while enjoying the park.

It is clear where you can smoke.

It is easy to control.

It is less vague than the previous statement and keeps the tobacco use in a firmly sturctured area. It also prevents cigarette butts from being strewn throughout a park.

It keeps smoking away from those trying to enjoy the park

It keeps the park cleaner and allows everyone to enjoy the park equally.

It may cause people to be more aware of what 25 feet means.

It promotes healthy air for all

It provides a clear alternative space

It provides a restricted option for tobacco users

It sound like a nice idea. It needs to be a reasonable distance to walk from say beach to grass and tree designated area. otherwise ppl are not even going to try & its way to hard to enforce. Reg Joe pipes up and politely asks t hat smoker move mite be met w. violence these days. You never know what's going to trigger ppl.

It stinks

It would be easy-not everyone can estimate 25 feet, and many people ignore "within x feet" of entry, etc where those signs are posted

It would be great--however, difficult to enforce.

It would be slightly better. But total ban is best.

It would prevent any interference with enjoyment of the parks by nonsmokers.

It's better than allowing people to smoke in all areas. I would recommend that you eliminate smoking completely from all areas of the Park. In conditions like we have now you have a high fire risk and why

It's better than just distancing it from the most used areas

It's better than Option A.

It's better than smoking/ tobacco use IN the park. I'd rather prohibit it all together, but at least if nothing else, contain it to the parking lot.

It's better, but it's not strong enough.

It's greater prohibition than Option A.

it's not

It's not going to stop people from smoking and gives non-smokers a reason to start a confrontation.

It's okay.

It's a public recreation area. Smoking is a dangerous health hazard and should be banned.

It's a reasonable accommodation for smokers. I don't smoke and don't want to smell it in a park.

It's better than people smoking in recreation areas.

It's better than the other option.

It's better, may be a reasonable compromise

It's not

It's not

It's time to eliminate smoking from all public places.

It's very clear where you can smoke

It's very restrictive but still giving an option

Keep park area clear if smoke yet gives people a designated place they can smoke

Keep smoking away from kids

Keep tobacco use away from children

Keeping beaches and picnic areas free of smoke and discarded cigarette butts

Keeps all smoke away from nonsmokers who are recreating.

Keeps everyone healthier

Keeps it clear and simple

Keeps more people and animals safe

Keeps risk of smoker-related fires lower.

Keeps smoke and litter away from where people actually gather, and allows smokers a place to smoke. As an ex smoker myself, I always understood when places had designated smoking areas and appreciated that I didn't have to leave entirely in order to smoke a cigarette.

Keeps smoke away from kids

Keeps smoking away from people.

Keeps some people from smoking by playing children

Keeps the entire park area smoke free.

Keeps the environment clean for all users

Keeps the parks free of litter, filled with clean air and avoids the mess and unsanitary conditions spitting creates in areas where people lounge around in.

Keeps the smoke away from the parks

Leaves a spot for smoking to happen.

Leaves little question where you can smoke

Less areas to smoke the better

Less contact for second hand smoke for children and those using park for exercise.

Less disgusting. unhealthy smoke

Less exposure to smokers

Less intrusive government; consistent.

Less litter.

Less littering. Although I could see those who would still smoke and toss their butts deep off the trail to avoid getting in trouble, increasing the possibility for a fire.

Less mess of the smokers.

Less second hand smoke and less litter from cig butts.

Less smoke in the park. Less chance of fires?

Less smoking generally. Closer proximity to waste receptacles.

Less trash in the park, less possibility for exposure to 2nd hand smoke.

Let's everyone use the park space and not have to worry about that health hazard. Getting in and out of your car would be annoying if all the smokers are there and can't go anywhere else.

Like this because of the smoke and smell from the tobacco to others that don't smoke. At least giving them the parking lots they then do have a space and can't complain. Although monitoring it would hard any way it is prohibited.

Like this idea better.

Limit fire risk

Limit secondhand exposure and litter. Concise rule.

Limited exposure

Limited to parking lot

Limits smoking

Limits the impact of this destructive behavior on others. Probably the best compromise.

Limits the use, smell, etc

Limits tobacco use.

Love it! Again, no second hand smoke in the buildings and open spaces!

Love it.

Love it. Even better than the previous option. Please move with this option.

Love it. I'm a non smoker though.

Love this for the health and safety of people. Gives people and option.

Love this idea, most smokers do not dispose of their cigarettes properly.

Make parks smoke free.

Makes it easier to police

Makes sense, similar to businesses

Makes the most sense.

Making the park healthier. I run a lot in parks and when someone is smoking on the path it is not fair to the ones making healthy choices to have to breathe in secondhand smoke.

Maybe easier to understand and enforce. Cuts down on litter and fire hazard.

Meh.

Minimizes potential for fires in the woods, provides a clean environment through out the parks and beaches.

Minimizes second hand smoke for park users. Confines cigarette butt litter to parking lot which is easier to clean.

More concise and clear, but almost worse - can't control if a smoker is by my car while I'm getting the kids in

More likely to be less smoke, healthier for everyone

More prohibitions, reduce having to deal with the second hand impacts of tobacco products. I like this but does cut an element out of park use... but it's unhealthy, we don't let folks choose to walk around w/ alcoholic beverages in the parks NOR in the parking lots.

More room to freely breathe but can mean a tense situation in the parking lot to avoid smoke.

moves it away from the parks in general

Much better and more in keeping with the state's long standing public policy.

Much easier for non smokers to avoid second hand smoke but still allows smokers a place to smoke in the park

Much easier to monitor and enforce.

Much preferred

my air would be more breathable.

My child would not be exposed to second hand smoke.

N/a

n/a

Cannot police

Nice idea but hard to enforce in an outdoor setting.

Nice, but not sure how it can be enforced.

No

No

No

no 2nd hand smoke in the park

No exposure to smoke in parks. Less commercial tobacco litter. Still leaves vaping as a possibility

No haggling about distance. Minimizes area over which smoking litter is likely to be found. Potentially reduces number of smoking receptacles needed.

No litter , no smell , no second hand smoke . Clean air for walkers runners etc

No one has to be exposed in the park

No one needs to smoke.

No opinion

No opinion

No secondhand smoke in the parks Animals are more inclined to venture around

No secondhand smoke on park grounds like playground

No smoke

NO Smoking anywhere!

No smoking in parks including parking lots is the way to go.

No smoking near people using facilities, but provides a space for smokers

No smoking period anywhere in parks

No smoking. Many public spaces including hospitals do not allow smoking on their property.

No tobacco or the butts from cigarettes to deal with.

No, slippery slope.

No. Smoke on their own property.

Non-smokers don't have to encounter smokers on paths and trails. Less cigarette waste

Non-smokers shouldn't have to be out on trails and smelling smoke.

None

Not appealing

Not appealing

Not appealing!

Not appealing.

Not appealing. Tobacco use always is accompanied by litter.

Not enough. Why allow smoking in the lots?

Not even here!! What's the point? No one is going to actually follow this rule ?????

Not good

Not ideal, but better than option A, I guess.

Not much

Not much

not much

Not much. If people are getting in and out of cars they will still smell smoke. Not good for little kids or adults.

Not much. It's not a complete ban, which would not ultimately work. It still allows smoking in the parking lot.

Not needed

Not realistic.

not restrictive enough

Not safe

Not sure

Not the worst idea, either this one or option A

Not very appealing. Then you will just have a smoking area in the parking lot. People and children will still be subjected to breathing in smoke.

Not.

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing - I'm concerned this means more cigarette butts on grass near picnic areas- away from buildings

Nothing - no smoking, just like public shopping and eating. Parks should be healthier places than those.

Nothing - smoking and tobacco use should be banned in all park areas / facilities

Nothing as long as they are picking up after themselves.

Nothing except for smokers

Nothing for me

Nothing is appealing about it.

Nothing is appealing about this option

Nothing is appealing about this option.

Nothing is appealing about this. I don't want to walk through a cloud of smoke in the parking lot of a park with my children.

nothing it is completely discriminatory.

Nothing Smokers litter

Nothing- it would be abused and there would be butts all over the parking lots.

Nothing—parking lots is where probably happen already

Nothing, Become a meeting place to loiter

Nothing, how is it enforced.

Nothing, this is a horrible idea.

Nothing!

Nothing! Smoke inside your enclosed car if you need a smoke.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

NOTHING.

Nothing.

Nothing.

nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing. In my opinion, tobacco use should be prohibited on all park property.

Nothing. Let people work out any conflicts themselves.

Nothing. No smoking period.

Nothing. Parking lots would be full of smoking litter and smokers. Bad image for public area.

Nothing. They're outside. Let them be. I rarely come across smokers yet when I do, they always stay to the side. It's a public space. Let them enjoy it. What's next, a ban on perfume in the parks? No eating or drinking? A ban would be childish

Nothing. This results in cigarette butts, potential fires in trash cans, etc.

Nothing. Wading through second hand smoke and cigarette butt trash sounds like going backwards.

Nothing. Why should folks walking to their cars have to walk through tobacco smoke?

Nothing. Why should people have to walk through smoke to get to their cars?

obviously less second hand smoke, generally

OK;

On the face this is OK

Once again, my health and the health of others.

Only for smokers.

Optimal

Option B doesn't really resolve the health problem

Overstep.

Parking lots should be included in the no smoking rule. Not only will it provide a welcoming area for families, but it will keep the parking lots clean. Smokers flick their butts on the ground. Who will clean them up? Plus, the butts are harmful to the environment. Equity means that every person should have a clean park.

parking lots would be okay as long as they are in cars otherwise people will be gathering and not moving out of people who are driving way

People have the option to smoke in their vehicles

People more likely to follow this vs no tobacco anywhere

People should be able to smoke near their cars. No one lingers in a parking lot very long.

People should not be allowed to smoke in the parks at all. The concern of youths seeing smoking a social norm is harmful to our parks and healthy living. Not to mention the liter and environmental impact of cigarette butts and fires.

People sit and smoke in their cars already in the parking lot and it is stinky, and already a nuisance to those of us who avoid all smokers due for health reasons.

People who smoke deserve to be able to have a place

People with asthma won't be prone to asthma attacks and children or other adults won't be as at risk for second hand smoke.

Perfect

Perfect!!!!

Perfect. A place for someone to have a cig and fewer people smoking around kids both safety wise and role-modeling.

Personally I find smoking to be disruptive and because of the nature of smoke being boundless and since it impacts everyone's health I would prefer no smoking in parks. But smokers should be allowed to enjoy that parks too so allowing smoking in the parking lot seems fair.

Personally, this is appealing to me .

Places limits on smoking.

Potentially curbing the amount of cigarette butts.

Potentially less confrontation as it further limits on ground use.

practically eliminates fire risk (although still a risk)

prefer a completely smoke free area, promote healthy lifestyles, remove risk of secondhand smoke

Prefer this idea - cigarettes are often littered around playground/volleyball/softball spaces - making it easy for small children who put things in their mouth to pick them up. Would prefer no smoking particularly around congregate spaces

Prevents smoking from interfering with others enjoying the park.

Probably a better option, easier to enforce with clearer boundaries.

Probably makes sense.

Probably the most reasonable

Prohibit in parking lots also.

Prohibiting tobacco and vaping would be nice but impossible to enforce so why bother? No reason to make a regulation that won't be enforced

Prohibiting use of tobacco would enhance the enjoyment of all nonsmoking park users which would be the majority of park users

Protects us from the poisonous secondhand smoke in most places

Provides some accommodation for tobacco users while preserving themajority of park property.

Public health

Reasonable compromise

REDICULOUS!

Reduce fire hazard

Reduces litter throughout parks. Accessible to firefighters.

Reduces littering and exposure to secondhand smoke. Is a reasonable compromise between smokers and nonsmokers

Reduces second hand smoke exposure more for everyone, and could help litter from smokers contained to an easy to clean area.

Reduces tobacco use and secondhand exposure, easier to enforce than more complex rules.

Restrict smoking to inside the vehicle.

Safety and reduction of second hand smoke. Hopefully less garbage/waste!

Safety of our children.

Same as above- I really feel that smoking shouldn't be allowed in public places at all.

Same as above, to a greater degree.

Same as above.

Second hand smoke is dangerous for everyone.

Second hand smoke is detrimental to health. It's best to ask visitors to refrain from smoking close to others.

Second hand smoke is not enjoyable to breathe or have nearby.

Second hand smoke would be avoided by most park users.

Second phase

second-best option

Second-hand smoke is harmful to all people, but especially children who are playing in the parks, and as this is a place that is frequented by children tobacco use should be banned.

see above

See above.

see above. Also, it would encourage healthy lifestyles.

See above. My kid with asthma can play with a lowered risk of an asthma attack and it limits park litter.

See above. Very clear - you don't need a tape measure.

See my previous comment RE general tobacco use. But this option makes it much easier to monitor and enforce the rule since there isn't any room for judgement (i.e. how many feet someone is/isn't from prohibited smoking areas). If this were the rule being implemented, there should be safe and clearly marked cigarette butt disposal options.

See my response in Option A. Same.

seems like a bad idea as everyone will use parking lot and would be exposed to smoke

Seems like a nice compromise between smokers and non-smokers, although it isn't great that families won't have a choice but be near the smoke if they drive.

seems reasonable.

Sets aside a space for smokers that is easily definable.

Sets boundaries, and likely reduces litter due to people likely just smoking in their cars. Butts on pavement vs. in the grass or elsewhere.

Sick of people dropping cigarette butts everywhere

Similar to points above it is for the safety of residents and those using the park to have smoke free environment.

Simple and protects users on trails, etc.

Simplicity and keeps smoke away from playgrounds

Since people tend to break rules prohibiting their bad habits when enforcement isn't around it's best to just make this rule strict. Masking is a good example of non compliance of a non strict rule whether you believe in the practice or not.

Smaller exposure area.

Smoke travels easily as does the smell of vapes etc. It's never enjoyable to be out for a walk or enjoying a park and come across someone who was just smoking or vaping and the stench and smoke are there. By prohibiting smoking and tobacco use inside the parks you'd be allowing nature to shine.

Smoke-free walks! (but realistically, that mostly happens anyway), with an accommodation for addicts. Also, fewer butts to mess up the place. No bad examples for kids.

smokers have a place to go, non-smokers can get away from the smell. but everyone will have to walk thru smoke when they arrive.

Smokers have rights too and pay a lot in taxes to smoke. One little sniff of second hand smoke isn't going to hurt anyone. What about breathing forest fire smoke for 2 weeks. Let's ban all new tree planting after a fire somewhere.

Smokers won't taint the experience of park goers while they're enjoying the parks. Smokers have one designated place where they can smoke. It's very unambiguous. The parking lots are appropriately marked and people can often maintain a distance of 25 feet to avoid any irritants.

Smoking and Tobacco should be banned everywhere.

Smoking has no business at parks. Parks are built to improve health and get people outdoors. Smokers ruin their health and others'. It shouldn't be allowed.

Smoking is gross

Smoking is gross and smells gross and produces obscene amount of litter. It would be nice to enjoy fresh air with inhaling a bunch of second hand smoke.

Smoking is harmful

smoking is obnoxious and a health concern.

Smoking is OK outdoors

Smoking is stupid

Smoking should only be allowed inside a person's vehicle

Smoking stink! Really? Can't people leave their bad habits at home for 2-3 hours?

Smoking sucks

So the smoker can smoke but be away from others.

Sometimes when I am on a long bike ride on a trail, you are saying I would not be able to enjoy a cigarette...with no one else around. I believe most smokers are courteous and would not smoke in another's presence. But to say I can't smoke, which is still legal, in a park or on a trail for which I pay tax dollars, is completely unfair.

Sounds even better!

Sounds good in theory

Specific area and minimize fire risk

Specificity. Cleaner in areas around buildings and beaches

still a place to smoke where people dont cause a problem for other park users.

still allows for people's rights and it is outdoors.

Still allows people to smoke without as much on trail disposal (possibly) and without additional air pollution.

Still designates a smoking area

Still dislike this option. Don't want to see the butts in the parking lot, or enter the storm drains

Still nothing. No smoking means no smoking

Straight forward and easy to understand. Should decrease the amount of litter (e.g. cigarette butts) throughout the park.

Studies show negative effects related to secondhand smoke so it promotes a healthier environment for all.

T

Takes smoking away from public gatherings.

That exposure to smoking and tobacco use is severely limited and kept away from all public portions of the park.

That would be ok

That'd be awesome to cut back on the littering from cigarette butts.

That'd be fine too.

The health and safety of non smokers and there is still an area for smokers to smoke.

The less smoking allowed in parks, the better. Many of my family members are asthmatic and/or have allergies to tobacco smoke and nothing ruins time in the outdoors more than an asthma attack due to an inconsiderate smoker.

The parking lot is a great place to smoke and the best of all the offered options.

The smell can carry significantly--so it's not appealing.

Theoretically, most places, I'd be "safe" from second hand smoke.

There are far too many cigarette butts littering our parks. And nonsmokers don't want to walk through clouds of smoke from smokers when they're out doing "healthy" exercise.

There is a blanket, no smoking in the facility creating a harder border between the smoking and non-smoking areas

There shouldn't be smoking in parks at all

There's regulation

They can smoke in their cars - better if they don't smoke in the parking lot because cars are in close proximity to each other and smoke travels

This allows smokers to have access to some outlets.

This confined smoking use to a smaller area and leaves most spaces smoke free. It also gives those who MUST smoke an opportunity to join family and friends at events.

This could work well for smokers who want to enjoy the parks/trails but keeps others from being directly affected by smokers

this eliminates smoking just about everywhere but still allows an option for people who must have a cigarette.

This eliminates smoking on trails, in picnic grounds, etc.

This indicates where they can smoke/vape. Clarity is important.

This is a clear statement.

This is a close 2nd to Option C

This is a compromise between the two options

This is a good compromise position.

This is a good compromise.

This is a good idea, it is the normal for now. It will keep the "riff raff" out. This also still allows for some use but only to cars where only people that want to smell it can.

This is a good option

This is a good option for compromise

This is a great option too, but if I'm parked next to someone smoking it still is annoying to have to smell them.

This is a great suggestion. Smokers will smoke. At least have them and their corresponding litter contained to one area.

This is a slightly better option if you don't have the guts to say NO SMOKING. At least the parking lots are paved so starting a fire is less of an issue. Of course, we all know there will be "butts" on the ground that are not picked up

This is a terrible idea.

This is better

This is better, but I think you should go further and prohibit it even in parking lots, maybe unless people are inside their vehicles. Children should not be seeing people smoke.

This is better, but still subjects individuals to secondhand smoke

This is better.

This is clearer and easier to define than the 25-foot rule

This is easier to enforce and will provide a nicer atmosphere in the park for non-smokers

This is even a better than option A.

This is even more appealing for the same reasons above. Tired of seeing butts on the ground while hiking. All around better for environment, animals, and people.

This is going to be a nightmare to enforce and smacks of busybody politics

This is good but maybe a little restrictive.

This is good keep it away from children

This is great, except when non smokers are unknowingly parked next to a vehicle with multiple smokers. That can make for an unpleasant auto exit and limits the availability to leave your windows open a bit for air exchange while you are in the park

This is GREAT!

This is ideal in terms of eliminating exposure

This is less ambiguous than 25 feet, but still allows a place for smokers to go.

This is more appealing because it limits where the smoke can originate from and blow to. within 25 feet of structures doesn't stop a good breeze from carrying it to the equipment anyways.

This is more consistent with other smoking policies in public spaces/buildings. Smoking is a personal choice that compromises the health of those who choose not to smoke. This change would represent a strong public health position.

This is my preferred option. They can go back and sit in their car if they wish to partake. Keep our natural environment clean and parks family friendly. Allowing you t in our public parks at all just encourages kids to congregate in the woods to hide it. Others shouldn't be subject to any 2nd smoke in public areas. Keep it in their cars.

This is probably the best compromise, provided that people smoke only in their cars.

This is probably the right thing to do.

This is reasonable.

This is simpler than Option A

This is slightly easier for people to define and understand.

This is slightly pointless.

This is the best idea. I think there should be no smoking on any public grounds.

This is the most appealing option. It removes any grey areas and limits exposure to only those people in and around the parking lots -> many of whom are already breathing in dangerous fumes from the vehicles.

This makes sense.

This makes the entire park more appealing to non-smokers and families with children. A bonus would also be that trash should be confined to one area and would be easier for people to clean up after themselves.

This makes the most sense. It is clearly defined; yet allows some tobacco use.

this might be the best

This might be too constraining and most smokers I know would most likely not abide by this rule.

This might help.

This option gives smokers a place where they can light up and gives those of us who object to smoke a place to suggest they go to light up rather than telling someone they can't.

This option is even better than the first one.

This option is more appealing since the smoker has their vehicle to dispose whatever they are smoking.

This policy seems fair, to allow smokers to get their "fix" when they are arriving to or departing from a park.

This protects public health to a greater degree than Option-A, which should be assessed as the higher value to consider.

This provides more protection for the majority of people who are non users.

This reduces exposure levels for all

This seems common for other outdoor activity areas.

This seems like the best option of these 3

This sounds even better!

This sounds good.

This will work well with minimal impact to nonsmokers

This would be better you can't smoke on many campuses or hospitals

This would be my choice. I'm an ex-smoker, so understand the desire to have a legit place to go

This would be okay.

This would be preferred, with option A being the fall back. Smoking should be restricted in these spaces.

This would cover most of my secondhand smoke concerns (obviously car exhaust isn't great either).

this would lessen the chance of fires and cigarette remains all over grounds.

This would restrict the littering to the parking lot. If you create a designated smoking area or have an ash tray for smokers that might encourage smokers to stay in a certain area. Let's keep our parks beautiful.

THIS!! Smoke travels and has no place in a recreational location.

Those is more easily understood and enforceable.

Tobacco should be banned on all park property.

Tobacco use in parking lots only will be fine

Tobacco use is an equity issue. Minorities are disproportionately affected. Please prohibit smoking and vaping in all parks.

Too authoritarian. Not illegal.

Too extreme. I think people should be able to smoke in the picnic areas

Too restrictive

totally fine. i do think we need to let them smoke somewhere so parking lots work.

Treats every park user in an EQUITABLE manner not giving those of cultural or spiritual followers preference.

truly limits smoking/tobacco to an easy to understand space. boundary is hard and set.

Unappealing because many many people park in the lots and get out of their cars and smoke. With Langton Lake path right next to the parking lot, it's quite disgusting to be trying to enjoy the morning air and have to walk through clouds of smoke.

Very clear

Very clear area and less fire hazard because of the surface.

Very clear on the designated side it is approved to smoke

Very clear rules, easier for smokers to follow. Parking lots only seems like the best solution.

Very clear; only can use in parking lots

We could make a fort out of the butts in the parking lot. If people don't like someone smoking, move to another spot. The park is not that crowded.

We no longer have to deal with second hand smoke, the smell, or the litter.

We would like to see tobacco use prohibited everywhere in the park! It is unhealthy for all of us and a fire danger.

Well, that could work, if there were areas for them to smoke and be able to put the cigs in the proper place.

Why allow it in the parking lots? This is better than the first one but then you will just have people out in parking lots smoking which creates issues for people coming into the park and parking.

Why must I be exposed to second hand toxins to park and access my car?

Worst case scenarios, it's better than nothing

Would be useful for preventing fires.

Would help with air quality AND trash prevention as well as discourage use of smoking of tobacco entirely.

Would lessen my exposure to second hand smoke.

Wow

Yea. Smoking causes cancer. Secondhand smoke is a large contributor.

Yes

Yes

YES

Yes

Yes

yes

Yes - people incl children shouldn't have to expose themselves to oke in order to use the parks. Full stop. Smokers can smoke in their cars or outside the parks.

Yes - this is best. In many spaces - including picnic areas - you cannot easily get away from someone smoking. It's much clearer if there is just no smoking.

YES PLEASE!!! PLEASE!!!!

yes please. smoking is gross and unhealthy for everyone.

Yes, keeps the park clean from cigarette butts and smoke from people trying to get fresh air

Yes! (See notes above)

Yes! As a non smoker this is great, I should not have to smell see it taste others who are partaking

Yes! I like this. Easier to enforce a whole park rule rather than one based on measuring out 25 feet. I wouldn't have to walk through clouds of smoke to get from beach to bathroom. Less litter.

Yes! It's so annoying when you're trying to have a gathering and you're overtaken by the smoke.

YES! The less smoking the better please.

Yes.

Yes. Smoking is gross

Yes. This one. Parking lots only.

You list the health problems related to tobacco. Please prohibit it everywhere.

Nothing appealing

not appealing

Better than option 1 but no appeal either

Could see the argument about someone in their car. But still prefer it banned on ALL Ramsey property

A bit easier to enforce than more complicated Option A

Definitely easier to enforce

better than option A...

Much better than option A, but still requires all people to potential need to navigate areas of smoking during their trip (people who drive will have to use the parking lots)

It's pretty clear if it's just to one area.

Easier to pick up cigarette butts.

Gives an option for smokers/vapors to still be with their family but not too far away.

Better...allows smokers to use parks as well (aren't we trying to promote a healthy lifestyle?) Of course, no smoking is ideal, but not necessarily realistic.

it does make it easier on the other hand for parents to help their kids avoid second hand smoke.

Would remove an unhealthy activity that people don't enjoy being around

This would still give people a place to smoke but would remove the activity from more common areas...if people complied.

Ordinance might be clearer to people than the 25 feet (Option A)

Nothing. Parks are a place to promote health and wellbeing and should not be a place for people to smoke.

Better to prohibit all smoking. Parking lots will then be further littered w/butts. yuck.

I can easily leave the parking lot.

I wouldn't encounter someone smoking on the trail, and limits opportunities for accidental fires

It should be prohibited in the park

Makes it safer for young children and those with respiratory compromise to use the park systems.

No

Nothing

Sure. I don't care too much about this.

This is better - it's a designated area which is much better for understanding and implementation. I like it over the 25 feet away option.

This is overkill.

yes! I want to be at this park, where tobacco use is limited

Yes. Keeps smell and cigarette butts off beach and park

Smoking and Tobacco Use Option B - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions

Option B: Prohibit smoking and tobacco use everywhere except parking lots.

Please use this space for questions or concerns *and* suggested solutions.

A designated smoking area in or near the parking lot could keep a lot of people from complaining about the smoke as they go to or from their cars. especially if they have children with them

A middle ground perhaps but we should be future proofing and smoking is a health hazard.

Again, how will it be enforced

all parks including lots and grounds should be 100% tobacco free, this is 2021!

All smoking devices not just tobacco.

All these changes so far benefit the comparatively few smokers versus the natural habit occupants (birds, bee, butterflies, animals, children, aerobic exercisers, youth and adults with allergies and breathing constraints).

Allowing smoking in parking areas is dangerous.

Already proven to be a serious health risk, exact opposite from the purpose of a park.

Also hard to enforce but clearer so better.

Also include vaping.

Although this is great, kids and other Nonsmokers are still exposed to commercial tobacco in the parking lot

Any tobacco / alcohol use should be punished with minimum sentences of 5 years imprisonment

As long as people don't sit in there cars and then flick their cigarette butts out the window onto the grass or snowbanks. It make a mess.

As someone who has picked up over 200 cigarette butts on local parks this year, mostly in parking lots - pleas provide receptical

Ash trays in/near the lots will be needed to prevent litter, and also avoid issues with hot butts causing trash can fires.

Ban all smoking. If you really care about the health of people or open up a Tabasco shop and collect tax.

BAN SMOKING ALTOGETHER IN THE PARK -- IN ALL AREAS AND AT ALL TIMES.

Be sure to have bins/ashtrays near the lot exits to reduce waste. And lots of signage.

Better than above option

Better than Option A but why would you allow smoking in parking lots? Make it like school grounds and prohibit smoking on all park grounds, including parking lots.

Bigger fines for smokers who break the law.

But the parking lot will be filled with smokers and their butts.

But where will the butts end up? Will you add receptacles to make it easy to dispose of the butts?

Butts or other smoking debris on the ground. Having to walk through smoke while trying to enjoy outdoor activities.

Cigarette butts all over the parking lot

Cigarette butts and plumes of smoke will exist in the parking lots.

Cigarette butts in parking lots - there would need to be receptacles and someone to clean up when people don't dispose of it properly.

Cigarette butts need to be packed out.

cigarette butts thrown on ground.

Cigarette butts will not make it into the trash and will litter the parking lot - no solution this is a problem that does not have one

Cigarette garbage all over the parking lot.

Cigarette garbage littering the parking lot

Clear and large signage

Compliance.

Concentrated smoking in the parking lots means nonsmokers have to wade through that every time we access the park. The solution is no smoking anywhere.

Concern - smoking in parking lots is still a nuisance to those using the parks, at least in places where parking lots are busy. Solution: prohibit smoking and tobacco on park property altogether.

Concern again that everywhere in our community where smoking is allowed, litter in the form of cigarette butts follows

Concern that creating any new regulations around tobacco use gives police a reason to approach, some one who is otherwise following the laws, and as we've seen recently multiple times in Minnesota every interaction with police is an opportunity for violence, or structural racism.

Concerned about proximity to smoker's children for safety and supervision of children. Personally love the restriction to parking lots.

Concerned about this being used inequitably against BIPOC people

Concerned for teenagers

Concerned that parking lots could become hangout spots rather than picnic tables/other park facilities. I prefer option A or no tobacco restrictions

Concerned that there would be issues with littering and that there would be a lot of smoke everyone would have to walk through to enter the park because it concentrates all the smokers in one area.

Concerned this only allows people with cars who access the park to smoke. If we are going to allow smoking it should be equitable.

Concerns : litter from ashtray dumpers in parking lots will be washed into drainage systems

Could contribute to more vaping

Could have people congregating in parking lots to smoke creating issues for those coming to and from the parks.

Could there be a non smoking parking area?

Creating rules that will largely be ignored normalizes rule breaking.

Designate an area near a shelter or picnic area so others can remind smokers that there is a place to smoke however uncomfortable it may be for them to have to go to such a designated place.

Difficult to enforce.

Difficult to enforce.

Does this include vaping?

Doesn't go far enough. we need to be able to get to our cars without passing through a group of people smoking out there.

dog poop standards with bags and cigarette stations where they stand in a place and all smoke on each other instead of mother nature is way so good

Don't make parking lots outdoor smoking lounges!

Don't ban smoking

Don't treat us like children

Don't want any smoking due to second hand smoke concerns

Eliminate smoking in ALL areas of the Park

Eliminate smoking in all parks. No exceptions. No parking lots, or community buildings, etc. Most employers have done this and smokers have figured it out. What happens when someone is holding a wedding or event in a park space. Up to individuals to police their guests. Might be difficult.

Enforcement

Enforcement

force tobacco users off property

Garbage is annoying.

Hard to enforce

Hard to enforce

Hard to enforce

Hard to enforce, messy and unhealthy

Hard to patrol? Need for receptacle for cigarette butts in parking lots.

Having smoking be confined to parking lots creates pedestrian/car hazards.

How about in their cars in parking lots?

How many cigarette butts will there be in the parking lots?

How will this be enforced?

How would it be enforced? Would I call 911 if someone was using tobacco?

How would this actually be enforced? This would mean that people fishing along the lake shore, or walking on the trails, can't smoke until they leave their spot and go to a parking lot. This is a lot to expect in a large park (like Long Lake).

How would this be enforced? Adequate signage and appropriate containers for cigarette butts in the parking lot would help reinforce the new policy.

However, in other places where smoking is banned, people will still smoke, but not have anywhere to throw the butts, increasing the litter.

I also wouldn't people hanging out in the parking lots if kids are around and one of them gets hurts going back and forth to the parking lots with their parents or looking for their parents. Accident waiting to happen.

I am concerned about the enforcement of this, and how it would be handled by law enforcement or other enforcement entities. I do not trust Ramsey Counties Sheriff's office to treat people with respect when enforcing ordinances.

I believe this is too limiting for those who choose to use tobacco products.

I do not like this idea. People entering or leaving will be exposed to second hand smoke. I don't think there is an alternative unless you have a separate parking area, far away from everyone else, just for smokers

I don't really have an opinion. I don't smoke, but I've never had an issue with this.

I don't see why you would allow it in parking lots. That is where people are in close proximity, even though it is short term. Then it might be better to just mark off a small section of the park where smoking is allowed - like some do for a dog pooping place!

I don't smoke, don't have kids, ok with smoking outside and parks should be accessible.

I don't think there's any good reason to ban smoking outdoors if it isn't near where people are gathering

I don't have an issue with people smoking even when I'm not a smoker.

I don't like that parking lots are where everyone goes at some point on their visit to the park, meaning they'll often run into a smoker at the beginning or end of their trip.

I feel like people use the parking lots for a quick lunch break or stop to use their phone and could possibly have a smoke.

I load and unload my 3 small kids in the parking lot. A process that can take 15-20 minutes. I do not want to expose them to second hand smoke for that long if someone happened to be smoking next to my car.

I prefer a designated location that has adequate receptacles for cigarette butts in order to reduce littering.

I smoke. Since we are discussing outdoor space, what would be the need or reasoning?

I think parking lots should be included.

I think this might be too restrictive. I hate being around smoke but people are outside and as long as they're staying away from others, what harm are they doing to anyone else but themselves?

I will still encounter smoke in the parking lot and cigarette butts may still be a problem.

I would prefer no smoking in the entire park.

I would push for parking lot cleanup as much as possible

I would think this would be difficult to monitor. I think if it was enforced it would be great.

I'd rather see a designated smoking area that isn't going to make my own car smell bad.

I'd support 25ft. from buildings and playgrounds. Tobacco use is legal for 21+ in MN, as is alcohol use. If beer and wine are allowed on the beach, in picnic areas and at outdoor events, so should tobacco use.

I'm not sure we should be making this into a law. I think people are respectful. Having parks 24/7 and this law. Who will uphold?

If a smoker has children on a playground for example, they shouldn't have to leave their view to go and smoke.

If allowed in parking lots only, I still would be concerned about butts and trash remains left there.

If its allowed anywhere they will smoke wherever they want just like the state fair. They don't follow the rules there.

If smokers are willing to keep to themselves in the park while smoking, it should be allowed.

If smokers want to smoke, they can smoke at home or take a walk on a city street.

If the goal of parks is to be outside, healthy and active - smoking or tobacco use is the opposite. I say limit the use in the space as much as possible. I don't want to inhale it - or have my children inhale it when playing on the playground, sports or walking.

If this happens there should be butt containers so folks don't just toss them on the ground

If this rule is written it will likely be another unenforced rule, so what is the benefit?

If you do this, provide ample receptacles to collect the butts

Increased cleanup of butts & for park employees.

It is not really a concern. Creating excessive laws CREATES criminals.

It restricts smokers from the park and may make them not want to go to the park at all

It seems like it would never be enforced. I can see how smoking a cigar on a late night walk would be enjoyable

It still sets a bad example for children, and enforcement is slightly trickier. A full ban would be nicer for those.

It takes a long time to get in and out of cars with young kids. Having some people smoking right next to you as that goes on is pretty awful.

It will result it more litter or people going to the park to just smoke.

It would cause litter in our parks

It's still in the park area!

Its not healthy, Cig butts are everywhere, you're enabling them. Look at how many butts are by the shore, curbs and landing dock.

Just eliminate smoking and vaping in the public parks. Why subject those of us who are trying to lead healthy lives with other people who want to smoke. Let them smoke at home or in their cars.

Just prohibit smoking. This is a tax payer operated park. If you can't smoke in a public building why should you be allowed to smoke in a public park?

Keep it out and of parking areas too. Often smokers leave cigarette trash on the ground.

Less littering. Although I could see those who would still smoke and toss their butts deep off the trail to avoid getting in trouble, increasing the possibility for a fire.

Let us keep these public areas smoke free.

Like many outdoor venues, there are designated smoking areas that are well off to the side, and have places to dispose of their litter when they are done smoking!

limited areas for smoking are acceptable. No smoking outdoors away from others is an infringement on individual freedoms

litter litter litter

Littering concentrate in parking lots, probably easier to address, people move through parking lots though.

Littering in the parking lots, leaving to cigarette butts washing into our drain systems and polluting our waters. Can there be a designated smoke spot in the parking lot with proper receptacles to dispose of cigarette butts?

Lots of small children in and out of vehicles, waiting by vehicles for parents before safely walking through the parking lot still being exposed to tobacco use that they may not be used to.

Lots will be full of cigarette butts and people gathering around cars

Main concern would be smoke drifting into parked vehicles as many people come to park in their cars and enjoy the view. I have personally experienced this, with an entirely turned off car and windows closed. I acknowledge that some sort of accommodation probably needs to be provided for smokers and this does still seem better than smoking along trails or near playgrounds.

Make butt cans easily available.

Make signage exceptionally clear.

Make sure there are butt receptacles

Make sure there are places to safely dispose of cigarette/tobacco waste in/near parking lots. Post signs clearly.

makes the parking lot less welcoming and friendly, and adds unnecessary foot traffic in the parking lots.

Many beaches and playgrounds in Ramsey County have parking lots that run along the entire playground, so this would not keep smoke from the playground. Option C is my suggestion.

Many parking lots are less than 25 feet from structures and equipment.

Many people who enjoy the parks drive there. It's not fair to force them and their families to endure harmful second hand smoke inhalation just to enjoy a county park.

Maybe designated sections of parking lots?

Me on a park bench having a cigar is not going to impact anyone for the few seconds or small whiff they get passing by, while for me it's one of the few options living in an apartment. They'll get more smoke inhalation from your average charcoal barbecue or just being outside when Canada is on fire...

Might prevent people who smoke from visiting the park with their families.

Might this unintentionally create a concentrating of smoke in the parking lots, which nonsmokers then have to walk through to get to and from their cars? I recall that being very annoying when smoking was prohibited inside restaurants but allowed outside the front doors.

More likely to have tobacco waste in our park parking lots

More liter. Unsafe air for children

Most people don't smoke, leave it as is

My concern is who is going to have the time to regulate this. I feel there are more important issues to use the staff for

My concern- leaving my car and walking threw smoke.

N/A

Need to have a designated area in parking lot. So much littering of smoking products in the park as is

No idea how to enforce it. Would need to run a street sweeper through the parking lot, at least weekly, to deal with butts, discarded packaging, etc.

No smoking

No smoking anywhere

No smoking anywhere

NO SMOKING period....

No smoking.

No way! No pollution

No...if you feel the need to smoke, do it IN/On your private property, car....NOT public property

None

none

None.

nonsmokers can be out mostly by themselves and still be exposed to jarring wafts of smoke

Not as healthy for everyone especially kids.

Not limiting enough. Smoke travels beyond the boundaries of a parking so secondhand smoke is still a concern. Where will cigarette butts go? Are there designated receptacles for them?

Not only do I think this would have all of the same problems as solution a, namely that a large portion of parks lack parking and therefore tobacco will be defacto banned there, but I also think that so long as tobacco users are being

respectful they should be able to use tobacco and enjoy the relaxing nature of the parks. One of the best things about Saint Paul is that we have such an abundance of parks and they make very good places to take a break from work, and many workers would like to have a smoke and relax. I think that's something we should try to preserve for them while obviously respecting the fact that many park goers would prefer to have space away from tobacco users.

Not protecting people at the entrances

Not realistic. Too restrictive. Focus on the big stuff like having more sheriffs patrolling more often the parks.

Not sure

Noted above.

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing. Let people work out any conflicts themselves.

Only solution NO SMOKING! It's hazardous to ones health. Honestly, if you really need to smoke stay home.

Overly broad

Parking lot would still cause exposure to secondhand smoke

Parking lots are close to too many locations so you can still smell the stench and just makes it complicated to enforce

Parking lots are well marked and could have butt stations for disposal of littering or at least containment out of the park at large

Parking lots might be smokey and full of butts and empty vape cartridges.

Parking lots will be littered with cigarette butts, unless many ash tray receptacles are provided

Parking lots will be littered with cigarette butts. Smoke and smoking garbage will greet those arriving at the park.

Parking lots will become dumping grounds for cigarette butts. They don't decompose. I don't want to park near someone who is smoking and filling my car with smoke.

Parks are meant for the enjoyment of others. Just because you don't smoke doesn't give you the right to infringe on others rights

People are still being unwillingly exposed to smoke while getting themselves and children in and out of the car.

People don't throw away their butts and if they do could cause fires..

People smoke and outside it usually not a problem except for the butts.

People will more likely to follow where smoking is permitted instead of just doing it anyways

People will still smoke where they're not supposed to, just like they do now, since it's technically allowed in some spots

People will take advantage of the rule.

People will throw cigarette butts on the ground in the parking area.

People with health concerns also need to access the lots

People won't listen. There is nothing you can do.

People, including children and individuals with health conditions, are still exposed to second hand smoke. I imagine the parking lot would be littered with butts.

Perhaps there could be designated smoking spaces at the parks that aren't where everyone is congregating?

Picnic tables and trash cans with ash trays set around a certain area away from playgrounds and beaches. I.e designated smoking areas.

Please consider prohibiting all smoking/ tobacco use in all areas of all parks!

Please make sure "vaping" is included as well!

PLEASE NO SMOKING!

Please provide butt disposal containers.

Possibly the parking lot area? I just don't want to see someone having a police encounter when they are sitting on the grass right next to the parking lot smoking

Pot smoking in cars has been fairly common.

Potential risk of large groups gathering in parking lots

Potential that parking lot would be unsafe due to use of tobacco in a concentrated area; suggest to set additional limit that smoker needs to stay 25 feet away from other groups of people

Problem of enforcement.

Problem with this option is that people will still smoke nearby kids and families, and smoke will carry into the park areas.

Prohibit it everywhere

Prohibit smoking and tobacco use everywhere except parking lots.

Prohibit smoking and vaping everywhere, including parking lots. I see no reason to exempt parking lots.

Proper receptacles for butts to be easily accessible.

provide receptacles for cigarette butts so they do not litter the lot

Regulating tobacco use wouldn't be enforced.

Requires most people visiting park to effectively walk through smoking area, encourages congregating in parking lots potentially posing safety risk.

Restricting tobacco use to parking lots may generate kickback from tobacco users who feel they should be allowed more freedom to enjoy the park on their terms. Enforcement of this rule needs to be considered to make it an effective policy change.

Ridiculous since the smoke will dissipate outside!

Risk of the parking lot having a lot of cigarette butts.

Same as above

Same concerns as above.

Same thing-- all signage should make clear that ceremonial use is allowed.

Sec

Second hand smoke is detrimental to all those around them. Especially children.

See above

See above answer. Even when I am in a parking lot I do not want to breathe in smoke. I do not want my car to stink of smoke when I return to it.

See above.

See above.

See my response under option a.

See Option A answer

Seems like this would just create more littering and loitering in parking lots.

Seems overly restrictive

Set comment above

Silly

Similar concerns.

Smoke at home if you want on your property, NO SMOKING PERIOD on County property.

Smoke congregation at parking lots. also, cigarette butts would all over the parking lot which would then make it into the water via sewer.

Smoke doesn't stay in the parking lot. If you unfortunately park next to someone who is smoking, your vehicle is damaged by the smoke smell.

Smoke fest in parking lots :(

Smokers habitually litter with butts. This means whenever you come and go from parking lots you get to wade through the litter left behind. Have to explain to my kids smoking is bad, I know they do it, but it's still bad. No thank you!

smoking anything should be prohibited everywhere on park land

Smoking is bad for your health. We are in a drought- concerns about cigarette disposal.

Smoking is legal and should be permitted outdoors within reason. Prohibiting smoking creates barriers for certain demographics of park users and is inequitable. Provide designated receptacles for cigarette butts to reduce litter, reduce fire risk, and create a visual indicator for where smoking is allowed.

Smoking is part of our social beings! I'm not a smoker.

smoking may offend some but it is being done OUTSIDE and not in an enclosed space.

Smoking should be 100% prohibited in parks.

Smoking should be allowed ONLY in parking lots, within the confines of a motor vehicle. I avoid tobacco smoke at all costs, even when I am outdoors, because I cannot stand the stench, plus I seek to avoid all 2nd-hand tobacco smoke.

Smoking should be banned in all parks and public property. The smoke doesn't stay in the parking lot. Non-smokers also need to park their cars and walk through the smoke. The smoke also permeates the non-smokers cars and makes them unusable.

Smoking should be prohibited like it is most everywhere else. Your right to smoke ends at my lungs.

Smoking should not be limited to the parking lot

Smoking tobacco is legal, just as is consuming alcohol. I'd see not allowing tobacco use within 25 ft. of buildings or playgrounds, but otherwise it seems more politicized than concern for health.

So I hate being around it at all. Prefer to not walk past it period.

So the parking lots will be full of people smoking?

Some of the parking spots are right near the picnic area, so this option doesn't fully protect park goers

Someone does not have the "right" to smoke or vape. and in an outdoor/ nature setting I don't think it's necessary. Allow parking lot vaping & smoking for those who feel they must.

Sometimes the parking lots aren't adjacent to the area of the park being used.

Sounds good to me!

specifically limit vaping and pot to parking lots too.

Still allows for use in areas where non-smokers often need/want to go through. Having a single dedicated area that's not normally trafficked would be better.

Still allows smoking near others

Still can smell smoke and often tobacco chewers spit on the ground. Plus don't need any "hanging out" issues.

Still creates litter

Still exposed to it in lot, smells drifting into other people's cars. Smokeless tobacco should still be fine.

Still have to pass by people smoking exposing children and family to unhealthy vapors. Keep no smoking anywhere on park property.

Still have to walk through smoke but parking lot is easier to avoid. Add cigarette butt trash holders

Still not enough.

Strongly disagree. I think smokers should be tolerated so long as their smoking is not affecting park visitors in a way that is easily avoidable by non-smokers. (PS. I'm not a smoker.)

Suggested solution is option C

T

The county should in NO way encourage smoking on any property. It's a slippery slope. I would like to smoke in the Commissioners chambers. A park space is just as sacred.

The inability to enforce this statute may lead to bitter interactions between the smoker and the park goer who wants the ordinance respected. These interactions can escalate.

The lots will be paved in butts. It will be a mess. It will smell. On the other hand not many people smoke.

The park is a little-known treasure in our 'hood. That's because the parking lot is not on a thoroughfare.

The parking lot is not an enjoyable place to sit and relax. A smoker may want to sit on a bench and look at the lake. They should be able to find a place away from others that is a pleasant place to relax.

The parking lot will be full of discarded cigarette butts

The parking lot will continue to be covered in cigarette butts and it is harder to avoid the smokers if they're all concentrated in the parking lot

The parking lots will be extremely littered with cigarette waste.

The parking lots will be littered with butts.

The parking lots will be littered with cigarette butts.

The parking lots will become smoking areas - I don't want to walk through a cloud of smoke on my way to enjoy nature.

There are kids in the parking lots too. People can smoke elsewhere. I don't necessarily believe there should be a designated smoke area

There are not recycling containers and there will be butts everywhere.

There will be excessive numbers of cigarette butts on the ground for volunteers to pick up.

This can result in massive, concentrated clouds of smoke in the parking lots that my asthmatic family members will need to walk through getting to and from their cars. It will also likely lead to the parking lots being covered with cigarette butts. In addition, cigarette butts that are not properly extinguished are dangerous to have lying around places with lots of gasoline.

This could deter or limit the use of the park for individuals who do use tobacco products.

This does not alleviate any of the concerns raised regarding secondhand smoke. Also, this would congregate smoking to a smaller area, making it completely unavoidable for families arriving/leaving.

This is fine, provide adequate places to dispose of butts.

This is not a good solution. People will smoke with windows down and sitting outside. Many playgrounds are next to parking lots. Children of all people should not have to inhale that.

This is ridiculous. Some of the parks are huge. It's an open, outdoor area, it's easy to avoid sometime smoking.

This is so restrictive it will most likely just be ignored anyway and would be a nightmare to equitably enforce. Also there's no particular reason someone who uses tobacco shouldn't be able to use the parks. Heck, it's easier for a

smoker to stand a significant distance away from everyone if they can do so in the middle of the park than if they are confined to the parking lot everyone has to use.

This is the most appealing option because these are easy boundaries to set.

This might be unnecessarily restrictive.

This might discourage some people from using the park at all.

This seems a little too fast.

This will be hard to enforce and a nightmare for erratic enforcement.

This will expose people to secondhand smoke in the parking lots.

This will likely set a double-standard similar to State Parks alcohol policy: for those in the know, you know you can bend the rules. For those not, you are following unenforced policy. Gives an excuse to police populations that may already feel excluded from parks

This would be difficult to enforce and youth would still see people smoking around the parks.

Those who are bothered by smoke have to walk through it to get to the park.

To access any part of a park, people will have to park their car to get to the park. When I'm helping offload my parents and grandparents, I would prefer to not have to walk through clouds of people smoking to get to the sidewalk. Maybe a corner of the parking lot, but not all of the parking lot.

To be honest, I don't care about this. I don't smoke, but don't mind people smoking outside.

To me, that just means continued cigarettes tossed onto parking lots

Tobacco use is terrible for the user, the people near the user, and the environment. It should not be allowed in any parks or parking lots.

Too easy to deny where they were, what are the limits of the P lot Etc.

Too many healthy people

Too many people hanging out in busy parking lots

Too smelly.

Tough to enforce and may start fights between those that choose to smoke beyond the parking lot boundaries.

Trash/ litter associated with smoking is unappealing and bad for the environment. Second-hand smoke is gross and unhealthy.

unenforceable

Use of tobacco and smoking should be prohibited in all Ramsey county parks including parking lots.

Users would still have to come into contact with second hand smoke in parking areas.

What if lot is right next to a bldg etc

What is the penalty for smoking? Who is it enforced against? How is it enforced? Does this become a tool for racist bias?

What kind of mess will be left in parking lot.

When utilizing parks for events the parking lots are often far from the pavilions or areas of the park frequently used by groups of people. Designated smoking areas would still give smokers an area they can utilize without completely leaving the area or deliberately breaking the rules.

While smoking is not advisable or healthy, there's a population that this might discriminate on. Also hard to say that vaping impacts anyone other than the user. Unlike traditional tobacco

Who will enforce this?

Who will pick up the cigarette butts?

Why allow in parking lots? Especially since parking lots are frequently close to buildings and facilities. It should be a complete ban in the entire park.

Why allow use in parking lots? This can be annoying when you are loading up your car to leave and are subjected to the smoke near your car.

Why exempt parking lots, just because they're already filled with toxic, dangerous air from cars?

Wife is allergic to smoke.

Will make a huge mess in the parking lots

Will make parking lots into ashtrays. Need to put ashtrays somewhere for the nicotine addicts.

Will this be enforced or is it a guideline?

Wishy washy again. If you're going to take a stand, do it everywhere. In one of our local parks the parking lot is full of people who park up by a fishing spot and stay there all day, every day and are responsible for 90% of the trash (even though trash bins are right there). If they couldn't smoke while they're drinking and fishing they wouldn't do this.

With this option we still have to walk past smokers and their clouds

Would be a pain for the smokers to have to find a parking lot to get a smoke in.

Would have to face smoking gauntlet to use parking lot.!

Would smokers hang out in parking lots, and make it difficult for people loading/unloading cars?

Would still allow smoking in parks.

Would there be lots of signs saying no smoking past this point? Lots of ashtray things to slow litter?

Wouldn't parking lots just get nasty then? You'd have lots of smokers hanging out in parking lots, making it very hard for others to walk through nicely without breathing all the junk.

You are discriminating against smokers with bad treatment! I am not a smoker, but this is outdoors!

You will end up with cigarette butts to clean up

Young people in parking lots

Who is responsible for cleaning up the butts in the parking lot?

Parking lots will be littered with smoking trash.

Need lots of cleaning of the parking lots

Still gives bad example to youth

How will this be enforced?

Who will enforce this?

Tobacco litter. SO toxic to our environment

Concerns re: targeted enforcement. Unnecessary negative encounters with law enforcement.

Folks in the parking lot are still exposed to SHS

Provide smaller designated smoking areas away from where people gather like many public buildings do.

Discriminates against people when the space is intended to be an open space for all

Ridiculous! Inviting a smoke party.

Parking lots would turn into an ashtray

Difficult to enforce too. There could be spillover from the parking lots to other areas of the parks.

Again, good luck enforcing this.

Shouldn't tell someone they can't smoke inside their own car.

my concern is when tobacco is used in ceremonies, Would that be allowed?

I am confused that you are considering ending patrolling of parks at the time of greatest potential criminal activity, but are considering greatly limiting smoking. I am not a smoker but this is just too limiting on a personal freedom that is not against the law and when done outside has minimal impact on my health.

instead of parking lots, use personal vehicles, as I don't want to breathe smoke even in the parking lot

Keeps smell and butt litter off beach and park areas

Sure. I don't care too much about this.

This still brings tobacco and smoke into the parks; it now crowds the smoke in the parking lot, where families with small children often spend time changing clothing, diapers, and even just loading/unloading cars. Seems it could lead to a lot of second hand smoke encounters.

Who will enforce this. ???

Smoking and Tobacco Use Option C - What's appealing about this?

Option C: Prohibit smoking and tobacco use everywhere on park property.

What's appealing about this?

A little too draconian

Absolutely nothing! Unenforceable, the police have more than enough to do.

Absolutely nothing.

Absolutely!

Again. I'm ok with this.

Agree

Agree completely.

All of it

All of this

Also keeps smoke away from kids

Also perfect

Although i feel this option is closely aligned with me, i also think it is too much. People outside and away from others should be able to smoke. I also want them to dispose of thier butts appropriately

An all-out ban is an easier concept to grasp, in comparison to designated smoking areas.

And vaping! We already have enough problems with air quality currently without people smoking and vaping!

Angers city residents and taxpayers who are smokers.

As a former smoker, the smell of a cigarette is strong and unappealing

As a non smoker everthing

As a non smoker this is appreciated, BUT —>

As a non smoker this seems a great idea.

As a non smoker, I love not having to worry about people smoking in the park.

As a non tobacco user with young kids, I like this idea best. Might keep ruffians out of the park

As a non-smoker and supporter of clean spaces everywhere, I love this idea. However, I can imagine that it would be challenging for smokers to have to leave the premises (and the groups they may be in) when wanting to smoke.

As a non-smoker I agree, but understand why it may be helpful to allow in a designated place near the park, only if the parking lot is significant distance from rec areas and trails.

As a non-smoker, everything. It would take the worry about running into a smoke cloud away.

As a non-smoker, this is best option

As a non-smoker, would prefer no smoke or litter from cigarette butts.

As above - Tobacco smoke and litter are the worst. Ban them from park grounds entirely. Tobacco use is an addiction, and no matter what rule is set, smokers always push the boundaries. And smoke goes where the wind blows it, so you always seem to end up downwind from someone.

As someone sensitive to smoke fumes, this is my top choice. I hope it would discourage people from being/becoming smokers.

Avoiding the littering (people just throw them on the ground), and fire concerns. Knowing we don't have to deal with the smell or asthma concerns anywhere in the park is huge. Also, due to my asthma and the fact that smoke is a huge migraine trigger for me it is an issue in parking lots too. I'm so sensitive to the smell that if someone is smoking next to my car, I've got a migraine for days. It would be such a relief to not have to worry about that happening. (Or stand there and wait for them to stop.)

Be the best but maybe unenforceable

Because it affects other people's health (not only long-term but also immediately with things like causing allergic or asthmatic reactions), this would be kindest to everyone.

Benefits the health of everyone.

BEST !!

best choice - no 2nd hand smoke anywhere

Best choice for all concerned

Best choice in my opinion. Sets best example for health concerns.

Best for all

Best for health

Best for literally every mammal and bird in the park.

Best idea

Best idea

best idea

Best of all policies, please do this.

Best option

Best option and easiest to follow since there aren't exceptions.

Best option for health of public

Best option to ensure no air pollution for all enjoying the spaces

Best option!

Best option!!

Best option. Keeps everything cleaner. No butts to pick up or have to look at. Less chance of fires and other mischief.

Best option. Parks should be about fresh air

Best solution ever. Cigarette butts don't decompose so eliminate them altogether. Parks should encourage good health so keep the air clean. Clean lungs are good. I shouldn't have to breathe in residue from someone's smoking habit. That's being fair to those who choose not to smoke.

Best solution for everyone's health and enjoyment of parks

Best solution. Clean environment for everyone

Best solution. It equally applies and is easy to comprehend. It protects the lungs for all who are going to parks to experience nature and get some fresh air. It also would eliminate a source of contamination for these that leave their cigarette butts around d the park.

Best yet. For health And environment

Best, healthiest solution. Nonsmokers don't cause problems for smokers. Smokers seven the most politely still infringe on the ability of nonsmokers to enjoy the parks.

Best!

Best. Smoke in your car, leave others' lung cancer choices up to themselves.

Better for health of kids.

better option than the two above.

Better overall

Can't enforce

Cannot police

Ceases tobacco use on park property. There will be no disputes over acceptable/unacceptable areas to use tobacco. Hopefully reduces litter.

Children won't see smoking

Cigarette butts end up on the ground and then they wash into our waterways and the storm sewer. They are almost impossible to pick up on a large scale.

Clean air

Clean air

Clean air for all. People can smoke elsewhere. Less risk of unintentional fires

Clean air in the entire park.

Clean air, no smoke near children

Clean air!

Clean air! Awesome!

Clean air. Not having to smell smoke while walking through the park. Will reduce the amount of cigarette butt litter.

Clean environment for pets and people traveling through the parks.

Clean smoke free air for all park users.

Cleaner air

Cleaner air, cleaner grounds

Cleaner and safer space for children and adults concerned about their health

Cleaner parks; however, it greatly limits the ability of smokers to use the parks.

Clear and healthy

Clear and minimizes exposure

Clear boundaries set.

Clear rules, no ambiguity

Clear rules.

Clear, easy to enforce, consistent. Cigarette butts take 10 years to decompose and are a danger to wildlife who can mistake them for food. They're a blight on the landscape and collect around benches and fishing holes. Smoking and drinking go together - without the smoking, some of the biggest trash-makers will be less likely to hang out.

Clear, enforceable and consistent with smoking prohibitions in nearly all public spaces.

clear, unambiguous

Clearest of all the rules

Completely removes the second hand smoke issue as well as discarded tobacco products in park grounds

Consistency

Consistent and no questions

Consistent through out the property

Consistent with other parks, such as by schools

Consistent with school and public buildings policy. This is best for our health and our children's health. It also keeps our public parks clean of tobacco waste.

consistent with some other cities smoke free parks

Consistent. People should smoke at home, not in public.

Could help prevent fires if people throw cigarette butts on the ground. Also less litter in parking lots.

Cuts down on littering and fire hazard. Very easy to understand.

Decreases litter. And doesn't affect others experience

Desirable but not enforceable

Difficult. No Way to enforce. Unreasonable intrusion and tremendous incentive for racism by police.

Does not encourage an activity that is harmful to the public health.

Doesnt matter as much to me.

Don't have to smell it or be near it anywhere

Don't care about this.

Easier to enforce. Healthier for all in the long run.

Easiest to communicate & enforce, but my guess is no matter which one you select enforcement will be marginal at best. Police have bigger issues to deal with than this.

Easiest to enforce

Easily defined and nearly complete protection of the health of other park users.

Easy enforcement

Easy rule and would actually keep children and everyone else truly safe from second hand smoke.

Easy to enforce

Easy to enforce. No question. There's no come back.

Easy to post and sign.

Easy to understand/enforce.

Eating like a pig and being over weight is bad for people's health too. Ban all eating in a park. No BBQ for sure, that makes smoke.

Either all in or not at all. Less room for ambiguity.

Eliminates second hand smoke.

Encourages a very clean environment.

Even a better option!! The smell of whatever is being smoked is offensive.

Even Better. Get people to stop smoking

Even less litter.

Even more appealing with the number of children using these areas. The smell of cigarette smoke on a summer day is unappealing, and the number of cigarette butts on the ground is also unappealing.

Even more simple!

Everyone is going to claim they are smoking for spiritual, ceremonial or cultural reasons. Good luck policing that rule.

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything

Everything - parks must be free of Ne'er-do-wells

Everything - there is no need to permit smoking on park property. This is in alignment with many places - school grounds, many companies, etc.

Everything about it is appealing.

Everything but perhaps allows not enough accommodation

Everything is appealing about this

Everything is appealing about this!

Everything is right about this. If you have to smoke, smoke on your own time. Smoking shouldn't be made easy for smokers at the risk of the rest of us having to deal with it or breathe it in. My daughter has asthma and we often have to leave park areas because of people smoking.

Everything to non-smokers.

Everything, except it may deter some people from using the parks.

Everything!

Everything!

Everything! Clear cut expectation and may eliminate need for any specialized receptacles

Everything! Enjoy the fresh air and not have butts scattered throughout the park. No one goes to a park to smoke—those who do are not there for the park!!! They are there for not great reasons.

Everything! No worries about smoke or tobacco use!

Everything! Protecting air quality for all users is the best policy.

Everything! This is strong signage to indicate full public protection to prohibit smoking and keeps grounds and parking lots clean from cigarette butts. This leaves no room for any ifs or butts about how far from a building you can smoke, etc because all smoking is prohibited on park premises.

Everything!!

Everything!!

Everything!! No trash, no stink

Everything.

Everything.

Everything.

Everything.

Everything. Better for the health

Everything. Eliminate cigarette butts and make a healthy environment for everyone and children especially.

Everything. Get rid of use in parks. People can go figure out somewhere else to do it, no need to have non-smokers deal with their habit.

Everything. I hate second hand smoke.

Everything. It prevents litter, exposure to secondhand smoke and inappropriate role modeling. We should be making parks as healthy as possible and there is nothing healthy about smoking.

Everything. It's the best option. Healthy for all.

Everything. Makes for healthy environment and keeps others from having to breathe second hand smoke. It also eliminates ciggy butts lying all over the park which do not decompose for umpteen years.

Everything. My asthma really acts up around smoke.

Everything. No exposure to second hand smoke, and no cigarette BUTTS LITTERED ON THE GROUND!

Everything. People go to the park to be outdoors and enjoy the fresh air. Not to breath in cigarette smoke.

Everything. Smoking is a health hazard

Everything. To have a truly clean park with clear and enforceable rules that will actually create deterrence can really only be done with this option.

Exactly right. It's a clear, consistent, defensible policy in line with air quality public policy. Parks should promote healthy behaviors and my right not to be polluted. A complete ban is the most clear and consistent approach.

Excellent idea, a clear rule that's easy to explain and enforce. Will help reduce unwanted exposure to secondhand smoke and reduce littering and fire risk.

Excluding parking lots seems unreasonable.

Expecting not to encounter second hand smoke at all while on park property would be awesome. People can smoke before and after but not during their park visit, thereby being considerate and protecting nonsmokers. Love it. Additionally less litter.

Fantastic! I don't think anyone needs to inhale other people's smoke.

Fewer cigarette butts on the ground in the parks.

Fewer tobacco butts littering property. I live on Grand and have seen them tossed off a bicycle as a person rides by my house. I have left my house to stomp them out. Even in a drought, people lack common sense. I recall when smoking was allowed on nursing stations, in patient rooms, and hospital administrators used to smoke in their offices and what a stir when no longer allowed! No big deal now. Same as a camp counselor when staff were no longer permitted (guess what? they quit smoking!). Where do people come up with \$ for this expensive habit and then expect non smokers to foot the bill for cleanup - smoke and drink at home. It might save a life or two..

Fire safety, air quality and minimize litter

First choice

For me, the litter is as bad as the smoke. I'd rather it be eliminated to the extent possible

Former smoker here-you will still have people smoking but it will be less if you institute a complete ban. The harder it is for people to smoke, the less they smoke!!

Fresh air everywhere on park property! Of the three options, this should result in the biggest decrease in cigarette butt trash on the grounds.

Good

Good for air quality.

Good for all

good for non-smokers.

Good idea.

Good luck with monitoring this, if it even is monitored now.

Good. Clear.

Great idea

Great idea

Great idea

Great idea and good for the general health of the public.

Great idea, although the parking lot idea seems like a good compromise with smokers

Great idea.

Great idea.

Great Idea. All aspects are positive.

Great idea. Cigarette butts littering the park are gross, as is breathing second hand smoke while walking, biking, running, or picnicing.

Great idea. It would provide for more enjoyment by the vast majority of park users.

Great option.

Great! No issues with smoking of some interfering, with outdoor space of others.

Guarantees no cigarette butts on the property and for other people not to be exposed to second hand smoke.

Hard to enforce for those w addiction to tobacco

Hard to patrol?

Health !

HEALTH and LIFE!

Healthy and clean

Healthy choice

Healthy to all and setting a good exemple fot children.

I agree with this

I agree with this approach.

I agree with this. See my previous comment.

I agree with this. the ban should be complete to protect all the park users from exposure to secondhand smoke and to ensure youth and kids aren't exposed to tobacco use. Also, litter reduction is a huge plus.

I am allergic to smoke so this does appeal however I think it would be hard to enforce.

I dislike breathing smoke as I do not smoke.

I don't really have an opinion. I don't smoke, but I've never had an issue with this.

I don't see a need for any additional restrictions

I don't think it's too extreme. I'm ok with them using tobacco in their cars only.

I don't want any potential second hand smoke near my child.

I fully support this option. There would be no cigarette liter to clean up in our parks. I'm tired of seeing discarded butts on the trails, in the dog park, and parking lots. It would also reduce any fire risk.

I have a low tolerance for secondhand smoke and it's much healthier for children to not be exposed to it.

I have one friend that smokes and it would allow the rest of my friends and me go to the park without facing smoking.

i like it

I like it but may be too restrictive.

I like that the best. No stinky smell, just fresh air!

I like the idea of no smoking anywhere

I like this , but I don't smoke.

I like this one the best. Several places are banning smoking altogether (like the apartment complex down the street from my house - they make people leave their property to smoke).

I like this option as I do not smoke, but feel it is not really fair to infringe on civil liberties of all due to my preferences.

I like this solution, especially this year with extreme drought. This results in even less trash, odor and fire hazard than just allowing in parking lots.

I like this the best.

I like this the best.

I like this. Since it fits with most other tobacco policies

I love not having to be subjected to second hand smoke or seeing cigarette butts on the ground.

I love this idea. If someone wants to smoke then they should do so in their own vehicle.

I love this. Though tobacco is considered medicine in Native cultures, it is not to be used recklessly or excessively. This policy sets a good example for our children.

I prefer this

I prefer this option. Follows public health guidance. Eliminates littering. Discourages youth who currently use the park system to smoke/vape.

I really don't like smoking of any kind.

I really like to be smoke free in nature.

I see parents smoking in front of their kids at the park, which in turn are smoking in front of my kids and very unhealthy. I would like no tobacco in the park areas, 25 ft quickly turns into just a few feet as rules are bent.

I support this as well:)

I support this proposal. I am discussed by the amount of trash, including butts and unused cigarettes, that people throw all over the place.

I think it's great but not fair to smokers

I think this is a good option, as it is a simple, straightforward policy and would help keep parks clean and clear of smoke. I would think that people usually aren't spending all day at a park, so they won't die if they don't smoke for the amount of time they're at the park. Also, this would make it easier to enforce.

I think this is great to limit exposure to children using the park

I think this is the best solution. It eliminates gray areas of where smoking is or isn't allowed.

I think this is the wisest solution.

I would appreciate this, personally, but seems a little bit brotherish.

I would be for this solution, but I doubt it would be enforceable, and certain groups would consider it discriminatory.

I would love and support this for the health of all, including the environment!

I would love if nobody smoked ever, so this appeals to me on that level.

I would love this but I am not sure it is fair. Smoking is an addiction. I hate the smoke but not the persone smoking.

I would prefer no smoking in public places but smokers should also be allowed to enjoy the park somehow and they are, after all, physically addicted. Besides if there aren't designated smoking areas they will just smoke anywhere they want rather than smoking nowhere.

I would prefer to completely ban smoking, but that may deter people from using parks altogether.

I'd like it but...

I'm a cancer survivor and never smoked. So the cleaner the air the better. Let's have some places clean for our children.

I'm a non smoker and think this is great.

I'm not a smoker, so this is great.

I'd definitely be in favor of this but I'm not sure it's realistic and I don't think people will obey the law.

I'm a big fan of this option. Removes all second hand smoke, removes (ideally) all smoking litter. I don't see any negatives to this.

Ideal but the infractions would be irritating to others and enforcement seems unlikely.

Ideal standard for health.

If people want to smoke they should do it in their own homes. Not in public spaces.

If the goal is promote health and wellness then tobacco use should be prohibited. You can't create a mission statement and be okay with half of your goal. The evidence is clear about tobacco use and second hand smoking.

If this wouldn't cause inequities it would be great.

In a post covid world, there are going to be millions of people with lung issues. A person smoking affects other people's health. Smoke travels. So even with restricted areas, if it's windy, it still affects the non smoking areas. Furthermore, people leave cigarette butts everywhere. Overall, smoking should not be allowed in an open-public access area.

In some ways easier to enforce.

Inclusive to all families with health concerns being able to enjoy the entire park without being inhibited by smoke

It allows the park to be tobacco and smoke free. Sets a better example for kids. Allows others trying to break the habit the space to be free. Easier to identify others who might be smoking other things... (if no one can smoke or vape, then they can't do any- legal or illegal substances). Easier to patrol.

It covers all the contingencies.

It eliminated

It illuminates the chance that and a smoker might have to smell somebody else's smoke

It is an ideal proposal. I would love this.

It is the best option - no one has to breath in second hand smoke or pick up excessive numbers of cigarette butts that inevitably will be thrown on the ground.

It is the best public health approach.

It is the healthiest option.

It is VERY appealing to know that when I visit the park, I can enjoy nature in a clean environment. Fresh air will be available for all. Cigarette butts won't be littered all around the parking lot and park, plus the critters that live in the park will not be exposed to dangerous waste.

It keeps dangerous smoke away from the public and from children. It will also - hopefully - keep the parks a little cleaner. Smokers litter the ground. It's disgusting. Keep that out of our parks!

It provides a smoke free environment for everyone to enjoy.

It puts too many limitations by not allowing people to go to their car/park if mor to smoke

It seems ridiculous to ban smoking in an area that allows cars. I would rather see a ban on idling cars in parking lots - that would do much more to improve air quality.

It will drive smokers to parks that aren't county-run, like Maplewood Nature Center, or they'll just ignore the rule and let's face it -- no one enforces rules in parks.

It will prevent children and non-smokers from being exposed involuntarily to harmful smoke and reduce litter from cigarette butts.

It won't matter because unless you are going to enforce this people will smoke wherever they want to so again, this seems to be a question to just fill space.

It would be great--however, difficult to enforce.

It would be impossible to enforce. Again, "who you gonna call?" Please tell the City to get a few more cops because that's where people will call.

It would be nice to not have to smell people's smoke when at the parks.

It would be the right thing to do.

It would keep me and my kids from dealing with second hand smoke and would reduce cigarette butts left on the park premises.

It would parks safer for children and non smokers.

It would save both children and adults from being exposed to secondhand smoke.

it's a fixed rule without exceptions

It's a really good idea, but could limit park use for many

It's clear and it leaves no room for interpretation. Do it.

It's great for nonsmokers such as me.

It's not going to stop people from smoking and gives non-smokers a reason to start a confrontation.

It's the safest.

It's a clear restrictions- there's no question as to where they can stand, who is permitted, etc.

It's a concrete rule that doesn't leave room for interpretation and allows everyone to enjoy the parks without having to inhale smoke

It's a public recreation area. Smoking is a dangerous health hazard and should be banned.

It's clear cut

It's easier to breathe without having to breathe in smoke. It's healthier

It's simple and effective. This would certainly be my preference.

Keep all smoking away from park. A park is a place for people to find rest.

Keep cigarettes out of the park.

Keep smokers somewhat contained to an area and not just van them would be a great first step.

Keeping cigarette butts out of our parks.

Keeps all safe

Keeps all spaces safe for all

Keeps everyone healthier and takes away the temptation for adults to step away from their kids to smoke

Keeps first and second hand smoke away from public land use! Helps keep our respiratory systems working better.

keeps smoking fully out of parks.

Keeps the park cleaner

Keeps the parks clean and safe for all users

Keeps tobacco away from people.

Keeps tobacco use off of park property.

Less butts on the ground?

Less cigarette butt litter in parks and waterways!

Less disgusting, unhealthy smoke

Less litter and it follows many companies policies of no smoking/tobacco use on property.

Less mess

Less risk of minors involved in these activities. Less chance of fire. Less litter. Health of others respected.

Less smoke in the park. Less chance of fires?

Less smoke is healthier for everyone

Less smoke.

Less trash and less 2nd hand smoke.

Less trash, less potential for fires, less pollution.

Like it

Like this kids don't need to be around this

Limit exposure for kids & park patrons. Limit littering in the parks.

Limit secondhand exposure and litter.

Limited exposure and cig-butts everywhere.

Love it

Love it.

Love it. Keeps everything clean.

Love it. Non smoker here

LOVE this! This is the best option!

Make a smokers spot

Makes it easy to police

Might be too limiting

Minimizes the exposure of children to smoking adults. Minimizes their desire to mimic smoking behavior. Minimizes exposure to second hand smoke in the parking lot. Reduces littering on park property.

Models healthy practices everywhere on park property.

Most accessible for people with disabilities and breathing issues. Don't need to walk through cigarette smoke. Easiest to enforce and understand

Most desirable in my opinion to keep parks smoke free.

most healthy

Most people don't smoke

Most people that smoke litter their cigs all over, they seem to not care about littering

Most preferred option - would limit risk of fires, and smoke inhalation for patrons and children who aren't interested.

most preferred-less smoke; less garbage

Most protection for guests from secondhand smoke

most protective of health; and maintains societal pressure on smokers to consider cessation

Much easier to control, eliminates littering of the butts, conforms to total bans in most other public places, no second-hand drifting poisoning of the air nearby, protects children from viewing a dangerous activity.

much older adults seem to still be smoking. i think it's impossible to stop them and we should just have areas.

My child would not be exposed to second hand smoke.

My favorite idea. Parks are healthy, beautiful, and natural and smoking hinders the ability of the public to truly enjoy the parks. This removes any confusion about allowable areas for smoking and keeps everyone away from any potential harm caused by smoking.

My favorite option by far! Keep the air in the space clean and the groundwater less contaminated by avoiding the chemicals from the butts leeching into the ground.

My favorite option- when we are out enjoying parks, I do not want my children to have to walk through a cloud of smoke or walk through vape trash to get to the beach. There will also be less trash to have to clean up at park- lots of times a cigarette butt or vape trash has ruined a nice day at the beach. This would also prevent local wildlife from consuming tobacco trash.

My favorite option!

My ideal but not realistic.

My personal favorite, though I don't use so that may be why...

My personal preference.

N/a

Nice for non-smokers and kids

No

no cig butts

No cigarette butt litter, no drifting smoke

no cigarette butts or fire risk

No exposure for nonsmokers, which is great.

No exposure to tobacco for young folks or others while on park property. No commercial tobacco litter. No debates around where smoking is/isn't allowed. Good for public health and the environment.

No fear of an asthma attack from smoke. It makes sure that one person's decision to smoke does not endanger the life of another.

No need for this

No one has to be exposed in the property

No one needs to smoke.

No question of where

No reason to smoke anywhere on park property

no risks to park property, etc

No second hand smoke or cigarette butts to pick up.

No second hand smoke risk or garbage on property

No second hand smoke, less cigarette butt trash collecting around parks

No second hand smoke. No smell of smoke to detract from the smells of the park.

No secondhand smoke

No secondhand smoke or cigarette butts laying on ground.

No smell, no secondhand smoke , clean air , no smoking related litter

No smell/health disturbance at any park, plus less trash. I like this the best.

No smoke

No smoke anywhere – sounds great

No smoking anywhere.

No smoking or vaping at all in the parks.

No thanks. I'm not a smoker, but as long as it is outside, should be fine.

No tobacco use.

No worries about breathing cigarette smoke

No, need designated areas.

No, outside areas should be open to all

No. We will not renew our annual park passes if this happens.

Non smokers don't have to breathe foul air.

Non smokers will love it, free from smoke everywhere

Non-smokers can enjoy a completely smoke-free environment.

None.

Not appealing

Not appealing at all.

Not appealing.

Not appealing. Cigarette butts are a problem in our parks.

Not being exposed to secondhand smoke would be great.

Not having to deal with smoke

Not having to deal with smoke in the parks. Especially worried about children and if marijuana is legalized

Not much

Not needed - but would recommend not around large groups /children/etc

Not realistic

Not sure how you would enforce this.

Not. Will lead to illegal smoking and fires.

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing appeals

nothing ever. never.

Nothing is appealing about this.

nothing it is completely discriminatory.

Nothing ruins a day outdoors hiking or playing at the park than smelling someone's cigarette or vape smoke. I think it's an especially great idea to keep smoking and the effects away from young kids or other vulnerable patrons who visit parks.

Nothing to me

Nothing, people are outdoors

Nothing!

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing. I understand some restriction but people should be able to smoke if they want to.

Nothing. Let people work out any conflicts themselves. Bunch of fascist do gooders.

Nothing. People will not follow it and parking lots seems reasonable

nothing. to be honest less people might use the park. smoking isnt really an issue when i visit parks

Nothing. We all know that smokers will continue to smoke, regardless of the park rules. Let's allow them to smoke as much as they want within the confines of their own vehicles.

Obvious for non smokers,

Of course all non smokers would prefer this option, but then we all know people will break that ordinance and smoke where ever they want

Ok

Ooh. This one is good too! I wouldn't have to deal with it all when going to the park.

Option C makes the most sense!

Option C maybe a bit extreme but faire

outdoor smoking seems reasonable given we are a free country and cigarettes are not illegal

Overstep.

Parks are a place for families and healthy activities. Smoking in any form does not belong there. This is hands down the best and only reasonable solution.

Parks are outdoors so I don't think its fair that people can't smoke somewhere on park grounds.

Parks are public property and even outside, second hand smoke stinks! All residents should be able to use and enjoy their time at a park.

Parks provide fresh air and air freshening for state, count and city visitors and neighbors.

Parks should not be a place for tobacco users to go to smoke. Kids frequent parks, and they don't need second hand smoke around them. Smoking is a choice, therefore smokers can smoke somewhere else.

Parks would be discriminating against smokers; if your family includes a smoker, you will not be welcome in parks. As an ex-smoker single parent, this would have resulted in me limiting use of the parks for my child and I.

People can enjoy nature without breathing secondhand smoke.

People can go elsewhere to dmoke or vape. Smoking leaves debris and invites potential fire hazards

People can smoke in their own cars

People don't have to be exposed to second hand smoke needlessly just because they want to spend time at one of our beautiful parks.

People less likely to smoke in parks & won't leave cigarette butts everywhere

People who are exercising or sensitive to smoke are free from this type of air pollutant.

People who choose to be healthy and smoke free don't have to breathe in smoke when going to their car.

Perfect

Perfect plan to protect the health of me and my family.

Perfect! Everything is appealing because it will allow a smoke-free place for all to recreate, reduce the number of cigarette butts on the ground (dangerous to birds) and prevent fires from being started in dry vegetation by tossed cigarette butt that is still lit.

Perfect. Smoking is incompatible with outdoor recreating at the parks.

Personally, this is my favorite option.

prefer a completely smoke free area, promote healthy lifestyles, remove risk of secondhand smoke

Preferred for public health

Preferred option. I think the less smoking occurring, the better.

Preferred policy

Prevents smoking from interfering with others enjoying the park. Best option.

Probably the ideal solution

Prohibiting use of tobacco would enhance the enjoyment of all nonsmoking park users which would be the majority of park users

Promote

Promotes health and reduces litter.

Protects everyone from second hand smoke

Really ideal if it can be enforced. As an aging person, I don't know if I would report someone who didn't go by park rules.

Reduced health impact on park visitors, and reduced fire risk.

reduced tobacco products being disposed of in the parks

Responsible vapers/cigarette smokers exist, they should be able to smoke as long as they don't litter or bother other people with their secondhand smoke.

Restricting smoking is good, but it probably can't be enforced.

Smoking is stupid.

Safer for park goers overall and non-tobacco users with respect to elimination of second-hand smoke, unwanted trash (cigarette butts), and potential fire risk.

Safest for public health.

Safety and reduction of second hand smoke. Hopefully less garbage/waste!

Safety of our children.

Same as above

Same as above

Same as above but better with parking lots included.

Same as above, to a greater degree.

Same as above.

Same as above. I endorse this choice

Same as B, seems really good.

same as before - not in America!

Second-hand smoke is harmful to all people, but especially children who are playing in the parks, and as this is a place that is frequented by children tobacco use should be banned.

See above

See above

see above

See above

See above.

See above.

See above.

See above.

See above. Either option is great!

See my answer to Option B.

See my response in Option a. Stop trying to police people's freedom of choices. If the cigarette butts bother you, put out receptacles.

Sends the message smoking is unhealthy for everyone.

Setbacks cause confusion, a total ban will be easier to follow and enforce. Also, 25 ft is arbitrary and hard for people to measure in their heads. There is nothing safer about having people smoke in parking lots, and parking lots are one place inside of parks that everyone typically has to go - it counter-intuitive to ask non-smokers to park in secondhand smoke.

Sick of people dropping cigarette butts everywhere

Simple clear and easy to enforce

Simplest of all rules. Everyone survives not to smoke in a park for a couple hours.

Smoke-free and healthy parks.

Smokers will feel excluded

Smoking and Tobacco should be banned everywhere.

Smoking causes cancer whether you smoke if or have it Econ's had. We shouldn't have to be exposed if we don't want to be.

Smoking has no business at parks. It needs to be cut out and this does it:

Smoking is bad for you and this may encourage people to quit.

Smoking is gross and smells gross and produces obscene amount of litter. It would be nice to enjoy fresh air with inhaling a bunch of second hand smoke.

smoking is obnoxious and a health concern. eliminates cigarette butt litter in the parks. Many companies already ban smoking on their grounds.

Smoking kills, including second hand smoke!!

smoking only in parking lots is good idea

Smoking prohibited everywhere is the greatest solution of all.

Smoking should be discouraged everywhere seeing we know it's not good for the smoker or others in terms of second hand smoke

Smoking should be prohibited like it is most everywhere else. Your right to smoke ends at my lungs.

Smoking shouldn't be allowed as this is a place of recreation for everyone. Smokers alienate those who don't want to smell it or get it in their lungs.

Smoking sucks

Solid health encouragement Excellent idea

sounds good but hard to enforce

Sounds like the best idea.

Sounds lovely but not at all practical. Won't happen. And if it's the rule, people will smoke everywhere

Still nothing.

Studies show negative effects related to secondhand smoke so it promotes a healthier environment for all.

T

TERRIBLE! Again, discriminating against people. Good way to keep ANYONE from using the park facilities.

that parks would be smoke free.

that will be broken and probably too prohibitive

The best of the three options.

The best option and easiest to enforce

The best option because there is no ambiguity

The best option.

The best option. Reduces the mess and smell and clean up costs. Clean air should be clean.

The best solution. It helps with health and safety from fires.

The burden of tobacco use and exposure falls disproportionately on the health of marginalized groups. Tobacco-free parks policies are proven to reduce tobacco use and exposure, thereby reducing the associated chronic health problems. Also, exposing young people to tobacco usage makes it more appealing and attractive, thus giving into the issue. Along with all of this, the environmental impact of cigarette butts and e-carts is detrimental for the environment.

The fact that someone isn't sharing second hand smoke

The health and safety of non smokers but it may stop smokers from using the facilities of the park.

The parks will be safe and clean for everyone, including those with breathing problems (like myself); a day at the park can be spoiled by just a few moments of exposure to cigarette smoke or vape.

The safest option. Consistent throughout all parks so easy to remember.

The way it should be! If you want to smoke go to your private property and smoke there. I shouldn't have to experience your smoke.

there are a lot of children that use our parks and I think smoking should not be allowed

There are no exceptions. Smoking should not be allowed on the premises at all.

There would be no second-hand smoke anywhere on the property.

this

This is a wonderful idea as it keeps the park from looking like a dumpster

This is an easy to understand and more easily enforceable.

This is appropriate.

This is better option . we don't want to make our kids passive smoker

This is easier to enforce and will provide a nicer atmosphere in the park for non-smokers

This is fantastic. No smoke anywhere.

This is going to be a nightmare to enforce and smacks of busybody politics

This is good option b/c kids, old age people, pregnant women and sick people come to park for refreshing and relaxing.

This is how it should be. Restrict smoking altogether in parks.

This is ideal as I'm not a smoker. Keeps away from families and children 100%. Keeps cig butts out of the park, creating cleaner areas. Promoting everyone's health with this decision.

This is my favorite option!

This is my personal preference.

This is my preference, given we as a society have long limited tobacco products - it seems that this is a eventual ordinance component.

This is my preference. People go outdoors to enjoy fresh air.

This is my preferred option. I like to exercise outside without secondhand smoke.

This is my preferred option. Parks should not be a place for fresh, clean air and enjoying nature

This is my preferred option. Smoking is unhealthy, causes litter, and could lead to fires. It is also a bad image for children

This is my strongly preferred option. Everyone should be able to enjoy the fresh park air without being subject to smoke. It is very unpleasant to walk downwind from a person smoking.

This is not appealing to me at all.

This is safest for all, especially people with asthma, heart and lung conditions.

This is the best option - we know that second hand smoke has dire consequences for all individuals and especially youth. Keeping our parks completely smokefree will make our parks healthier.

This is the best option for me and my family.

This is the best option in my opinion because second hand smoke is a serious concern

This is the best option since it is a comprehensive policy and would be easiest to enforce. It would also show that Ramsey county is taking a stance on health, equity, and not encouraging youth to take on such addictive behaviors by seeing adults use tobacco. This would also decrease tobacco litter. Several other cities and counties have successfully adopted similar comprehensive policies successfully. Ramsey county would not need to update their policy again.

This is the best option, no one should be subjected to smoke from a park visitor, its unhealthy. Other types of tobacco use should also be banned. Parks are a magnet for kids, they should not be subjected to this exposure. If people have to smoke they should leave the park

This is the BEST option! Please do this over option A and B.

This is the best option.

This is the best option.

This is the best option. It is the easiest to enforce and aligns with health and safety standards.

THIS IS THE BEST OPTION. Prohibit smoking and the use of ALL tobacco products everywhere on park property.

This is the best option. Smoke doesn't stay within certain boundaries and is very unhealthy for people and other creatures. It ruins the air. When I go to a park I want to breathe air that is as fresh as possible. People who smoke need to respect other people's right to breathe healthy air -- they have decided to impact their own health by smoking but they do not have the right to impact my health.

This is the best option. There should be no smoking on any public grounds. There are always butts every, this would help eliminate the problem.

This is the best option. Tobacco use for cultural, ceremonial or spiritual practices should be in places other than parks.

This is the best option. We should be able to enjoy park spaces without having to worry about smoke. If people want to smoke, they can do that before or after they visit the park.

This is the best rule for everyone's enjoyment of public spaces.

This is the best scenario. Parks are an outdoor spot that everyone should be able to enjoy. Smoking detracts from it.

This is the best way to protect the health and safety of all park visitors and would make me more comfortable taking my children to the park. It also symbolizes the county promoting a healthy lifestyle for all its residents and visitors.

This is the correct option. It's never enjoyable to be walking and have a smoker in front of you or having to walk through a cloud of smoke from someone in the parking lot. Not to mention the discarded butts left all over the parking lots.

This is the most appealing - no one is irritated by the smoke, and you are encouraging people to enjoy fresh air and limit their unhealthy smoking. It is also very good for children - if their parents smoke, it helps protect them a little.

This is the only way to ensure families can enjoy the park knowing they won't be subject to harmful second hand smoke.

This is the perfect option for reasons noted above

This is the preferred solution to me. Smoking/tobacco use is harmful to everyone, even outdoors. There are plenty of non-public spaces in which people may smoke. I'd appreciate this option the most.

This is the right answer

This is the safest and healthiest option, and for people recreating and enjoying parks, they should not have to worry about or be bothered by secondhand smoke - especially children

This is the way it should be, no question!!

This is too limiting.

This is what I would want to see.

This one is my favorite, for the reasons above. Clearly smokers don't get rid of their butts and that litters the park areas. And secondhand smoke, even outside, is annoying and unhealthy.

This one!

This option makes the most sense to me. To encourage smoking and/or vaping when we know how dangerous they are should be limited to private property.

This option protects public health to the highest degree.

This removes any gray area of where one can smoke and protects the health of all

This should be done in all parks

This sounds even better.

This sounds good to me

This works for me.

This would allow all people to be free of unhealthy tobacco smoke. It would keep butts from littering the park. Minimizing the possibility of fire damage to picnic tables and pavilions. In Minneapolis a few years ago people using a device for smoking burning down a pavilion and restaurant causing hundreds of thousands of dollars in damage.

This would be a great policy

This would be even better.

this would be for the best just like a lot of campuses no smoking on campus but then again no enforcement of current laws are being followed

This would be great— tobacco is harmful to everyone nearby

This would be ideal. People can smoke elsewhere

This would be my favorite.

This would be my first choice to discourage littering and use of illegal substances in the park and curb possible fire problems as a result of littering.

This would be my preference. I hate cigarette smoke and hate seeing cigarette butts. Plus emptying ash receptacles is an expense. Cleaner for all!

This would be nice if it were followed, but people who are addicted are going to find somewhere to smoke and are more likely to follow the rules and avoid playgrounds and crowds if they can go somewhere.

This would be okay, too.

This would help keep the entire area cleaner.

This would only make sense in times where the fire hazard level is high.

This would protect clean air in the parks, keep the parks cleaner, and offer a healthy environment for youth.

Those who are bothered by smoke can enjoy the park without worry

to hard to enforce

Tobacco use on park property is not necessary and is a bad example for teens and young children.

Tobacco is a killer and as taxpayers we pay the price. Tobacco use is higher in communities that are poor. Don't encourage or perpetuate poor health in these communities.

tobacco smell is harmful to everyone. people are not likely to dispose of their butts in appropriate receptacles. dogs, children and wildlife will be exposed to the waste and may attempt to ingest it. i say this as a former smoker.

Tobacco smoke, vape smoke and pot smoke all carry far more than 25 feet. I prefer not to smell any of them.

Tobacco smokes triggers my daughter's asthma. It would be nice not to worry about it.

Tobacco, smoking, including e-cigarettes should be banned everywhere. They are a proven, significant health risk and other folk should not be exposed to it.

Too extreme. I think people should be able to smoke in the picnic areas

Too much. Some people smoke. May as well give them a place to do it.

Too restrictive

Too restrictive and people won't even bother to follow it.

Too restrictive lending folks to a higher willingness to break the rules

Too strict.

too tough to do.

Unambiguous.

Undue infringement on personal rights

vape and cigarette smoke can be offensive and shouldn't be impacting those who don't smoke.

Very clear and concise rule. No weird parameters.

Very discriminatory

Very easy to understand

VERY Good for public health

Very healthy.

Very straightforward, simple, clear. Eliminates smoking around everyone, no need to keep my kids away from certain areas. Consistent with the city's move to further restrict tobacco

We all know that smoking kills. Why allow it at all?

We are not fascists.

We can enjoy the fresh air - no second hand smoke, no smell that you taste, and no cigarette butts.

We wouldn't have to smell the stink of people's smoke. We also wouldn't have to see their cigarette butts littering the ground everywhere.

Well-being of park users

While I would love this, it doesn't seem feasible.

while I would prefer that there were no smokers, I recognize that it's an addiction and people need some designated area to smoke.

While this is appealing to the non-smokers, it appears to be somewhat discriminatory to the smokers.

Won't be exposed to any second hand smoking

Would be great but unenforceable

would be ideal, but this won't happen

Would be nice to not have to navigate tobacco smoke at all.

Would be too hard to regulate cars in parking lots.

Would in theory eliminate the litter that is probably being produced from smoking or tobacco use.

Would lessen my exposure to second hand smoke.

Wverything

Yay!

Yep. They can stay home and smoke themselves to death instead of forcing us to allow them to have their disgusting habits by us.

yes

Yes - people incl children shouldn't have to expose themselves to oke in order to use the parks. Full stop. Smokers can smoke in their cars or outside the parks.

YES Even Better

yes even better

Yes please

Yes please

Yes please.

Yes please. Clear guidelines, healthier for everyone

Yes please. Second hand smoke, not being able to enjoy fresh air, and litter of cigarette butts would make the park not as enjoyable. Smoke free please.

Yes yes yes!!! Parks are not the place for this. I hate having my kids (and myself) around this! Find another location where others are not so closely affected by ones choice to do that. It's a choice that one has the right to make but when it affects others in close proximity it's an issue.

Yes- clear easy to understand, good for the environment, good for kids, helps people quit.

Yes, keeps the park clean from cigarette butts and smoke from people trying to get fresh air

Yes, please.

Yes, please. See above.

Yes, smoke affects/effects everyone, pets, plants around the smoker. Makes germ litter, Cause fires.

Yes, smoke free

Yes, so I, my family, my pets...don't have to be around smoke or the butt trash they leave behind. So kids don't think it's ok to smoke.

Yes, this is the best options in my mind.

Yes, this is the cleanest and safest alternative

YES, THIS ONE PLEASE. I hate going to parks and some dude is smoking and it wafts my way. The more public policy prohibiting smoking the better.

Yes, this.

YES, Yes, yes!

Yes!

Yes! Healthy and modern. This is safest for all users, especially children.

Yes! I thought this already was the rule at Tamarack.

Yes! It sends the message that our parks are healthy spaces for everyone.

Yes! No tobacco products anywhere in the parks or parking lots is definitely best.

Yes! Parks are are for healthy recreational activities & this should benefit all of us!!!!

YES! Same as above only stronger!

Yes! Smoke shifts and secondhand smoke is detrimental to other people's health.

Yes!!

Yes!!!

Yes!!! Please!!!

Yes!!!! Do this please.

Yes.

Yes.

Yes.

Yes.

Yes. 100% this. Smoking should not be allowed anywhere in the park.

Yes. Gets rid of improperly disposed cigarettes which have biological materials. Gets rid of second hand smoke.

Yes. Reasons as above.

YES. Simple rule with no other interpretations.

Yes. smoking is the worst. Smoking should simply be prohibited.

Yes. The parks are full of kids and we don't need smoking near them.

Yes. This makes it healthier to bring my children to the park.

You can't actively control this so I would say just everywhere

You wouldn't have to smell or I hale second hand smoke anywhere in the park!

"Appealing to me"

YES. SUPPORT 100%

Support this 100%

Prohibit it and this could help prevent fires due to the dry conditions

Fits with healthy living activities

Easiest to enforce, helps all people that smoke, smoke less, no second hand smoke exposure for anyone.

Encourages clean air and environment

Tired of the contamination from combustible products.

YES! Keeps all those seeking to avoid SHS protected!

Easy to enforce. No tobacco use.- period-

Way easier to enforce since there are no exceptions to locations or distance.

we go to parks to connect with nature- not be exposed

Simple

Simple

In line with trend among other agencies

Parks are designed to have a positive impact on health. Tobacco use doesn't fit with this

This protects kids, our neighbors and our environment.

The best option. Easy to enforce. Eliminates exposure.

YES! The burden of tobacco use and exposure unfairly impacts on our most vulnerable communities- BIPOC, low income, kids

Good example for our kids

Most pleasant park experience.

with added dry spells in MN, this will reduce the risk for fires

safest option for all

Agree that it's obvious so not having to think much.

Ability to enjoy the fresh air!

It's clear, concise, and fair to everyone.

As a parent, I love this

Sounds good to me.

To me this would be ideal...

This will address tobacco litter issues in the park.

This is the best option. Several other parks around the state have passed comprehensive policies. Easiest to enforce with ample signage.

This would be great but requires some self compliance

Tobacco-free parks policies help prevent youth tobacco use by establishing tobacco-free community norms.

Tobacco-free parks policies are proven to reduce tobacco use and exposure, thereby reducing the associated chronic health problems.

Banning smoking everywhere in the parks makes enforcement easier and eliminates a concentration of smoking refuse in places where it would otherwise be allowed.

Everything. Smoking is a scourge on society.

I vote for Option C.

I would be able to always avoid tobacco smoke

Love this. Smoking and tobacco use are a choice (in most cases, unless medical use). I'd love to see our parks smoke and tobacco free.

Makes it safer for young children and those with respiratory compromise to use the park systems.

Nada

Overkill

Smoking is gross Cigarette butts all over. Shows good example for kids.

Sure. I don't care too much about this.

This is the most appealing option for me.

Tobacco leads to cancer; second hand smoke kills.

Tobacco should definitely be prohibited

YAY! Will make the park environment healthier and safer, e.g. risk of fires. And, reduce litter and pollution.

YES! This shows we honor and respect health of others, especially children who are most often at parks.

Smoking and Tobacco Use Option C - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions

Option C: Prohibit smoking and tobacco use everywhere on park property.

Please use this space for questions or concerns *and* suggested solutions.

A compromise could be allowing people to smoke in personal vehicles.

A designated smoking spot which non-smokers can avoid.

A total prohibition may be appropriate for smaller parks or where the wind effect from second-hand smoke from the parking lots is in close proximity to locations of high public usage. However, in some parks that are large or more spread out, allowing tobacco usage in parking lots may still provide adequate protection of overall public health. I would recommend consideration of a case-by-case approach based on individual park geometry.

A very clear standard to understand and enforce.

Again I don't and nobody in my family does but smokers are taxpayers too. I can see some restrictions but let's be real. It's outside.

Again, hard to enforce. Could lead to negative encounters with police or other park visitors.

Again, how will it be enforced?

Again, inconvenient for people who choose to smoke and also encourages people to deliberately break the rules. I suggest designated smoking areas in addition to specific areas where it is prohibited.

Again, not how this is really an equity thing. It's a health hazard for many, so what about them??

again, offer smoking areas with ashtrays?

Again, this may be unnecessarily restrictive.

Allow it in cars with windows up. This would be hard to enforce. I could see someone sitting in their care with windows down puffing away.

BAN SMOKING ALTOGETHER IN THE PARK -- IN ALL AREAS AND AT ALL TIMES.

Banning vaping, pot, and other smoked substances too. No need to limit it to tobacco use.

Be sure to have bins/ashtrays near the lot exits to reduce waste. And lots of signage.

Being a smoker myself I feel this is just another way for people to ostracize me for being who I am. I'm aware of the harmful affects of smoke inhalation and i do suggest that we have smoking areas so that others who do not like smoke or children will not have to smell it. Designated points around the park should have small areas with ash trays and picnic tables or benches so smokers can enjoy a quick smoke break before they continue to do what they were doing. They should be strategically placed in open areas and at certain distances from other park areas so that smokers will be encouraged to move to said locations but they should not be journeys; rather a brief walk to the location.

Best Buy likely hard to enforce

Best option

Best option

Best option and healthiest for our community

Best solution you have presented. Ciggy butts can carry disease and are unsightly.

Cleaner. I didn't go to a park to smell smoke.

Clear and good signage is critical, in multiple languages. Good enforcement will be critical.

Compliance.

Concern being... At least designating the parking lot as a smoking area gives smokers a place to do it.

Concern is that even though I don't smoke, I don't like government always getting in citizens' faces.

Concern is then people will spill out to neighboring areas to smoke and vape - streets, private property. Not a good option.

Concern that creating any new regulations around tobacco use gives police a reason to approach, some one who is otherwise following the laws, and as we've seen recently multiple times in Minnesota every interaction with police is an opportunity for violence, or structural racism.

Concern: disregarding rule, unequal enforcement, seems too small to complain about, but potentially would greatly impact enjoyment of park

concerns would be how to enforce and what are the consequences? The last thing we need are more police in parks for really petty stuff.

Correct option

Could be hard to enforce.

Could lead to conflict as some people will want to be able to smoke somewhere - would suggest having dedicated smoking areas out of the way of normal flows of traffic.

Could potentially reduce the number of park goers as it would likely deter tobacco users from going to parks due to this strict policy.

Creating rules that will largely be ignored normalizes rule breaking.

Designated smoking area

Difficult to enforce

Difficult to enforce.

Discourteous smoking actually isn't a huge problem although there are sometimes a cluster of men with cigars stinking up the shelter/bathroom area at Crosby. I figure there are always jerks among us.

Discriminated against smokers

Disparate impact.

Does this include vaping?

Doesn't allow that area for smokers or tobacco users.

Doesn't seem like this would be followed though

Don't treat us like children

Don't want to smell the smoke or see the discarded butts throughout our family use and natural/wildlife areas

Dont bam smoking. This is the worst. Is trump running the parks? Man you all are on some Trump policies right now tryin to control people.

Eliminate vaping too.

Enforcement of the rule.

Enforcement will be an issue but "no smoking" is easier to enforce that smoking only in certain areas.

Enforcement would be difficult

Everytime I take my Grandsons to the park someone is always smoking. They may walk away but smoke travels through the air. They just don't get that.

Focus on health - physical and mental.

GO with Option B.

Good for children

Good idea

Granted NOBODY would follow this rule anyway, and no one enforcers it. Like nobody enforces it at bus and train stops, so it really doesn't matter

Hard to enforce

Hard to enforce

Hard to enforce.

Hard to enforce. Prohibition means there will not be an easy way to dispose of butts and they'll end up on the ground. Yuck

Have butt containers available for those who break this rule.

Haven't heard lately, but what about he goose poop?

Healthy recreation ans smoking do not go together. I see no reason why Ramsey County would want to support an unheathy habit and endanger innocent by-standers.

Hopefully smokers will be respectful of others

How do you enforce it?

How to monitor smoking on the property and fines.

How will it be enforced and enforced equally

How will it be enforced??

How would it be enforced? Would I call 911 if someone was using tobacco?

How would this be enforced?

How would this be enforced?

How would you enforce this?

How you you enforce this?

However, in other places where smoking is banned, people will still smoke, but not have anywhere to throw the butts, increasing the litter.

I am a NEVER smoker and have had THREE relatives DIE from LUNG CANCER and extremely biased AGAINST ANY smoking option.

I appreciate that smoking restrictions is also equivalent to denying access to blue collar and working class people. To some, It is an elite, puritanical ethos to create a smoking ban.

I assume there will be some major pushback, given parks are innately outdoor areas. I would create specific spaces where smokers could reasonably go

I can see this potentially causing altercations with smokers vs non-smokers. The limited smoking areas stated before is a reasonable solution.

I can see why smokers would feel crowded out of smoking almost everywhere. But for the reason above, it still seems like the best option.

I do see a lot of people smoking at Battle Creek Park and I pick up a lot of butts, cigarette packaging, vape cartridges. Some folks may feel this is too limiting because the Park is a place they have been able to smoke.

I don't really have an opinion. I don't smoke, but I've never had an issue with this.

I don't support this. People who smoke already have a lot of restrictions and I don't see the point in prohibiting them on all park property. I use Battle Creek park a lot and I don't care if people are smoking when they're outside.

I don't think it's possible to enforce

I don't think people would pay attention to something this strict. People would still be smoking and then they would just do it wherever. Most of the smokers I know are respectful enough of others that if you give them parameters, they will follow them.

I don't see the need to be this stringent when parking lots are not places people frequently hang out in anyway

I don't think it is realistic. It seems a reasonable compromise to allow smoking in parking lots

I fear that this is taking a step to criminalize a substance and am cautious as to the impact this will have on over-policing. I would be highly concerned if this was implemented with any fee or citation attached to those who do not follow the ordinance.

I feel it will take to much staff time to regulate this

I hate seeing the beauty of any park littered with cigarette butts, disposable lighters, etc. It's just as filthy as trash in the park.

I hate smoking, but people should be able to do so if they remain considerate of others.

I have friends who smoke who I want to park with.

I have no concerns about this solution. Smokers can take their trash and smoke and keep it at their own house.

I have no concerns. The less places people can smoke, the harder it will be to smoke, and the less people will smoke. This is good for everyone, physically and financially.

I hope this is the option chosen. The problem comes with enforcement. It's been my experience that many who smoke or vape will try to do it where they aren't supposed to, ignoring rules and regulations because they find them inconvenient. They don't seem to understand that their filthy, polluting habit affects all those around them.

I like the idea of being able to smoke in the parking lots only,

I prefer a designated location that has adequate receptacles for cigarette butts in order to reduce littering.

I realize this isn't realistic, so having a designated spot to smoke is a compromise.

I think modernizing must reference vape products, which could include other substances that may be unknown until chemical testing of the product. The vapes are still harmful to the user and people in the area.

I think people should be allowed to smoke in their vehicles in the parking lots.

I think that it would be extremely difficult and expensive to enforce this. As much as it's an unhealthy habit it's still prevalent in our society. I would rather someone have a cigarette then go for a walk rather than having them sit at home smoking and not moving.

I think this option is unrealistic. We already have signs in parks that say "tobacco free zone" and people are still smoking and leaving butts & on the ground.

I think this policy would have the effect of limiting access for smokers. Wouldn't recommend this policy.

I think this will annoy people and likely not worth it.

I think this would make a lot of people mad and would discourage smokers from being outside and at parks, likely leading to a less healthy lifestyle.

I unfortunately do not see this being followed. People will still smoke in their cars and the parking lots. With no smoking or a place to safely discard butts provided, litter will be a problem.

I worry about whether this might create equity issues. Are certain demographics more likely to smoke, and thus likely to be excluded from parks by this rule? I hate smoking, but it is an addiction; if you don't allow it at all, smokers effectively cannot use the parks.

I would be concerned on the impact of this. Many may not be able to enjoy our public park spaces if smoking is fully prohibited. Children may not be able to use parks because their adults won't take them

I would like smokers to be encouraged to recreate in parks. If they are allowed to give themselves a nicotine fix in their own vehicle before they go for a walk or bike ride, they may figure out a way to cut back on tobacco use after they have been out breathing fresh air.

I would like to see actual enforcement on this; I have definitely had experiences where I've been on a beach or in a space where smoking is not allowed, and still see people smoking. It doesn't feel safe to approach a stranger and ask them to stop, and that shouldn't be the job of other people enjoying parks

I would think this would be difficult to monitor. I think if it was enforced it would be great.

I'm not sure that a complete ban could be enforced and may create more litter if receptacles are not available

I'm worried people will become policers of this policy. potentially putting themselves or others in danger.

I've lived in cities where smoking is prohibited in all public areas not just parks so this is very fair.

If it's too onerous (no parking lots or cars), people may be more likely just to ignore rules all together

If people want to engage in unhealthy activities such as smoking, they don't need to do it in the park.

If there aren't any spaces to smoke then I'm not sure people will comply if they have to leave the park to smoke and come back

If they're going to smoke; It is far better for people to smoke outside and move their bodies around in a park. Harm reduction, please

If this rule is written it will likely be another unenforced rule, so what is the benefit? Tobacco use is not for the park system to deter. (I am not a smoker)

If tobacco addiction counts as a disability, public services need to provide some kind of accommodation, such as smoking in the parking lot or some other restricted area.

If you prohibit- who will enforce and how! Waste of time and money!

If you want to prohibit smoking, than prohibit the playing of personal music on park property. No car stereos, no boom boxes, no portable speakers.....unless it is a public event. There have been many times when people are using park pavilions and are playing loud obnoxious music.

Is this going to be enforced?

It is not really a concern. Creating excessive laws CREATES criminals.

It may reduce park use.

It puts too many limitations by not allowing people to go to their car/park inf lot so people will jsut end up smoking anywhere

It really does discriminate against citizens who smoke which is legal in this county, state & country There are some great ppl who smoke. It's really unfair. You're inviting a lawsuit.

It seems highly unlikely that violaters of a tobacco ban would be easily fined, so creating comfortable smoking areas, similar to those at the State Fair, could be a feasible solution if most surveyed do not want tobacco use allowed freely in the parks.

It seems like it would never be enforced. I can see how smoking a cigar on a late night walk would be enjoyable

It would make those who struggle with tobacco addiction feel excluded from family or community events at the park. I think parking lots or another designated area would be an ideal compromise.

It's not gonna work.

It's perfect

It's 2021 ... time to get on with outlawing tobacco use in public

Its very unreliable. The more you tell people what not to do, the more they do it. Giving them an "option" of a place to use tobacco increases compliance.

Keep smoking out of parks

Keep thins as they are.

Let them be

Littering is the biggest issue with cigarette butts. I think also that people are less likely to camp out all day if they can't smoke.

littering their butts and dog poop and also trash need steep fines, have posters and trash CARRY OUT STATIONS AND BAGS, TEACH AND OUTREACH !!!!

May be hard to enforce. If a person is smoking in their car in the park parking lot, is that prohibited? Allowing smoking in the parking lot creates a buffer between personal space and the public area.

May become a barrier for kids with parents who use tobacco and want to visit the parks and beaches. While I don't want to be excluded to tobacco anywhere in the park, I would be okay with tobacco use in a designated space only if it allowed more youth to visit the parks.

May limit access/participation.

May limit the opportunities of smokers to join their families on outdoor excursions.

May lose people coming to the parks for gatherings.

Maybe show pictures of people on oxygen from smoking. The cost \$\$ health of smoking, maybe pictures of car wrecks from intoxication in the parking lots.

Meh. People have addictions... cut them some slack.

Might be a put off for a few people or their families, if they cannot use.

Might end up discouraging park use by some members of the community

More Lighting Random patrolling Help call boxes

Most easily discriminatorily enforced.

Most people won't abide by this. If they want to smoke, they will

most smokers will likely simply disregard this

My concern about prohibiting use of tobacco products in all areas is that there won't be proper receptacles for cigarettes and people will litter more! I overall just don't think this is very realistic.

My concern is that people will ignore this or just stop using the parks because they aren't allowed to smoke.

My concerns here are actually for homeless individuals who use smoking/tobacco as a heat source and who may stay in the parks. While I do not want to see smoking at the parks, I also do not want to see them being threatened or punished for the use.

My only concern is how will this be enforced?

N/A

na

No concern.

No concerns

No concerns. Do it!!! Makes it easy to tell the difference between illegal smoking pot and cigarettes if no smoking allowed period.

no second hand smoke and less litter

No smoking policy would Exclude greater numbers of low income people/people of color. No suggested solution.

NO SMOKING SIGNS and NO SMOKING ORDINANCE... IF caught, there is a fine.

No smoking, no vaping, no pot, no drugs, no alcohol at public beaches.

No smoking.

No vaping

No way to police it and folks are going to do it anyway.

Nobody should have to tolerate the pollution of others whether it's noise, light, or smoke

None

None

None; this sounds reasonable

None.

Not appropriate because you would be taking people's personal rights away.

Not practical. Or enforceable.

Not welcoming.

Only useful if it's enforced. Who would enforce it?

Option B.

Overly restrictive

Overly restrictive.

Overstepping a bit

Park boundaries aren't always clear, may push people to use tobacco on private property adjacent to the parks or along city streets instead. Feels more exclusionary of people who use tobacco than Option B.

Parks are public places. "My rights end where yours begin." Smoking is NOT a private habit

Parks are to enjoyed if you are taking rights away let's get of the park. Pretty sure the animals don't care about tobacco

Parks should be models for healthy outdoor air.

Parks should be places offering encouragement for healthy lifestyles, practicing healthful activities, learning about nature and health. I'd like to see more signage in parks, with info about all of the above. Go ahead and preach not smoking, with suggestions and referrals about how to stop!

People are smoking in and around the park, there are empty smoke packets etc that are thrown on the ground instead of put into the garbage, plus LOTS of smoke butts laying on the grounds

People can smoke in their cars. I shouldn't have to smell others smoke.

People don't follow rules

People enjoying park property should be free of having to deal with second hand smoke. Clean air, clean park.

People should be able to smoke in their car, etc.

People sitting in the car should be allowed to smoke, cars produce much worse fumes than cigarettes.

People smoke, how are you going to enforce toe it

People will be upset and use "freedom " as a crutch as to why it shouldn't be a rule.

People will still smoke (I Believe) . .

People with friends/family who smoke would not be able to gather with them in parks. For most people, smoking is a difficult habit to quit. This would further limit use of parks by everyone.

People won't listen. There is nothing you can do.

People won't follow it if it's 100% prohibited

People would act in a provocative and belligerent manner because they feel targeted and excluded because of their choice to smoke. Allow some smoking areas.

Perhaps too much of an intrusion on the rights of smokers to use the park facilities. Probably would result in reduced compliance.

Please do not allow smoking at parks, they are designed for children. Everything about this question is so wrong, what research is pointing you to that it's OK to have smoking around a park full of kids? Not the time or place.

Please make sure "vaping" is included as well!

Probably not realistic.

Probably too hard on the nicotine addicts. Need to have places with ashtrays somewhere away from the people that don't want to breathe smoke.

Probably too restrictive for smokers.

Problem of enforcement

Problems for groups gathering such as family reunions, weddings, etc.

Prohibit smoking and tobacco use everywhere except parking lots.

Prohibiting it everywhere is the best option. Especially considering the fire hazard that it poses right now

Prohibiting smoking may also reduce fire risk during droughts. It will be extremely difficult to enforce. It should include prohibiting vaping also, and smoking marijunana. Hopefully it would not prevent smoking parents from bringing their kids.

Require all cigarette butts to be packed out of the park.

Ridiculous since smoke will dissipate outside!

Same

Same as above

same as above

Same as above, I don't think we should ban outdoor smoking

Same as before - give smokers an area to smoke away from others

See above

See above.

Seems unreasonable for an outdoor space and possibly used against BIPOC people

Selective/discriminatory enforcement of rules that targets people of color or other disadvantaged groups.

Set comment above

Smoke travels way too easy so just ban it and keep it simple

Smokers tend to think restricting their smoking is unfair. As a nonsmoker I think they never should have started.

Smokers will ignore this

Smokers will still smoke. this is unmanageable and I don't want park police to have to try to regulate this.

Smoking does not necessarily lead to other uses; however, with restrictions in place I give me peace of mind that I can be welcomed at a park and enjoy clean air without breathing in tobacco smoke of any kind including pot, which I thought I could smell coming from a group enjoying playing ball.

Smoking is a difficult habit to break -- a physical addiction. This could impact some people's ability to attend family gatherings, etc.

Smoking is harmful to everyone involved. Ban it.

Smoking is legal and should be permitted outdoors within reason. Prohibiting smoking creates barriers for certain demographics of park users and is inequitable. Provide designated receptacles for cigarette butts to reduce litter, reduce fire risk, and create a visual indicator for where smoking is allowed.

Smoking is not illegal, so there should be some consideration for those that just have to smoke while near park property

Smoking litter is so gross and I'm tired of picking out cigarette butts out of the sand my kids are playing in. In general, it makes our parks dirty.

Smoking should not be limited to this extent, however I think smokers should be considerate of minding distance to others.

Some people need to smoke so they will either leave the park or break the rules. Providing them the parking lot seems like the best option.

Strongly disagree. I think smokers should be tolerated so long as their smoking is not affecting park visitors in a way that is easily avoidable by non-smokers. (PS. I'm not a smoker.)

T

The ban on smoking should not be lifted. Perhaps one area of the park, far away from other people, could be designated as a smoking area.

The mess they leave would be everywhere!!

There are no questions.

There needs to be an optional area where smoking is ok. Smokers will smoke.

There will need to be signs to clarify this rule and what to do if someone is seen smoking

There's no longer any ambiguity about the harmful effects of tobacco use. The parks should not be places where one has to put their health at risk to enjoy.

This does limit the rights for cultural ceremonies as mentioned above

This does make park rules very restrictive and unreasonable/unwelcoming.

This is great!

This is increase potential for many to visit and reserve space in our parks as provides cleaner options.

This is ridiculous. If people want to smoke, let them smoke (again I understand some restriction). Second hand smoke in an outdoor setting is nearly impossible to cause a health issue. You would have to be very close to the person smoking, have the wind blowing just right, and do that every day for numerous years to have your health affected.

This is the best option. Smoke does not stay contained to a given area (e.g., 25 feet away from a building/beach/event/etc. or within a parking lot). There are also fire concerns when smoking is introduced in addition to health and enjoyment infringement.

This is the right solution. Ban smoking on park property. We should not have to worry about breathing clean air when we use a County Park.

This is too limiting. Option B minimizes the harm to non-smokers. Option C is very non-inclusive.

This is too restrictive. It's people's (unhealthy) choice to smoke, but there is plenty of space in a park and as long as they are away from popular features, let them, there still is plenty of fresh air to go around.

This is way past what is reasonable for the general public and overstepping "the public good"

This just makes people hide to smoke.

This might also alienate people who smoke.

This really limits people, as long as others can avoid the smoke I don't see why it should be totally banned

This rule will most likely get ignored. Then we are relying on people to call in a complaint which leads to certain types of people being more likely to get a complaint called than others. Also why arbitrarily decide someone can't use tobacco in a large outdoor space. Ask people to keep their distance from high use areas, make rules about butt disposal, and provide easily accessible butt disposal stations to encourage proper disposal.

This seems the most straightforward

This seems too restrictive.

This will create disparities and has the likelihood of increasing unnecessary confrontation and police involvement. Not worthwhile.

This will likely set a double-standard similar to State Parks alcohol policy: for those in the know, you know you can bend the rules. For those not, you are following unenforced policy. Gives an excuse to police populations that may already feel excluded from parks

This would be incredibly hard to enforce and seems overly punitive to those who choose to smoke

This would make it nice for all nonsmokers. People who smoke would have a problem with this. When my daughter played softball and one of the city parks, her coach was thrown out of the same by the umpire for smoking while coaching, it was a good plan, plus demonstrated to the girls that no one can get away with disobeying the rules.

To authoritarian

Tobacco is addictive so it's unlikely this will be followed. Enacting might actually create problems throughout the parks & resources wasted on trying to enforce.

Tobacco use outside doesn't bother me at all

Too restrictive

Too restrictive and nanny-state like.

Too restrictive, it's legal and it's outdoors. Enforcement not a good use of resources.

Too restrictive, smoking is still a legal activity

transition into no smoking/tobacco/vaping products in parks, announce a planned transition if there is a reason to move toward this over a period of time.

Trial and errors maybe the key

uncertain

Unenforceable, especially in larger parks.

Warning, only fine if they refuse to stop.

What about a designated area to smoke. Like a "smoking section" but just in a certain park of the park.

What is the penalty for smoking? Who is it enforced against? How is it enforced? Does this become a tool for racist bias?

When discussing this issue, PUP (possession, use, purchase) penalties need to be discussed. No one should be penalized for usage, but also it shouldn't be allowed

Where do butts go if someone does smoke on park property?

Where do smokers go?

Who is going to police this?

Will this be enforced or is it a guideline?

Wind can carry the awful smoke to those of us who do not want the smoke, may be allergic to it are just think it is unhealthy. Promote good health not bad habits that destroy the lungs.

Without an area to smoke, smokers may just smoke anyway

Would be hard to enforce, may be used by police to hassle people.

Would be kind of difficult for a smoker to visit the parks. Unless they smoked in their car.

would it increase more traffic in and out of the park. how would it be enforced?

Would the no smoking policy be enforced. If not the smokers would just light up anyways.

Would this be enforced? By whom?

Writing people a ticket for smoking seems wasteful, however. Signs in our parks about the environmental damage of cigarette waste would go a long way.

Yes, smoking is bad for us as is alcohol and sugar, but it's not the city's job to delegate morality

Yes! No pollution

You can't control what people do in their cars

You must have designated smoking areas

You would have even less trash, odor and fire hazard if you also disallowed smoking in the parking lots.

You'll need to clarify how vaping is treated. I believe some neighboring counties have incorporated vaping prohibitions into their ordinances as well.

Could there be designating smoking areas?

Who will enforce? how?

Is vaping included? Clarify.

Many city parks are 100% tobacco free in Ramsey Co.

City of Arden Hills prohibits all tobacco products in their city parks.

Will have a learning curve for users - need communication plan

How will park users be informed about this ordinance?

Will there be signs posted?

it does not seem inclusive. As much as I hate to say it, I think there should be a designated place for smokers.

1 to liking it but not really being inclusive to all

What happens if someone does smoke or use tobacco?

Enforcement may be unrealistic.

This is clear and should be a rule for any and all kinds of smoking regardless. If all facilities are smoke free, then the parks should also be.

Unfriendly for people who smoke/vape. May keep people who already have an unhealthy habit to be more healthy?

I prefer there to be no smoking, but can't support something that can barely be enforced.

Picky ordinances can be used as ways to go after the "other."

Overkill. Open criminal activity at night possible, with no oversight, and yet watching smoking like a hawk. That makes no sense to me.

Please keep our parks smoke and tobacco-free!!!!!!

Sure. I don't care too much about this.

There is no place for smoke or tobacco in these places

Why not have smoking areas. Other public locations have these.

Other ideas for Smoking and Tobacco Use

A clearer delineation that vaping is not allowed outside the designated areas. Without listing vaping specifically, most people who vape will continue doing it everywhere as they would not consider themselves in the category of smoking or tobacco use

A designated smoking area, maybe a farther corner of a parking lot

Again like many outdoor venues, it would be great to have designated smoking areas that are well off to the side, and have places to dispose of their litter when they are done smoking!

All of these suggestions are likely to only be loosely enforced.

Allow non-smoke/vapor generating tobacco use (chew, etc.)

Allow smoking everywhere. Prohibition is always a bad policy with substances.

Allow smoking in private vehicles in parking lots only. I don't want to smell it or see the butts.

Allow tobacco use only in designated areas that are provided frequently throughout the park. Designated smoking areas can be marked by a butt disposal station. Smokers already look for that sort of thing. The general public can avoid those areas. As long as there are enough of them people will be easily inclined to follow this system.

Also recommend considering the wind effect with second-hand smoke when assessing where it would be allowed.

As much as I dislike smoking, I find it hard to regulate this in an outdoor, public setting.

As noted, adjust park hours so that the people who live adjacent to parks can enjoy quiet time for better sleep environment. I suggest 6A to 10P.

Ban smoking in Ramsey County. Make it illegal everywhere or stop with the silly political nonsense

Banning smoking is racist. Don't be racist.

Better proposal for the health of our community is to eliminate smoking in public parks. Seldom have I ever seen a smoker throw his ciggy butt in the trash. I have seen more smokers take their ash tray in their car and empty it in public parks alongside their car when they often leave.

BURN SAGE AND TOBACCO TO WELCOME THE ANCESTORS

Cant stand smoke. Please make it go away.

complete ban is my preference but if any smoking is allowed, it needs to be kept in a very narrow specified and clearly identified area to ensure no one else is exposed and so people can be sure to avoid those areas to avoid exposure. Possible designated smoking area that is far away from where other park patrons will frequent.

Complete smoking ban in the park! The health of anyone enjoying the park is at risk

Conform park total prohibition of tobacco use to all other such government laws.

Could there be designated "tobacco allowed" areas, instead of designated prohibitions? For instance, could there be a designated tobacco area that is visible from the parking lot, the bathrooms, or other major amenities, but far enough away that the smoke won't bother people? Put some trash cans there to cut down on litter from tobacco as well. I'm imagining when I was a kid and my dad smoked - in that situation, we could have picked a spot to hang out where he could get to the smoking area easily, but none is is would be exposed to the smoke.

Create a designated smoking area, make it comfortable and separate from the park. Prevent smoking from everywhere else.

Create designated smoking areas to accommodate city residents and taxpayers who are smokers, but do not completely prohibit nor completely allow anywhere. Consideration for BOTH non-smokers and smokers is possible.

Create designated smoking areas with appropriate disposal bins. Signage educating about the environmental hazards of cigarette butts and responsible disposal.

DESIGNATED SMOKING AREAS

designated smoking areas?

Difficult to enforce.

Do not regulate smoking in parks.

Does this include the use of smokeless tobacco?

Don't ban it anywhere except inside buildings. There's simply no way this can be enforced without you looking like racist jerks. As a smoker, the parks are one place I don't feel like a complete criminal because I smoke. Don't take away that option. Because I'll be one of the ones breaking the rules, along with every other smoker in the parks. Go a step further and install cig butt trash cans if you don't like looking at the butts on the ground.

Drug free, tobacco free, alcohol free beaches. If necessary, designate one beach location as drinking/ smoking/ using beach.

Enforcement

For smoking only designate an area if it's unavoidable and make sure it ventilated and not impact rest of the areas.

Go with a park by park policy. If park-users at a specific park want to ban smoking then allow for a process to publicly discuss it. If there is a park where people are less concerned (for whatever reason) then there's no need to create restrictions.

Have a designated smoking area? Perhaps not possible at all parks- but worth considering

Have a small smoking area in some more remote and less attractive area of the park is a possibility for die-hard smokers. At least then they still get some fresh air.

Have dedicated spaces, outside the normal flow of traffic and park use, available for people to smoke if desired.

Have designated sitting and a bbq area for smoking. Off limits everywhere else.

Have designated tobacco use areas on the far sides of parking lots where there is less traffic of people, children, and pets. Still welcoming tobacco users into the parks. Or include other small tobacco use areas throughout larger parks with appropriate trash cans.

Higher tax on cigarettes

<https://www.reconnectwithnature.org/news-events/the-buzz/environmental-impact-of-cigarette-butts>

<http://cwsec-sc.org/cigarettelitter/>

I am good with the 25ft away from buildings and playgrounds or when other people not part of your party are present.

I am not sure how much smoking takes place at the parks. I live near a park and am a frequent park user, but I am not sure the impact smoking is having in said places. With that said, I would be all in favor of banning smoking from parks but would also be open the middle ground of designated smoking in the parking lots.

I believe all substances should be legalized and do not think that creating ordinances to prohibit any substance is in the best interest of the community.

I can't imagine these restrictions would actually be enforced given that current restrictions (e.g. leash laws) are not enforced, so it seems silly to add additional restrictions.

I didn't realize this was a problem. I can continue to coexist with the guy that seems to be always in the area near the boat launch smoking a cigar. But then I am just walking. I wouldn't choose to hang out near him.

I don't agree with smoking rules outside. It is outside with wide open spaces.

I don't think there's a solution here that pleases everyone. The status quo seems to be shifting towards more and more restrictions on tobacco use. In my opinion this is the right move.

I don't care if people smoke or not it's the cigarette butts/littering.

I feel that a zero tolerance policy would be the only one that enforcing would be realistic. People come to these places for fresh air, not pollutants. Get rid of it.

i like this one "Prohibit smoking and tobacco use within 25 feet of any park building, outdoor event, playground, beach or nature center grounds." then both smokers and non-smokers can enjoy the park, and non-smokers can get away from the smell

I suppose an option could be to provide a smoking space. It might not always be convenient, but would give the smokers some rights. Would a no smoking ordinance cause smokers to use the restrooms or changings rooms?

I think it shouldn't be allowed anywhere in the park. Most people in the park are there to enjoy the fresh air and exercise, not to inhale someone's smoke.

I think perhaps, and this might be a difficult rule to enforce, but that a rule based on proximity to others would be better. Like you can't smoke within 10 feet of a child and 5 feet of an adult. That would still make it so that on days when a park like mears is really busy, then you can't smoke there at all, but I think that's totally fair as I'm not sure there would be a respectful way to do so anyways. Obviously if two people were smoking together they shouldn't get each other in trouble, but I think that if smokers are expected to give everyone else a wide berth while they're smoking they should be allowed to smoke in the park.

I'd be fine leaving the policy as it is right now, never noticed an issue.

I'm all about options B and C! Though I know that with C, people will still smoke, and may choose to smoke in their cars, which is more unhealthy.

I've not seen smoking as an issue in parks to start with personally, so I'm wondering if this is a couple proposed solutions looking for a problem. I'd like to see some data on if there is an issue before regulations are put into place to fix the lack of an issue. If there is an issue, information on WHERE the issues are occurring would inform the solution for WHERE restrictions should be put in place.

If option A is selected, I would recommend also adding that tobacco products should also not be used in the sight/presence of children and teens regardless of where they are.

If people feel the need to smoke, they should be able to find a non-park place to do it. Parks often are frequented by families with young children. Eliminating smoking from the park also helps create a more healthy environment for kids and positive role models can be seen NOT smoking.

If the county chooses to restrict tobacco use as outlined above, it should be prepared to enforce those restrictions - many of the existing ordinances go unenforced, and what's the point of adding more restrictions if they'll join that camp?

If they really need to smoke, people could be allowed to smoke in their cars with windows rolled up.

If you have to smoke, the parking lot would be the best option

Increase the fine, NO SMOKING ON PARK PROPERTY

It is not really a concern. Creating excessive laws CREATES criminals.

Just apply The same principles Or basis in law that is used when determining city nuisance ordinances

Just let it be a free for all and let people smoke etc in the park. It does go against the health and fresh air aspect of parks, but people aren't going to follow the rules anyhow, and it's doubtful that there would be much if any enforcement of rules either. Generally vape 'vapor' dissipates very quickly and wouldn't affect anyone nearby, and other smoking dissipates fairly quickly also when outside. As far as the smoker, their health isn't going to be any better for not smoking for a couple hour visit to a park.

Keep parks a safe place

Like I said, have cigarette butt dispensers. This will allow smokers to smoke outside the pavilion and not disturb non-smokers.

Maybe have clearly demarcated (roped off or something that makes the area unarguably clear) smoking areas that are somewhat away from common areas of use but not so far as to be unreasonably inaccessible. Then people immediately harmed by smoke could use the park without issues, but smokers would still have an option.

Need all non smoking!!

Nice of you to ask.

No need to change any policies. I have no bother by smoking. Most are quite respectable and attempt to distance themselves. Why do we need rules or laws. Let people make good choices.

No opinion

No options.

No smoking allowed.

No smoking at playground No smoking within 25 feet of a building

No smoking in parks

No smoking in parks please.

No tolerance enforcement for violations.

none

None

None of the above are perfect. People who smoke should be welcome at parks, but 25 feet can be perceived differently, some parking lots are less than 25 feet from playgrounds, and weather conditions can still carry unwanted smoke into the playground, even with distancing. How about designating a smoking area at each park?

None.

Offer the parking lots as well as trial a smoking spot somewhere in a park or two and see if they get used. Let the person enjoy nature while they smoke, but far enough away from others that it shouldn't interfere

Option 3 is ideal, though, exception should be granted for smoking of legal substances done solely in one's own vehicle.

Option C is great!

OPTION C IS THE BEST OPTION. Prohibit smoking and the use of ALL tobacco products everywhere on park property.

Option C would be ideal

Park hours 8AM to 8PM needs to be adopted. Let us not make Arden Hills parks into vice dens by 24/7 open hours.

Parks should be smoke free spaces.

Pay close attention to people that live near parks, this will significantly affect their lives

People want to use parks for exercise to be healthy and also to "commune with nature." Being exposed to someone else's secondhand smoke is unpleasant and defeats the purpose of parks.... as well as being a health concern for both children and adults. If drunks are banned from the parks, those addicted to nicotine should not be allowed to indulge in their vices at the expense of others.

People who want more smoking options just use that as cover for their real goal which is to use our parks for smoking weed and other drugs.

Perhaps allow at campings sites only.

Personally if I was the only one going to the park, I chose no smoking. anywhere. But then I should have. moved the the country. All citizens need to be considered. The risk of second hand smoke is much less then someone committing a violent crime in the dark of a park.

Plastering parks with no smoking signs/enforcement leads to a less welcoming environment for all. I'd prefer to use our parks to promote healthy behaviors/activities and maybe have signs/info about smoking risks without the rules.

Please be sure there are safe places to throw cigarette butts that won't start on fire

Please do not allow tobacco products anywhere in our parks.

Please keep tobacco use out of our parks! A park should be a place for clean, fresh air and enjoying nature. Not smoking.

Post a fire danger sign in all parks. Low/Moderate/High and enforce accordingly

Post a sign that says "Smoke responsibly" and then something like be considerate of others who don't smoke, like the dogs might not be familiar with children sign might not be a bad idea

Potentially a expanded option 1 50-100ft or an expanded option b by adding some designated smoking area.

Prohibit smoking and tobacco use within 50 feet of any park building, outdoor event, playground, beach or nature center grounds.

Prohibit smoking in specific/high traffic locations (trails, playgrounds, beaches)

Prohibit smoking only within park buildings and on playground equipment. Prohibit discarding butts anywhere other than provided receptacles.

Prohibit tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs.

provide designated smoking areas

Public health is to assure, assess and advocate for the health of the population. Sometimes government regulation is the best or only means for changing unhealthy behaviors in the larger population.

Put up a signs asking people to respect others, and not smoke. But pass no law or ordinance prohibiting it. Let Karen call the cops, and the cops tell her she's got nothing, and they don't respond to things that aren't illegal, just suggested.

Restricting tobacco use encourages healthy behavior, a goal of a park system

Separate, comfortable smoking areas, similar to those at the State Fair, if most people surveyed prefer no tobacco use freely at parks.

Set up defined smoking areas, away from other facilities, with appropriate containers for disposal of cigarette butts and other trash. Prohibit smoking in other areas.

Smoke/trash, doesn't just harm you, it affects/effects everyone around you.

Smokers are going to smoke. I would rather see more disposal of cigarette areas. Encourage people to clean up their cigarette butts just like you encourage people to pick up dog poop.

smoking 30 or 50 feet away from others and buildings might be a nice middle ground.

Smoking allowed in picnic shelters only.

Smoking is disgusting, and smokers throw their cigarette butts on the ground for everyone else to clean. Much better to move garbage and pollution as far from playgrounds and fields as possible

Smoking is hazardous to the health and well-being of humans and pets. Parks should be a place where healthy is the primary concern. There should NOT be any smoking allowed on park grounds.

Specifying e-cigarettes/vapes and smokeless tobacco are also important when referring to tobacco products.

Suggestion: signs should include a QR code and/or phone number to access quit resources.

Support whichever way the group decides to go.

T

The county should also think about how this policy is going to be adapted if and when recreational marijuana becomes legal in the state.

The first one seems more equitable. I'm not a smoker and think it's a bad habit but they shouldn't have to leave the social group or children to smoke.

The rule isn't ever enforced. Those of us with sensitivity to smoke and with children who are can't escape it at the parks easily.

There could be designated smoking areas. There are dog parks so why not smokers' parks?

This is the main reason why I'm submitting this survey. It is already difficult to access the nature spaces nearby for my family to enjoy. Smoking will really limit access further and will be unwelcoming for my family.

Tobacco and other products are not needed for the purposes of outdoor enjoyment and education

Tobacco is a legal product. Smokers have already been forced to go outdoors to use it and now you want to say we can't smoke while sitting in a park?

Tobacco use in/on your private property/car!

Use of tobacco should be cast as (1) health of children, and (2) health of park environment/littering. The public health side of reducing cigarette smokers (while admirable) should not be used as describing why change policy

Vaping seems to be much less invasive. I would love to know the effects of vape second hand smoke vs. cigarette. I truly would rather someone vape in my area rather than smoke cigarettes.

What about a designated area to smoke. Like a "smoking section" but just in a certain park of the park.

Whatever you decide, please remember that the rule should apply to everything you want to control/discourage rather than just a few rules here and there. No smoking, no drinking, no throwing rocks at the water's edge, no [fill in the blank]... you get the picture.

When will there be adequate numbers of law enforcement to make our parks the safe places they should be? one more thing - No over night camping, please enforce this law.

While no smoking is my favorite idea, Some of the parks are very large so if the parking lot idea is popular, it may be good to have additional "smoking zones" within the park.

why not go with whatever current state requirements are for other commercial places?

Would love to see #3, but I suppose #1 is the most feasible.

You need to get much better lighting at county parks to help stop crime

It's outside. Do we really need to regulate this?

Fines and Penalties Option A - What's appealing about this?

Option A: Violations are petty misdemeanors.

What's appealing about this?

\$300 is a reasonable fine

\$300 is more affordable if for instance someone is walking on a ski trail versus drinking alcohol in the park.

\$300 maximum vs \$1000

\$300 not impossible for many . . .

a

A consequence but depending on the violation (walking in the park after hours or smoking on the beach) it seems harsh if it may show on an employment background check.

A heavier fine for not following the rules.

A lot. Punishment fits the crime

A minor infraction should not result in lifelong penalty from a misdemeanor charge. This eliminates that impact while still emphasizing that rules have to be followed.

A misdemeanor should not be the penalty for walking on the groomed ski trails and it should go on a permanent record.

Accountability

Again Not Appealing. If penalties get reduced, all that happens is more crime.

Again, who's going to enforce that? (Don't tell the Sheriff, he's busy w/the State fair.

Agree

All for it.

Allow sanctions without detrimental record impact.

Almost nothing. I'm sure no one knows this. No one should have a record or have trouble getting a job for a park violation.

An improvement compared to the status quo. Still provides some teeth for enforcement of rules.

An option for repeat offenders who don't change behavior after warnings

Anything that can be done to reduce or eliminate those that break the law would be a benefit for those that use the parks and follow the laws.

Anything to deter crime.

As an employer, I would want to know about someone's disrespect for public property. Wouldn't necessarily refuse to hire them, but would discuss and see what they had learned.

as I xc skier, there is NO enforcement of "walking on a ski trail in winter". -- there will never be an officer there when snowboarders, snow fat tire bikers, or hikers are going down the middle of groomed xc ski trails.

As someone who's son (who is white) spent many years in various jails and prisons for misdemeanor drug offences, I would opt to save any charges for those who destroy property or repeatedly flaunt the rules, even after "educational" talks with park police. I realize this opens up a can of worms since police may be biased against people of color, teenagers, etc.

Assuming this is after attempts at "education"? That said, damage to a park that is used by many should be a fine in my opinion

At age 64 I have come to the conclusion that rules like these are needed for safety, and need to be enforced because there always seem to be people who either think they are entitled to be "above the law" or challenged by the rules to the point where they are compelled to break them.

At least better than the current

At least it's not a criminal charge.

At least there is a penalty

At least there is a sanction for bad behavior which acts as a deterrent.

At least there is some penalty

Better than a \$1000 and misdemeanor.

Better than being cited for a misdemeanor.

Better than criminal charges

Better than current but still seems harsh

Better than current.

Better than misdemeanor— the majority of these violations do not need to constitute crimes

Better than the current system.

Better then now, but still open to abusive enforcement.

Better, but still seems harsh for walking on a ski trail!

Big fan of this. Misdemeanor seems a bit harsh for a tobacco violation.

builds in longer term accountability for one's actions, but less harsh than the current

Certainly more reasonable than the current system. Still a large enough fine to act as a deterrent.

Cheaper

Community service is the most appealing about this. All violations should result in a heavy amount of hours. #1 everyone has time to give vs money. #2 the result is an improvement of the community.

Consequences for wrong behavior

Court system is congested and slow

Creates a disincentive to criminal behavior, though not as strong as a disincentive as a full misdemeanor charge. Potential presence of the conviction on an employment check is a positive as well - it creates a disincentive to the disruptive behavior in the first place.

Crime sucks. I don't want my car broken into.

Damaging property fine, fix it cost to replace & labor and community service.

De-criminalizing seems appropriate. Fines? Absolutely. On someone's record seems to harsh.

Defers individuals from conducting such behavior.

Definitely an impediment.

Depending on the violation, it has a real consequence for times when it is appropriate

Depends on the violation, makes sense if it's property damage. But might be too heavy-handed for other violations, and this could unfairly punishing minorities and those in poverty.

Deter crime

deter crimes

Deterrent to antisocial behavior

Deters people

Disproportionately affects poor residents in material, long-lasting ways.

Doesn't show up on a background check

Doesn't go on permanent record

don't care

Don't know

Don't like

dont favor this method

Either option A or B is fine. But they must be enforced to mean anything.

Either option seems fine. This fine amount would likely deter someone from making the offense again.

Enforcing these are problematic!

Establishes a baseline and allows people to enter knowing the risk

Everything

Everything. If you do not have any teeth in a law people will just ignore it. There has to be consequences for a person's actions. However, you need to put up signage then to notify people as they enter the parking areas that the park is a "No Smoking Area"

Excessive because this type of offense should not affect future employment.

Fair solution.

Familiar and standard procedure. Non criminal

Fine destroying of property, fix it cost to replace & labor, community service, all ages, parents responsible for children.

Fine fee is approachable and petty misdemeanor is not as serious as a misdemeanor

Fine is better

Fine is enough to hopefully deter behavior if enforced.

Fines and penalties should not change. There needs to be some strong disincentive to vandalism and criminal behavior in parks. Cost of damage caused should be covered by the fine.

Fines seem appropriate. They need to be enforced. It has been pretty lawless lately, lots of garbage left, lots of speeding, lots of alcohol in the park, lots of boaters not obiding by the hours of recreation on the lake (more than 5 MPH between 11 AM and 3 PM).

Fines should still be a deterrent. \$100 or less might create an anything goes situation

For fairly significant violations and/or repeat offenders, it should be recorded on the offender's background. Though, I am unsure how much this is a problem.

For first time offenders

For walking on a ski trail it seems fair.

Generates revenue that can help with park expenses

Gives person(s) a chance to do better when visiting a park. What the person(s) does with being given a chance is up to them. If choice is to continue to violate, it turns into misdeanor.

Goes too far. Nothing is appealing.

Going to the court system add some weight and formality to the process and makes it less subjective.

Good

Good idea

Good idea

Good idea.

Good idea. It deters violations without severe consequences.

Good to have to be non- criminal I like that it doesn't rely on the Sherriff's office discretion to convert it to non-criminal; that sets up an easy way to fail into unconscious bias in implementation.

greater compliance incentives

Harsh enough but doesn't impact the individual for life

Has lots of "teeth" in the punishment.

Helpful for small infractions like walking on a trail when not open.

Hopefully somewhat of a deterrent

I am not a lawyer but it seems the violations for misdemeanors should be left in the hands of the justice system and not open to interpretations by a county park board

I disagree that these should show up in background checks.

I don't feel it petty misdemeanor should show up on employment background check. by doing that it is just making a it harder for a person to get a job. that is not good for our state or our community

I don't find this option appealing at all. It's too dire.

I don't love this.

I don't think these should show up on an employment background.

I don't see any reason to change laws as they stand!

I encourage restorative practices for property damage. Paying a fee doesn't penalize people who can afford to pay it. Collaborate with natural resources and have people planting trees or volunteering their time for damage. Maybe a community partnership can support this effort. Small fees for parking that escalate to big fees should go into the restorative practices category.

I feel like fines are usually given to the folks that will have the most trouble paying them, and I don't really think that's fair. I don't think they are necessary unless someone is stealing something or harming someone.

I feel that a higher fine is better for controlling violations.

i guess if you have to have something this is ok

I like giving them a penalty the first timer hey do something CCD wrong as long as there are warning signs. Why just keep giving them warnings? However, I wouldn't want this to show up a a background check and possibly preventing someone from getting a job so this is difficult

I like that at least there's a cap cost and no possible jail time cause that idea is absurd.

I like that there are repercussions.

I like the option b.

I like the tie in to employment so they're aware of the consequences

I like this. Education is best, but if it doesn't work, a fine is a good second option.

I suppose it can be a deterrent.

I suppose it is a deterrent.

I think \$300 is a sufficient punishment for park violations.

I think it needs to be something like this to keep people from violating.

I think that since the policy is education first, this policy largely works okay today.

I think that this is significantly better for the vast majority of current offences as the current penalties are more intense than the offences that they're punishing. \$1000 and 90 days in jail is a really extreme punishment for walking on a ski trail. I recognize that it's not the punishment people are likely to receive, but I think it shouldn't even be on the table as an option.

I think the lower fee is enough to get people's attention and not too exorbitant.

I think this is much better 1,000 and jail, is not reasonable to me.

I think this might be better for more serious violations like vandalism

I think this would be okay in certain situations, such as when people are purposely being destructive or behaving poorly, fully knowing the law. However, in some cases, people have no idea they are breaking a rule and in those cases they should not be fined.

I wasn't aware of fines for something like walking on a ski trail. This is not appealing and seems a bit extreme.

I would hope that some level of punishment serves as an effective deterrent.

I'm not sure.

I'm fine with Option A.

If deputies use the discretion that I believe they all have and use, NO need to lessen the fines as it should affect only the worst offenders

If people damage park property/spray paint buildings/etc the maximum penalty would be \$300? Not appealing.

if someone is getting a violation they are doing something wrong.

If wrong hold them accountable

If you are breaking the law pay for the crime.

If you are serious about this you will need increased police enforcement.

If you extend park hours, I think strick consequences are needed

In the end, there have to be consequences for behavior that endangers others and damage to property that results in danger or monetary costs

Is more appropriate for the purpose.

It could affect someone's life so is a deterrent

It demonstrates that the regulation has been seriously thought out.

It eliminates the negative equity impact and still allows the county to pursue felony charges if appropriate.

It gets them to stop doing it!

It has lasting consequences.

It is a non-criminal offense. The cost of the fine is more manageable than \$1000 while still making the fine itself enough to ensure people understand the seriousness of the fine.

It is fair

It is good for law enforcement to have something to reinforce their patrolling.

It is less severe than the previous penalties.

It is likely enough to curb bad behavior

It is more equitable and better reflects the nature of the infraction

It makes sense for most park violations to be petty misdemeanors; however, I'm not sure first offenses should show up on an employment background check. More serious offenses and/or repeated offenses would/should be handled accordingly, and should show up on the individuals employment background check.

It may change or correct the behavior of someone carrying out an ordinance violation with ruining their record.

It may show up on a background check.

It may stop people from being disruptive and doing things that they shouldn't be doing.

It might actually cause people to follow the guidelines and rules.

It might work?

It removes the chance for abuse over small things.

It seems a little more fair to start here as many violations may not be people intentionally causing damage but may just be uneducated behavior.

It seems fair.

It seems fair. I believe employers have a right to know if a prospective employee has trouble obeying rules.

It seems more reasonable

It sends a message that destroying parks/lakes/public use areas should not be vandalized. And the fine is an appropriate amount.

It still has a consequence but doesn't over react.

It teaches people responsibility and that others have rights besides them. However it seems rather harsh if it is the first offense.

It will address issues that may just be a mistake such as walking on a ski trail.

It would potential stop people from abusing the ordinance

It's appropriate

It's better than \$1000 max. That's ridiculously high.

It's better than misdemeanor approach.

It's good that no one could go to jail.

It's not appealing. We need to leverage public safety resources for other needs than ticketing park use or cigarette smoking. Especially for areas like Vadnais that do not have their own police force.

It's not.

It's a bad idea. You have a serious problem with people walking on groom ski trails. Off leash dogs. People destroying the ski trails. There's not enough enforcement as it is. Weakening the ordinances I fear will make it worse.

It's a better fine than \$1,000.

it's a deterrent.

It's a good compromise between what we have now and could have

It's a lesser "charge"

It's better than what is.

It's harsh but a big deterrent IF people know about it

It's important people are held accountable for their actions.

It's less awful than current rules

It's less harsh and should be implemented.

It's less punitive and fits well for the non-serious violations.

its fair

its not draconian

Keep it - people need to j km warn not following rules has consequences

Keeps an offender from continuing to do an act that hurts our parks. Especially not cleaning up after a celebration and debris is scattered through facilities and other park lawns/ trails. It's not appealing for visitors and o come back when encountering these issues upon a visit.

Keeps bad behavior at bay

Keeps people accountable but there should be other ways to hold them accountable....

Leave it the way it is and enforce it

Less criminal records.

Less damaging during a job hunt.

Less extreme than current policy

Less money. Less aggressive in record.

Less of a financial burden for what does seem like a pretty minor infraction

Less severe in case folks are unaware...

Less severe sounding. Familiar system to explain to neighbors

Less severe than a misdemeanor.

Less strict.

Lessening the violation.

Like it. Violate rules should have a. Impact

Like the permanent record part.

Limit violations

Limits penalty appropriately

Lots

Lower fee

Lower fee and lower charge level

Lower fines, no jail time.

Lowered fee, non criminal offense Seems more fitting

Lowering the fine seems good.

Make it 90 days in jail minimum if your beating people with baseball bats

Makes more sense.

Many petty misdemeanors usually expands to gross misdemeanor or felony. If it's a non-criminal offense most employers don't care although it reflects the character of a person who doesn't think rules apply to them

May be okay for minor offences.

Maybe for really destructive behaviors

Maybe good for a repeat offender

Means criminal activity will be less

Might be an incentive for some but will the courts be able to enforce the fines

More appropriate for lesser offenses. Vandalism and illegal dumping should remain a misdemeanor and be enforced instead of turning a blind eye.

More appropriate for smaller crimes (walking on a ski trail).

More equitable

More offenses with less penalty.

More realistic

More realistic fines for offenses and not such a stark difference between education or \$1000 fine

More reasonable punishment for violating park rules than current situation.

Most people do not have 1000\$. This is a more suitable fine.

Moves the needle in the right direction.

Much fairer and reasonable given violating Park ordinances isn't dangerous - if another offense occurs at the same time, there are other laws governing that with more serious consequences

No

No extreme fee , someone impacted could be low income. People with bigger crimes don't even get these fees

No jail time- lower fine.

No opinion

No opinion

No opinion

No penalty, no prevention. I like this idea.

No.

No. Unequal application of rules. Can give those with a leg up the advantage to request leniency in court vs. those who may just pay up

non criminal is acceptable

Non criminal offense seems more reasonable, as does the lower fine amount.

Non criminal offense, limited fine.

Non criminal. Not as harsh

Non permanent record

Non-criminal with recourse for reckless disregard to the rules.

Not a criminal offense, but breaking rules for safety and comfort of others

not a good idea to affect employment opportunities for minor infractions

Not a single thing. People who commit crimes should have their job status, college and rent applications, and immigration status impacted. They are criminals.

Not a useful corrective action, and how many actually get collected.?

not appealing

Not appealing could have long term employment ramifications

Not as good as the current rules. You have to have consequences for inappropriate actions of individuals. There is nothing discriminatory about the current fines. If you follow the rules there will be no fine. It is always those who feel that they do not have to follow society's rules and laws and feel that they should be able to do anything they desire. If the consequence is significant then it serves as a deterrent to violating the rules.

Not as strict and may be enough to get the message across

Not criminalizing so many people for non-violent offenses.

Not for me

Not much

Not much

Not much as the amount is excessive and it clutters the court system

Not much, the Sheriff appears to be using proper discretion.

Not much.

Not much.

Not necessary

Not part of a permanent record for walking on a ski trail in winter.

Not recommended because of the background check

Not sufficient enough to affect behavior. Leave as is.

Not the best option, but it does have ramifications that could produce compliance. And allows some control. On the other hand - if you obey the rules there is no problem with employment or having to pay a fine.

Not to sure it's appealing to any one who obeys the rules. It is easier on rule breakers.

Not worth the time & referee-ing of it.

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

NOTHING

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing - racially unequal

Nothing is appealing about this. The Sheriff's department should continue to try to change behavior and only use more severe penalties and citations as a last resort, but the more severe penalties should remain on the books as a deterrent..

Nothing is appealing. Its too much. Should nt go on record

Nothing on background checks, unless destroying of property. That should be reimbursed at cost to replace.

Nothing really

Nothing--too strict

Nothing,

Nothing, a 300\$ fine, what are you outta your GD mind? And ruin someone's employment chances over being in a park, this is sinister AF. WTF is wrong with you?

Nothing! Why should my employment be jeopardized just because I was walking on a trail or sitting on a bench having a smoke?

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

nothing.

Nothing. "In Park after hours" should not put someone's future employment at risk.

Nothing. \$300 if caught walking a ski trail? Yikes.

Nothing. Fines are too severe.

Nothing. I think Option B is the best course for parking violations and things that shouldn't even be considered a crime.

Nothing. Keep rules the way they are

Nothing. Leave people alone unless they are being intentionally malicious

Nothing. Our courts can't handle their current workload.

Nothing. Penalty is too harsh

Nothing. This is too much for violating an arguably unnecessary rule.

Nothing. This rule is terrible.

Nothing. Use second option. People shouldn't have the ability to get a job marred because of a park violation.

Nothing. Walking on a ski trail can keep you from getting a job, sounds overly punitive

nothing... people don't need to go to court over a misdemeanor.

Only appealing if used after violated more than once

ONLY BUTTS POOP FROM DOGS AND TRASH NEED FINED

Ordinances only work when they are enforced.

Penalty for an offense that is posted seems reasonable to me

Penalty is more proportional to the offense.

People held accountable with out permanent repercussions

People need to learn to follow rules. Perhaps if the appeals are through the court system, it will have more impact and the violators will choose better next time.

People need to learn to follow the rules and the law. Don't make exceptions. Parents need to teach their kids to be good citizens and respect everyone and the rules.

People should be aware their choices affect others and if they do not follow the rules they should be held accountable

People should be in trouble for vandalizing the parks.

People tag and destroy property today. Why lighten up.

People take it more seriously, and will probably f Comply with ordinance.

People will be accountable for their actions.

Petty misdemeanors are similar to traffic infractions, doesn't really affect anything yet enforces the law.

Pigs

Potential deterrent from crime on parks property

prefer option b

Probably better than the current, but doesn't seem like someone should have something like being in a park after hours show up as an offense during a background check.

Punishment more matches fine

Quick and straight forward

Real consequence. Yes

Reduced amount and more equitable.

Reduced penalty and seems reasonable

Reduces the burden while remaining a significant deterrent.

Reduces the impact of a large fine, but signals that violations are serious and we should all respect public property and follow rules to share the public space.

reducing the severity of the crime and the cost of the fine

Resonable.

Rules are rules and those wishing to enjoy the parks must abide by them.

Rules should be cited and enforced or there is no fairness having them. Create rules that will be enforced and people will largely follow them. If not willing to enforce, change them or it will only be those who respect authority that will follow them.

See below

Seems a bit less likely to be used as an excuse to give people of color.

Seems better than the current penalty.

Seems extreme. I am all for fines and enforcing laws like litter and public-area damage laws, but it seems counter productive to have these affect employment.

Seems fair

Seems harsh for being in a park after hours

Seems like a fair punishment for a violation that did not cause any damage to the park.

Seems like a good compromise

Seems like it's still a deterrent without being overkill.

seems more appropriate

Seems more appropriate in terms of offense vs punishment.

Seems more appropriate than a misdemeanor.

Seems more fair for a less violation like walking in the park after dark

Seems more fair with respect to victimless crimes.

seems more fare

seems more reasonable

Seems more reasonable for the behavior

Seems more reasonable for the level of the offense

Seems more reasonable given most of the time they try and use it as a teaching opportunity.

seems more reasonable. Especially if someone is walking in the park or on a trail after hours. It may be the shortest route home for someone without a car or choosing non-car transportation.

Seems ok for minor infractions.

Seems reasonable

Seems reasonable - depending on the the violation

Seems reasonable - depending on the violation

Seems to be a better fit

Seems to be the most onerous. If you do not want to enforce except in worst cases, then maybe this is fair because officers already prioritized who is going to be penalized. I definitely think enforcement of some violations needs teeth.

Serves as an appropriate deterrent with a reasonable fee.

Sets a standard of behavior with consequences !

Sheriff's deputies might issue more tickets

Should be used when there is physical property damage.

Should deter people from doing things they shouldn't

Shouldn't be criminal offense.

Shows up on employment background. As it should.

Simple and easier to enforce for vandalism and other petty misdemeanors

Simple, but ignores egregious behaviors, which should have more severe consequences.

Since most of the violations are parking violations and parking violations are typically petty misdemeanors this seems appropriate.

Slightly less negative long term impacts on one- time or juvenile offenders.

smaller fines, but still could impact people trying to escape poverty/homelessness with employment.

Sounds better

Sounds like a lot of work if you accidentally break the rules w

Sounds like more appropriate for the offenses

Sounds more reasonable.

Still a significant deterrent.

Still an expensive fine with court records... a good deterrent from breaking the laws/rules.

Still feels like a significant penalty while reducing it to a non-criminal offense which seems consistent with parking violations as the most frequently citation.

Still goes on the record for a petty crime.

Still strict to discourage damaging behavior but not be on ones permanent record.

Strong deterrent because of the amount of fine.

Strong enough where it would cause reason on criminals

Stronger consequence than option B. This could be used for multiple violations or be the next step to the administrative fine. If they fail to pay the fine or do the work they could be subject to the larger fine and up to 90 days in jail. That might not be an option.

Stronger penalties might be more deterring.

Substantially lowers the fine - \$1000 seems excessive

technically non-criminal.

that is fine, but walking on ski trails in the winter why is that.....when the people using the skjoring never think of others on the trails and they do not even move out of the way for anyone, also the bikers are taking over and not having curtesy to move out of walkers ways or neither of them share the walkway.....

That it is a non criminal offense .

That's too much money

The fee is high enough to be meaningful.

The fees and penalty aren't as high and no jail time is good.

The fine is large enough to actually hinder behavior.

The individual can go to court and have it removed from their record by a judge.

The laws will not be followed without a penalty

The only appealing part of this option is that it is potentially less harsh than current policy.

The ordinances are there for a reason. I prefer to empower enforcement. The kids educate and then enforce seems to be ok. But I think they're not enforced enough

The penalties are less which seems right since most of the offenders probably didn't know or mean to cause a problem.

The penalty being only a maximum of \$300.

The penalty is clear and weighty enough to deter violations.

The penalty should be enough to deter future violations. This does.

the price is lower for breaking the rules. I think many people break the rules on accident

The stronger the penalty, the less likely the violation.

The threat of a fine is a good deterrent, but doubt it is ever enforced. Fine should be higher

There are consequences for actions.

There definitely needs to be a penalty for damaging the park or making it unsafe and these need to be enforced.

There has to be a fine.... Destruction of property should be one fine (\$1000--\$5000 for example) Parking should be \$300 Etc. Graduated fines not less than \$300 for parking , for example, but go as high as \$5000 for destruction of property..

There is a consequence for breaking the law.

There is a fine that needs to be paid

There is a lot of worse things going on than somebody smoking in a park. Soon as we do something about the real crime. I'm done with this bulls*** survey. It's starting to piss me off.

There is nothing appealing about this.

There must be rules and some semblance of order.

There needs to be consequences

There needs to be some consequence for people breaking the law. If it is a minor offence, then a petty misdemeanor is appropriate.

There should be some threat of fine/ punishment as a deterrent.

There should be strict punishment for breaking the law

These are not criminal offenses. Our aim should be to correct the offenders, not punish them.

They are consequences to disruptive behavior to discourage it

They broke a rule are not necessarily criminals

This feels like a deterrent without being too onerous

This has real consequences for really bad behavior (damaging park property, behavior that puts others in danger)

This is a good option

This is acceptable for minor violations and employers should be able to know if an applicant is not law abiding.

This is an improvement over the current consequence. All of these violations are not of equal significance or impact.

This is better than the current option. it feels specific, enforceable etc. i like this idea.

This is better than the current scenario, but still too dramatic.

This is certainly a cheaper fine- petty misdemeanor is not as significant as misdemeanor if reported to employers

This is CLEARLY better than the current approach.

This is fine as long as the violations and fines are not dismissed.

This is more reasonable than the current policy

This is not an appealing option. It is better than the current one, but that is all. Walking on a ski trail should not result in a record that shows up on employment background checks.

This is not appealing. When people damage property, there must be a consequence to their actions. If people don't like the current system, they can CHOOSE to behave. No price for that!

This is OK with me. \$300 is a lot of money for most people. If there is no enforcement of the ordinances some people will do whatever they please at the expense of the rest.

This is steep unless the offender damaged park property. Then they should be held accountable to make things right.

This makes more sense than the current regulations.

This makes sense for *some* violations that are more "serious" like damaging property

This may stop some people

This might be a good incentive to keep people from breaking the rules

This option A. is the most appealing to me to send a message that it can be a significant fine and possible employment negative.

This provides a stronger incentive to follow park rules, rather than fines of lower value or severity.

This seems appropriate to me.

This seems like a more fair penalty - though I do think that a citation should be a last resort and the max amount should only be for repeat offenders.

This seems like a more reasonable penalty for violations that are not causing damage to people or property.

This seems like a reasonable update— no criminal record but nontrivial fine.

This seems more in line as a reasonable maximum punishment. Just in case the officer and the offender are both having a bad day and argument leads to the officer issuing an official violation, then the penalty is more reasonable.

This seems more reasonable and proportionate to the offense.

This seems more reasonable than a misdemeanor.

This seems much more reasonable and still provides incentive to obey the rules.

This seems reasonable.

This seems to be a good compromise.

This should be implemented now

This should remain the penalty

This sounds good.

This sounds more reasonable.

This sounds pretty strict and costly for all.

This will deter people from illicit activity.

This will overload the court system.

This would be a step backwards.

This would be fine as long as the proper authorities still have the authority to and force the ordinances

This would deter people from breaking the rules

This would encourage more frequent citing of bad behavior as the consequences seem to be more reasonable.

Through court system is better than volunteer panel

too harsh

too much trouble for little success

Too strict for most issues

Too tough for most encounters. Appropriate perhaps for really bad behaviors, and the warning ignoring, non-compliant individuals.

ules. Everyone is capable of following rules but breaking some rules should be punished more harshly than others.

uncertain

Understanding that a lot of damage is done by youths - still provides for consequences

Unknowingly committing a violation could not be penalized as severely. This makes sense but criminal violations must still be penalized.

Vandalism should be at least \$300.

Very little is appealing.

violating these rules does seem like petty offense while still having enough consequence to have the public observe the rules

Violations are non-criminal offenses.

Walking on a ski trail is so very different than damaging property. How are these two even connected?

Walking on a ski trail shouldn't carry the possibility of going on a criminal record, or 3 months in jail, or a thousand dollar fine; that's absurd. For little things, yes, let's not have it possible to drastically over punish people and harm their legal records.

We believe the practice as it stands now should not change. If a person uses the park in any malicious way, there should be consequences.

What about the white men riding dirt bikes and tearing up the trails?

While I would love to not have walkers on a ski trail in winter, the current penalty seems very excessive (especially considering that most people are likely not aware of all of the ordinances and I don't think there is a great education system in place for ordinances). It seems like the Sheriff's Office currently has a good approach.

Who's going to pay this? I can see there needs to be some penalty, but I think the city is going to impose a fine, which will cause more city expense to monitor payment, etc. Would this cause a problem with someone getting stopped by police for another infraction, and there be a warrant out? I don't think we want to go that way. Who would give this citation? Park police?

why is this broken? it is a rule that is working now. keep it this way.

Will ensure compliance.

Would deter violators.

Yea

Yes

Yes it should be a lower penalty

Yes it should show up on employment background check

Yes this seemed to be a good option.

Yes, all of it... discouraged unneeded behavior but doesn't permanently punish people who are unaware of the issue/rule.

Yes, break the law pay the consequences

Yes, they are not serious crimes. Parking violations can occur from people not knowing when the parks close etc because the times are not standard.

Yes, this make sense.

Yes. We are too lenient on everything.

yikes not much

You have to have some enforcement penalty. I'm not sure how breaking a rule has negative equity impacts - as long as everyone is held to the same standard.

Regulations are written so people follow rules.

If you break it, you get the penalty.

\$300 penalty may not be enough to cover repair expenses

don't like starting from a place of criminalizing. (prefer next option)

There is a penalty to a violation

This fine should remain to be \$1000...or this should be a graduated fine....property damage should be a larger fine and parking should be less. Most misdemeanors are taken off your record if you choose to comply with the community service option. So, if it is a minor offense (vs destruction of property), it most likely won't stay on the record

Vandalism should be penalized.

The right level of consequence for these violations.

Was stunned to learn minor infractions are currently criminal - this is progress!

Good that this is a less dramatic option than the current approach.

People make mistakes and there should be ways to learn that are more in line with the harm done than a misdemeanor.

better than the current approach, vandalism is a concern

If the common practice is for the Sheriff's Office to educate, why make it a crime at all?

Nothing is appealing about this. If someone violates one of these park guidelines, and they are not committing a more serious crime, I cannot see any point in this kind of punishment. I think being stopped and talked to is punishment enough.

Disagree with the above comment - the ability to document a violation does help mark repeat offenders.

It is proven that BIPOC are targeted more often than white citizens. Again, if no other crime is happening, how is being in the park after hours worthy of having your ability to find a job damaged?

Perhaps making offenders go through the hassle of appeals will really teach them a lesson??? I'm being cheeky.

Nothing is appealing about this. This would disproportionately impact communities of color and marginalized communities.

Is it fair to say "nothing"? Nothing.

clear impact for violations

Enough of a financial impact to make people think twice.

It's currently less than our policy now; so that's helpful...

Its important to prosecute repeat violations of park rules, etc.

No criminal record

Nothing.

This is not stiff enough.

While I think walking on a ski trail should result in the loss of a foot, I understand that criminal punishment disproportionately impacts the already disadvantaged and cannot support it's continuation.

Yes

Fines and Penalties Option A - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions

Option A: Violations are petty misdemeanors.

Please use this space for questions or concerns *and* suggested solutions.

#rd offense, then shows up on employment/rental checks

\$300 fine is still a lot for violating any ordinance given that some of them could literally be an accident.

\$300 is a very high fine for most things.

\$300 may still be excessive for some violations

\$300 may still be too much for many low-income individuals. For high earners it may not be effective in encouraging lasting change. Appeals through the court would require child care for many families, which isn't always accessible. This option does not seem like it would educate the individual on why/how their offense impacts others and does not provide any direct benefit to the park (assuming the fine doesn't get paid directly to the park).

\$300 might be too high for a violation

a

A more satisfactory option would be community service to correct the offense, esp for vandalism etc. work to correct the problem by the offender gives direct consequences and saves the county cleanup money.

Any cash fine seems to be overly punitive for poor people and not punitive enough for rich people.

any punishment by a fine is only a punishment to poor people.

Are all violations subject to this fine? Or could there be tiered fines depending on violation.

As a non-criminal offense police cannot use it to remove people who are breaking the rules and may be prone to more serious dangerous actions

As a user of cross country ski trails I believe enforcement of ordinance violation needs to be maintained or expanded.

As long as police are not ticket happy and try educating first, it will work. Some people honestly don't know and can't remember all the rules.

Assumes all park users have read park ordinances.

Background checks

being in a park past hours (or walking on a ski trail) should not show up on a background check! That's crazy.

Can it be off a person's record after 6 months or a year of good behavior?

Can some violations (ones that damage park property or are really unsafe) be a petty misdemeanor and more minor violations could be an administrative fine? I ski at Battle Creek. I've encountered people walking their dogs on the groomed trails (mildly annoying) but I've also encountered someone DRIVING on the groomed trail (scary and blatantly dangerous). One deserves some education, the other really could have done with a misdemeanor to deter him from doing it again.

Can this be an escalation for bad behavior?

Can this be used for offenses like damaging property, but not some of the smaller offenses?

Can you have different penalties for different violations?

Closing regional park gates at night could prevent people from using the park after closing.

Concern - teenagers who commit the crimes may not understand how this would affect future employment and could have a lot of issues in the future.

Concerned it could show on a background check.

Could be a roadblock for employment

Could have unintended consequences to employment and housing.

Could show up on background checks. I don't think this should limit the opportunity for someone to get a job and contribute to society.

Could still show on an employment background check....which seems a bit crazy for something as minor as walking on a ski trail in winter.

Court system is bloated and a pain.

CRUEL PUNISHMENT

Damage to property should remain a misdemeanor and be prosecuted.

Damaging property should be different than walking on a ski trail

Damaging property should have consequences.

Decriminalize

Depending on the violation, seems a bit harsh to end up on employment background check

Do NOT like that it shows up on a background check for employment!

Do not pursue this option

Do people actually get fined and pay?

Does not help pay for property damage for playgrounds, bathrooms etc.

Doesn't really deter people if they know the max penalty is a \$300 fine

Doesn't seem enough for some crimes (damaging or defacing park property). It can easily cost more than \$300 to fix/replace damaged or defaced property.

Doesn't seem necessary unless another crime was committed

Don't fine people or get them involved with court systems. Instead make them pick up trash at park or groom ski trails. Something that benefits the park and uses the person's time.

Don't do something that negatively affects employment. I lose a job bc I walked on a ski path? That's dumb (and I ski). Is this even posted? I thought not ruining a ski path was a courtesy not illegal.

Don't ruin a career with a silly violation. Unless damage is involved, this should never be part of a permanent record.

Education about rules, regulations, and consequences should be easy to understand and posted.

Employees sometimes won't hire someone with any criminal record so that would be concerning for me. I would hate someone to miss an opportunity for employment from a violation

Employment background check should not be influenced by walking on a ski trail. I think this is too serious.

Encouraging criminal activity or mischief is not the answer. Fines and posted rules with enforceable legal structure keeps the parks nice and enjoyable for every Minn citizen and tourists/visitors. If you can't pay the fine, then community service is a win for everyone...the violator learns consequences and the community is served through the service.

Enforce it

Enforce off leash dogs and people hiking on ski trail. Weakening their power will only encourage the behavior. Many of them know they're breaking ordinances and they don't care. Education isn't helping. Enforcement and fines.

Enforcement of ordinances may not be happening because police are hesitant to give ticket that results in a petty misdemeanor that could effect employment. Court system should be focusing time on criminal offenses.

Equity impacts should not be a consideration as long as the rules are enforced in an even handed manner

Even this seems a little excessive for people simply walking in the wrong place (much less \$1000!). Everyone should be given a warning the first time, especially since some will be treated differently than others.

Even though this option is lowered I still believe it is too much. A minor ordinance offense should not limit people's ability to gain employment and take care of themselves and their families.

Fees should be higher.

Financial penalties have disparate impacts to people depending on their income.

Fine not high enough

fine should start at 300 and go up

Fines are fine but shouldn't have to interfere with a job unless it's a strong crime

Fines are still discriminatory if a neighborhood offers few other free options for get togethers. This could still target minority neighborhoods.

fines for . . . smoking? littering? after hours? seems petty

Fines should be commensurate with income and wealth. Therefore should be based on % of one of these two things. That's how they assess fines in Scandinavia--based on income.

Fines skills be based on income, so those who can afford more pay more.

Fundraiser for County Parks?

Get the thugs out of the parks

Going through the court system sounds expensive and time consuming.

Harsh penalty for a lot of the violations.

Have ongoing learning and relearning so people understand their inherent biases.

Have the offense removed from their record after 3 years without a similar offense.

Having a criminal records is inherently inequitable

Having the court system deal with these very minor offenses might be expensive

how about an administrative penalty - fine. whoops, I see below.

How can every ordinance violation to have the same fine? Is there a way to only consider some behavior a petty misdemeanor?

How much are appeals likely to increase court load (and the corresponding bill to taxpayers) compared to option B?

However, it may trivialize the more serious offenses such as damaging property. Suggest two categories of violations based on all the past records. Serious violations that results in harsher punishment and non serious violations that results in an administrative fine.

I am a former Hennepin County Prosecutor. I formerly prosecuted park violation cases in Hennepin County. I previously was an Assistant District Attorney in Wisconsin. Minnesota's "petty-misdemeanors" Do not translate well to another state that does not have them, such as Wisconsin. Another approach is to impose civil forfeitures as a penalty, with the dollar value at the same rate as the current petty misdemeanor. Most entities would grasp the difference between a civil forfeiture violation vs. a violation that includes the word "misdemeanor" in it.

I am worried that serious infractions will not be dealt with accordingly. Perhaps have a sliding scale depending on what actually occurred.

I could not care less about negative equity impacts. I would hope that generally the county and its justice system can be counted on to provide reasonable sentencing for crimes that is appropriate to the offense. Changing the law because you are worried about the distribution of who is breaking the law is backwards. When tried in schools it has been a disaster, and is short sighted ideologically driven nonsense, modern day religion. If you want to address equity concerns about who is running afoul of the justice system the place to work on that is at the source (education/poverty/parenting), and not in giving a people a free pass on behaviors. Nonsense like this, pushed too far, is going to end up increasing inequity, not decreasing it. As far as my suggested solution, leave the penalties where they are unless there is some specific example of abuse or them being inappropriately being used. If the punishments don't fit the crimes, then sure change them, but don't change the punishments just because you are unhappy about who is acting out.

I don't think these should appear on background checks. In addition, going through the court system creates more barriers to someone appealing; I would rather avoid that.

I don't understand why we're being more lenient with crime? Why not have a higher penalty that is subject to the severity of the crime and comes with some judgement from law enforcement on leniency. It says that most of the time the sheriffs offices uses their judgment to change behavior or cite them, so why not keep it the same?

I don't want anything preventing people from getting jobs.

I don't want to loosen this, it will change the quality of life.

I don't know what petty misdemeanor is, can you give examples more than parking violation? Is that just if you park at handicap and you don't have the sticker?

I don't think in practice this is much different from what currently happens. Do any violations currently get cited? Judging by the amount of trash and people fishing illegally I'd say no. The things I wish would get enforced don't (like littering, drinking liquor, fishing in the wrong place).

I don't think violations should show up on background checks

I don't want people to be harmed by police for something minor.

I feel like someone should not have a criminal record over this. A fine should be adequate. I would recommend creating a county (or state) wide list. Warnings mean being placed on the list, and they get two warnings without a fine. The third time they get a fine, and the 4th time it goes on their record as well as paying a fine. That way you know who is ignoring the rules and who maybe just didn't realize the rule or the time or made a mistake or was riding with friends, etc.

I have noticed a lack of enforcement, particularly by the prosecutor's office of crime in Ramsey County. Crime will only continue to get worse until our law enforcement officers are supported by the law and prosecutors who are willing to keep the citizenry safe.

I like option B better.

I like the idea of education rather than fining folks for minor offenses

I need more data to understand the issue. Apparently few citations are handed out and, in practice, park personnel focus more on education. This seems to be working....so why change. Unless the data says otherwise, I would be opposed to eliminating citations entirely (especially for destruction of park property) and would rely on the current approach taken by the park staff.

I prefer education

I still don't think this is a fair option for minor offenses. This idea that something minor like walking in a park after hours could effect someone's future employment? No thanks. I still have concerns about the cost of \$300 though. One of those concerns is are there enough signs offered in enough languages for it to be understood by non-English speaking residents? Would it be clearly stated of the rules and consequences? Also, how are the fines defined and who determines them? Is there a possibility that a black man could be fined more than a young white woman for the same offense?

I think it would be fine to offer a warning first and document the person's name. Then a misdemeanor. I don't think we need to ruin anyone's lives.

I think that police would be reluctant to give tickets because they would be seen as too harsh.

I think that while this is more reasonable, much more reasonable in fact, than the current system, and I would personally be happy with this outcome, \$300 can still be a lot of money for some folks. I can understand a fine like that for significant offences like destroying park property, but hope that it wouldn't be commonplace to cite people for things like being at the park after hours with a \$300 fine. I also have concerns about it showing up in employment background checks for people but since it's virtually the lightest criminal offence there is I think most people without extensive other criminal activity on their record could probably explain it to the potential employer.

I think the city is asking for more trouble. I would rather see city working on keeping our sidewalks safe, and free from ice and snow. Keeping yards looking good. Monitoring curb appeal down some of our city streets. Just down Maryland or White Bear Ave, there are homes that are boarded up, grass that is growing long, weeds on the boulevard making it hard to see traffic. How do we get people to maintain their property.

I think vandalism or theft ruin things for everyone else and those people should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. Especially the people who think everything is their personal graffiti canvas.

I would be concerned that individuals who are chronic law-breakers would get away with more illegal activity and not have accountability for what they are doing.

I would hope that the sheriff's office would still use education rather than a citation unless someone is a repeat offender. I'd assume that many of the violations are due to ignorance of the ordinances.

I would leave it the same as it currently is. If you can't follow the rules, you should pay.

I would suggest a "3 strike" sort of rule - repeat offenders should pay higher fines and have it noted on their records.

I'm concerned that \$300 would still be hard for people to pay and that the misdemeanor would prevent them from being hired places to be able to afford to pay fines like this one or other essential bills.

I'm in favor of warnings, followed by temporary bans, followed by permanent bans. Violations to bans become criminal cases.

I'm thinking of basic violations like noise ordinance & dog poop. Those should most definitely NOT be on someone's permanent record. A fine should be sufficient.

If a violation is not causing monetary or physical damage to another person or public property or would not be considered a misdemeanor outside the bounds of the public space then no fine or criminal charge should be levied against the violator. Tit for tat.

If a violation is not violating other laws this still seems too steep, especially since most of these should be dealt with through education first.

If it is not serious criminal behavior should not show up on background checks.

If people want to camp overnight they should have to sign in, at least and pay a damage deposit (like in the State Parks). The county park cannot be a substitute for a homeless shelter; and if it becomes this it is a reflection of the current problem of unaffordable housing-which needs to be addressed immediately. We camp at a Hennepin county park which is very well maintained and overnight guests are registered and charged. It seems to work out very well, and it is better maintained than many State Parks.

If someone does more than 300\$ of damage to park property, are they still limited to that \$300 fine?

If the City has these rules, they need to actually enforce them and not bend over when there is a violation. If they can't be enforced, don't implement them.

If the rules are not being equally enforced or if people are reporting unequally towards one group of people, it becomes a hinderance on the violator's life. For some park users a fine of \$300 may cause a large financial burden.

If there's an equity issue then deal with the injustice. But don't make it less safe for law abiding citizens. I like using it as an educational tool unless serious. Or petty first time but that should be kept on the County Sheriff's records for future. Second time Misdemeanor. You can bet after I was pulled over for illegally driving on an emergency lane (running late to drive my kids to school) I used it as a teach moment but didn't do it again. Hey nobody has money to burn. It should be explained repeatedly in bold red signs what a misdemeanor is. It seems the only ppl who would be for this are ppl who don't want to follow Ordinances. Sherrifs should be held accountable if the majority of citations are of one race and that neighborhood is equally mixed then somethings off.

If they break ordinances have them come back and do volunteer hours to clean up the park.

Impact of silly decisions on future life goals seems disproportionate. Educating still a good first step.

Implement Option B

In my opinion \$300 is a LOT of money for some people. We want them to learn and conform, and be challenged to obey the law. We don't want to "hurt" them.

Individuals may not have the funds to pay the fine or may be unable to take time off of work for a court hearing.

Is it enough? Data should be compiled continuously to determine whether it is working well. The key is to reduce crime.

Is there a way to have some violations a petty misdemeanor (destruction of property) and others an administrative fine (in park after hours)?

It can be hard enough for some people to get jobs, and it's better to have people be productive and at a job, than out on the streets getting into trouble.

It could be unfairly applied and hurt people who are already struggling to make do

It doesn't really matter. If your one of the protected groups you won't be prosecuted anyway.

It has generally been the experience that issues we have seen/experienced in the park never have enforcement. I am pro education but when there is never enforcement there does not seem to be changes in behavior. Additionally, those committing the violation are usually not from the area so have no idea of the rules.

It is still a lot of money for a relatively harmless infraction.

It is very annoying, as a skier, to have people walking in the ski trails. However, aren't we just glad people are using the parks? and park signs are so confusing sometimes, even to people who work in parks! It's absurd to charge people for walking in a ski trail, unless they are purposely destroying it.

It might not be equitably enforced, e.g. BIPOC will face harsher penalties and might be more harmed by a \$300 fine.

It should not be a misdemeanor to simply be in a park after hours, especially if you keep the sunrise/sunset model. Criminalizing non-criminal behavior doesn't produce the desired result of keeping people out or making them clean up their garbage. when enforced by police or staff trained to consider any infraction criminal things only spiral out of control. Anything categorized as "non-criminal" but probably shows up on a background check might as well be classified as criminal. For being in a park after dark. Think about that.

It shouldn't be a misdemeanor offense.

It's not something that should be Limiting someone's ability to work.

It's time for everyone to just follow the rules.

Keep and enforce the fine at \$300. Create a way to reduce the offense to an administrative fine to keep off background checks for lesser violations for first offenders.

Keep existing penalties for more significant offences.

Keep the way it is. People need to be accounts for what they do.

Laws and rules punished by fix dollar amounts don't effect everyone the same. Fine should be a percentage based on last year's taxable income.

Leave the current laws in place!

Less consequential citations will be unlikely to address the parking violations

Let the justice system determine what is fair and proper

Likely to not be enforced because of the busy court system.

Lower fine that does not use judicial system

Maintain the existing fines and penalties.

Make it even higher. So tired of seeing park damage/city damage with graffiti. Employers should be able to see criminal behavior on a background check. Appeals are still available which is a chance to argue your case.

Make it harsher for repeat offenses

Makes criminals out of people smoking in the wrong place at the wrong time. Not worth it.

Many misdemeanors upon conviction are certified as petty misdemeanors, which means that the ultimate penalty imposed is the same as currently suggested by the survey. Starting with a petty misdemeanor charge reduces the county's negotiating position when interacting with people who committed the unlawful offenses. Moreover, to the extent that convictions have "negative equity impacts," these are merely in response to the negative equity impacts that violations of the park ordinance create in the first place - if someone's playing music loudly after hours and disrupting nearby residents' ability to sleep, of course that individual will be treated differently than someone who does not violate the ordinance.

May be too strong for first offense. Repeat offenders should likely be subjected to this.

May prevent an individual from obtaining employment

Maybe after 2-3 violations a fine no jail time

Minor violations should not go on a person's record until several repeat violations. Allow alternate ways to "pay" fines that are non-monetary.

misdemeanors shouldn't affect employment or housing

Mone

Most violations listed do not warrant affecting employment background check.

Multiple abusers should be fined more with each new offense

My concern is that these petty misdemeanors will show up on the background check and these are going to be younger kids or the currently underhoused and it's going to create a loop of individuals who can't get ahead in life.

My concern with this is that a person could still have something small on their record, which may not be necessary.

Need more enforcement, especially of walking on groomed trails in the winter.

No change is warranted

No fine for after hours. Max fine for damaging property

No opinions about these options except that it sounds like there should be much more variation in which infractions trigger which punishments.

No penalties against youth

No real benefit. Employers would view it the same.

No, reducing penalties increases crime and reduces public safety. Leave things as they are.

Not all violations are created equal. Some shouldn't even be petty. Damage to property should be a misdemeanor.

Not all violations or violators or motives are equal. So varies fines and opportunities for work.

Not appropriate deterrent or penalty for property damage.

Not enough of a deterrent

Not much different from the current state

Not sure that the punishment fits most of the "crimes" - i.e. too excessive.

Not sure why these would have to show up in an employment background check unless it was a serious offense??

How silly does it sound to have a negative score on your background check if you stepped on some cross country trails? I ski so I know how valuable those trails are but someone may be injured and trying to get back to their car??

Too much gray area here

Nothing wrong with this.

Obviously the real problem is you've made the punishment not fit the crime. Damaging park property should be illegal and criminal. Walking on a ski trail is not.

One consideration is that park users may not be familiar with rules that they violate; aggressive fines might be out of proportion to the actual offense where education and awareness efforts might be more appropriate or effective.

Park violations should not lead to showing up on a background check. Petty misdemeanors are inequitably distributed based on race, and disproportionately affect lower income individuals.

Penalty out weighs the crime.

People need to be accountable for their behavior. It is not an equity issue if you obey the law.

People should not be breaking the ordinance if they don't want it on their employment record.

Petty misdemeanors that show up on a background check can wreck a person's chance to get employment later. Violating a park rule as a thoughtless youth or recent high school graduate shouldn't wreck employment opportunities and family wealth opportunities for generations to come. I've seen it happen with a friend of mine. POC, made one stupid mistake as an 18yo, and struggled to get jobs the rest of his life. Led to depression and divorce when he couldn't adequately provide for the family.

Possibly more focus on additional education on park rules & regulations.

Pretty tough for a first time offender

Property damage should be taken more seriously .

Provides more penalty for offenses.

Quit trying to make ordinances that are impossible to enforce.

Race and inequality have NOTHING to do with illegal behavior. Stop excusing it!

Raise the amount to \$1,000.00.

Reducing fines may cause reduced compliance.

Regular reviews of how the violations are being enforced in practice to address equity concerns makes sense. This level appears to maintain the ability for enforcement to exercise discretion as appropriate and penalize more egregious violations.

REMOVE it from background checks for employment! Give them the ability to do community service in the parks. This is preferable over fines. Fines hurt those who cannot pay, and the record reduces chance of good employment. Neither of these are good solutions (at least not for first-time offenders)

Rules for areas should be posted, not just assuming that people know the rules. Parks should be locked when not open.

see below

See previous answers. Park use should not be criminalized.

Seems extreme for parking violations.

Seems like a good idea.

Seems like a harsh penalty

Seriously wish they would do this. We see flagrant violations all the time. I'm sick of wishing I could safely make comments to rule breakers. Dog crap, dogs (and walkers!) on the groomed ski trails, fishing bait and food trash everywhere, people wading in Sucker and Vadnais Lakes as well as people, dogs and kids walking on the (unsafe) ice. Education would be awesome, but most of these people know the rules!

Should be no appeal option.

Should not be a misdemeanor

Showing up at on a background check is extreme. Especially if it their first time

Showing up on a background check doesn't seem necessary

Showing up on a background check is ridiculous

Showing up on an employment background check is a problem. This can then make it impossible for a person who made a stupid choice as a young person to become a successful adult.

Showing up on employment check is pretty drastic for what is basically a legal activity

Shows up on background check, still has a penalty that (at least as stated) cannot be changed for volunteer work or based on income.

So what if the cops don't like me, for any reason, they can potentially ruin my career prospects for being in the park after hours? Or failing to yield to traffic that is supposed to yield to me as a pedestrian in a cross walk under state law?

So why not a warning or some separate administrative process to adjudicate these?

Something coming up on employment background check seems excessive depending on the action. Overall seems like a hassle for both parties

Sounds like another way our society is bending to allowing criminals dictate what should occur. Keep the more strict penalty in place and enforce it!

Start with education and keep a record so repeat offenders can be penalized as needed without punishing a first offense, for someone who may have acted out of ignorance. Also, keep track of race/ethnicity so there is data to show whether there is disparate impact on particular groups. What we really need is for employers and landlords to stop using years-ago, minor offenses against people, but that is clearly outside the scope of the current decisions..

Static fines are not based on income percentage

Stay off of background checks

Still concerning that something that petty can go on permanent record.

Still creates a possible economic burden. Still very likely that citations imposed inequitably

Still criminalize activity and possibility of discrimination with long term impacts.

Still criminalizing simple rules. Option B is better.

Still don't like the criminal record for minor violations.

still has impacts on minorities

Still not an ideal solution, because \$300 is still a large amount, and involvement of the courts is likely not warranted in most cases.

Still on background

Still seems a bit harsh.

Still showing on a background can be a disadvantage to that person for a non-violent crime that they may have committed years ago.

Still would show up on employment checks. So it's better but still not great.

Stop

stop using our lands as a money maker off the poor

Takes up more resources needing to appeal it in court. Depends on the violation. \$300 might be too much or too little, depending on the issue.

The \$300 fine could be difficult for individuals of low economic standing to pay.

The above paragraph states that misdemeanor violations have "negative equity impact". What does this even mean? "Negative equity" is a term used in investing. I'm at a loss for what it is supposed to mean in this context. And this lack of clarity makes this process more difficult. If this is a reference to a racial component, then I'm equally baffled. If bringing charges in these cases is a last resort, then allow park staff to decide how to proceed based on each unique situation.

The background says maximum, but how often is that number used? Is the \$300 more typical? A thousand dollars and 90 days in jail is much more punitive than just the \$300, and seems excessive for some of the potential violations.

The biggest concern is the fine and I have this with all fine penalties. Fines disproportionately affect low incomes rather than see community service than monetary fines

The fine is too high and this type of offense shouldn't impede someone's ability to get a job. That doesn't help anyone.

The maximum is NEVER imposed already. Ever. Ever ever. So why take that away?

The presence on an employment background check is an over reach.

The repercussions seem too high. I would prefer a lesser offense. (I do not smoke, btw)

The Sheriff's department should continue to try to change behavior and only use more severe penalties as citations as a last resort, but the more severe penalties should remain on the books as a deterrent.

The world has always had bad people. Hence why we need rules and consequences. Please keep our parks safe for children, seniors, law-abiding residents and all those that are healthier because they can safely enjoy nature.

There are many violations that deserve harsher punishments. Damage and vandalism are examples

There is the possibility for abuse of this if the person patrolling is not aware of biases or may be susceptible to the feeling of having power over another, and abusing it.

This is definitely going too far. Something like this showing up on someone's background check can and likely will hurt someone's future.

This is inequitable to those who are low-income and cannot pay the fine. I would suggest a community service option to those who cannot pay.

This is quite heavy compared with things like speeding fines (which are related to life-death issues)

This level of deterrent could still be devastating to people without resources -- both financially and in terms of entanglement with court/admin. I'm glad to read that citations are last resort after education/intervention. From what I read above, it seems like infractions need more distinct classifications. Reasonable use of the park when it's "closed" is radically different from intentional vandalism, or damage to natural areas. Parking violations should simply be that, not part of a generic category of "bad" behavior.

this may be beneficial for the people who intend to break the rules on purpose (poachers, trash dumpers, vandalism). Also, would the sheriff still use education over citation?

This seems a bit harsh.

This seems a little harsh for violations and inconsistent with the statement on education

This seems excessive

This seems harsh. I do not want to criminalize tobacco. Or I do but it is not right.

This seems like too harsh a penalty. In life, I sometimes break little rules but I'm generally a good citizen. As a white middle-aged woman, I know I'm very likely to get away with it without ever being confronted. How are park ordinances enforced? Is there a warning process? Do you have demographic data on violators?

This shows that we are more tolerant of people not following rules. This might appeal to rich people that have big yards with lake shore and would not need to use the parks for a place to take their children to play. If you are so concerned with equity you could make the fine as a % of someone's net worth.

This still feels too harsh, and I have no confidence that it will be equitably enforced.

This still seems like an extreme penalty and could disproportionately impact the lives of disadvantaged groups.

uncertain

Uneven/discriminatory enforcement that creates barriers for marginalized peoples

Unless the police are around it is hard to catch people violating any ordinance. McCarron's Beach is often trashed with litter (I have pictures and your cleaning staff knows the issues) but I don't believe anyone is ever charged with littering. Possible a fee could be charged at the parks to help offset the cost of monitoring behavior in the parks. Also when people have to pay to use something they tend to take better care of things.

Unsure about lack of differentiation. Are some circumstances worse than others? Leads me to lean to Option B.

Use data to track actual violations given and the behavior leading to that to ensure that the punishment isn't too strong for the violation.

use education that requires the student to actually produce some thing - A PowerPoint, an essay, an artwork, food, A constructed object, A performance, or some kind of productive piece even if it is in their own language, or culturally appropriate craft or skill.

Use fines & procedures that stay outside the court system

Vandals should perform community service and have to work in the parks collecting trash, cleaning graffiti, etc. They should be educated to understand why what they did was wrong & work to correct the issue in every park that has the same issue

violations may have unintended consequences for employment, housing and immigration .

Violations Shouldn't have lasting impacts to citizens.

Walking on a ski trail shouldn't impact your job chances.

Walking on groomed ski trails is a huge problem. This needs to be remedied. Weakening the penalties is going in the wrong direction

WE WANT RAMSEY COUNTY TO PATROL MORE AND ENFORCE MORE.

What is the financial implication to this decision. If damage is done consider person in violation to be held responsible for costs of repairs.

While petty misdemeanors may make sense for some ordinance violations, it still seems heavy for most, which brings us to Option B.

Who is going to enforce this? When enforcement is so lax already.

Why are all violations lumped into same category? Does not make sense to me. Property damage should be handled differently than a parking violation, and there are varying degrees of property damage.

why have rules and laws if we don't enforce them? We have rules so others can enjoy the park for the intended purpose, things like walking on ski trails is damaging the trails for those who must pay to use them.

Why not an administrative fine- without it being on their record- or a tiered system- after 2 or 3 violations- it's a petty misdemeanor, misdemeanor, etc.

Why not have the person contribute to the community in a positive way? For example, If you break something, fix it! We sure would have a lot of kids learning auto repair by now! Stop feeling sorry for people who ruin things - not working! If \$ is main factor, contribute time a - might actually learn a new skill or wow - empathy! Lack of consequences is hurting the individual the most. I don't think smoking is a crime - I think starting a fire IS. Or ruining property - this basic disrespect not learned at home, in school, society is hurtful to everyone. I was a Peace Corps volunteer in a remote village in Africa and believe me, there were self-monitoring social norms - and expectations. High expectation of contribution to home and community at all ages and stages as I was brought up. My father is now 98 - mother passed at 91 - both worked into their 80s! And enjoyed life and didn't feel it would be "better" if we had low expectations of behavior - and taught with kindness.

Will still likely not be enforced

Will the courts enforce this?

Without enforcement ordinances are moot anyway.

Would likely tie up the court system even more than it is already . . .

Would still want the public to see that violating parks laws still will be taken seriously & following the park rules matters

Yes!

You are looking to make it easier for those breaking the rules. You are just asking them to do it more with less repercussions = not good.

You need to stop making these violations misdemeanors or crimes. Period. I once got a parking ticket at a park after I already paid for my permit. The permit fell from its spot on the window after I stuck it there. The sticker didn't stick. I had a court date in another county but couldn't make it due to work so I paid the fee not understanding that it was a criminal offense. This showed up on my record. It was ridiculous that something as minimal a parking fee escalated to a criminal offense. You need to remove the violation level away from crimes, period.

Keep the ordinance the way it is, if you don't want it on the your record then don't do it.

What is the follow up if people don't show up to court or pay their fine?

This is more criminalizing and could impact people's future life. Could be something small that is done as a teenager that could impact employment opportunities

Hard to lump all penalties together, more options would be better

Not all ordinance violations are equal severity - consider breaking down further.

Another way for law enforcement to negatively interact with residents.

Most people have no idea what the difference is misdemeanor vs petty misdemeanor - still a scary and stressful interaction with a cop.

Sometimes people don't know that they are violating park rules...maybe warnings first?

Violations may vary...so one penalty system for different levels of violations don't sound too equitable.

Court processes can be onerous

Would be curious about the demographics of those who are actually cited currently and want to ensure avoiding bias in any choice selected.

RCSO starts harassing people before the parks are even closed. Again negative interactions.

This doesn't seem to address the fact that some violations are very different - more or less egregious - than others.

As the white mother of a child of color, I fear every time my son goes to the park or other public space that he will be unfairly targeted.

I wonder how it would be enforced fairly?

Violations and fines are not advertised in the park

Especially after what happened to the boys at Minnehaha Park a couple years ago.

Believe me, it is scary enough to have a law enforcement officer approach my child. As well, BIPOC have enough systemic racism against them that having something like this show up on a background check only makes things worse.

Rules are set forth for a reason. To protect the park and the folks who choose to participate in it. If you are respectful to the property then there is no risk for punishment. If there is a misunderstanding, then an appeal can be made.

Rules are set forth for a reason. To protect the park and the folks who choose to participate in it. If you are respectful to the property then there is no risk for punishment. If there is a misunderstanding, then an appeal can be made.

Do we have data around a problem, or do we just think there is one? You state officers rarely cite in favor of education, so what is the problem? Sounds like a good approach.

Municipal officers are tasked with enforcing these ordinances in county parks, but don't seem to have been approached for their input.

Practice should match ordinance and vice versa. If education is the way to gain compliance, violations shouldn't be allowed to result in criminal (or non-criminal) fines.

Court system may be clogged with non violent offenses.

Allow others in the park to report the offense

Keep status quo.

Need someone to enforce.

People need consequences for their actions

This is still prohibitive, and messy -- navigating the court system is challenging and not inclusive.

Fines and Penalties Option B - What's appealing about this?

Option B: Violations result in an administrative fine.

What's appealing about this?

A minor infraction will not follow the person through their life

A more flexible approach to dealing with the offense and penalizing in a fair manner. A single, petty offense should not show up on a criminal record.

A more forgiving "low end" for minor offenses, and a higher penalty for more dangerous offenses. The option to work off an offense - this seems especially good for incidents involving young people who aren't employed and whose parents would be paying a fine instead.

A small infraction for breaking a rule in a park should NOT show up on an employment check.

a violation should not show up on background checks. this is the better solution

Ability to substitute volunteer work is a great idea - - and the hearing panel would not take up court time. AND the penalty for not participating/paying make sense.

Addresses equity concerns

Administrative fine makes way more sense.

Administrative fines could be used to offset enforcement costs. Volunteer work substitution helps those who cannot pay the fine and, actually may be a more effective and positive enforcement.

Administrative, fair.

Affordable for many, but it's good there's an option to deliberate about the violation and have service option for those who lack income.

Affordable, resolvable, and doable. I like this option.

Again depends on the severity of the offense. But having people volunteer (maybe cleaning up the park even) might be a better punishment than a fine. Make them channel time in a positive way

Again more fair for walkers who meant no harm

Again, this is fine as long as the violations and fines are not dismissed.

Agree

Agreed.

Allows a way out of using it on their record.

Allows alternate to payment

Allows for 2nd chances if people are not aware of rules

Allows for more education about park behavior

Allows for more leniency and reasonable cost if violations are not severe nor do they affect background checks if the fine is paid in time. I also like that if the fine isn't paid initially it can then lead to a more severe consequence.

Allows for some discretion

Allows individuals to serve their community and keeps background clear for future employment opportunities.

Allows offender to be educated without a record.

Also a good option, but perhaps not as much of a deterrent

Also decent

Also like this option- more matching the severity.

Also seems reasonable

Also seems reasonable - depending on the violation

An administrative fine typically has a "cure period" whereby the offender has a specific amount of time to stop doing what they're doing wrong - it doesn't really seem to fit here. If they are smoking or vandalizing & they have a few days to stop, what's the point?

An option for repeat offenders who don't change behavior after warnings

Appeals hopefully easier. Like idea of volunteer work instead of fine.

As a retired prosecutor I believe this might be more effective than the present system and would likely result in more citations being issued for bad behavior. The truth is judges don't want their docket filled with these types of violations.

Beat option. Punishment more closely aligns with the violations.

best

best idea

Best option; consequences with an option to redeem

Best option...person is educated and corrected. If they don't comply or appeal it gets escalated

Best proposed option. Fines and volunteer work would directly benefit affected parks. Greater opportunity for education.

Best solution.

Better for racial equity

Better likely to enforce. Offers a teachable moment

Better of the two options. In a park or out of a park, if it is a crime it should be treated as such. Walking on a ski trail is not a crime in my view. Vandalism and willful destruction of property is a crime. Violations of park "rules" in most cases does not rise to the level of being a crime in my view. Some, but not all of these should be considered an administrative fine type offense. Most are likely to be of the "warning", "don't do that any more" sort of offense

Better option

Better option for actually giving out fines to deter undesirable behavior

Better option unless significant violation.

Better option.

Better than criminalizing a petty violation but still not great.

Better than the first option

Better than what is

Better— it has a reasonable amount of consequences and won't have a lasting impact on someone.

Better, but still seems to unfairly hit those with less time or money

Better.

Can leverage better behavior without permanent effects if the person cooperates.

Changing more offenses to non-criminal is a great step!

Choices for the perpetrators & some teeth in court if not followed through

Community/volunteer work is appreciated. I would not want the person to go to jail for 90 days, that seems excessive

Consequences without potential long-term damage to employment or housing.

Create what are determined to be fair rules that keep law and order and enforce them so parks may be enjoyed by all without intimidation by others.

Creates a pathway to resolution with minor impact, with increasing penalties when there is a clear failure of accountability.

Crime sucks. The fine is confusing.

criminal penalties not required for these types of violations

Damaging park property etc. is not at the same level as walking on the street trail in winter. Penalty should not be the same for both crimes.

Decriminalizes the activity but still acts as a deterrent.

Definitely will not impact future employment opportunities. The ability to increase the penalty for non-payment seems fair to all individuals.

Despite the increased consequences, most people will only see the \$100.00 fine, which is manageable by most. Most people don't think of long-term, extended consequences.

Do something wrong and pay the price-community service is not bad and a person can do this

does not go on a person's record

Does not go on one's record if the rules are followed.

Does not go on record

doesn't bog down the court system.

Doesn't default to being on background checks. Allows people fine-free option to make amends.

Doesn't excessively penalize people for minor mistakes. I REALLY like the idea of volunteer work being substituted for a fine. That prevents someone from being hit with larger charges due to poverty and might help some younger people appreciate the parks more.

Doesn't need to be a crime. Just give warnings. Then maybe 3 counts and a fine. It may mostly be teenagers hanging out. Do not need this taken to court.

Don't know

Don't need to clog the already burdened court system.

Easy way to hold people accountable by making them do the minimum and if they don't they get the maximum penalty.

Educate.

Encourages compliance

Enforceable, but not necessarily permanent

equitable. process allows for alternatives to fines.

Even better idea. This option would deter bad behavior in most cases.

Even better than \$300

Everything Love this option

Excellent idea. See my comment to the previous question.

Fairness here

favor this method for fines

Fine and volunteer work is good. Make them clean up the park. We shouldn't hurt people's ability to get work. Maybe some volunteer from home in case they can't get child care?

Fines are a simple start to an escalation process

Fines are fine. There needs to be some consequences for actions,

Fines mandated by the board, equitable and appeals are reasonable and aligned with the Parks.

For lesser offenses

For minor infractions, parking etc makes sense

Forgiveness and lenience allow violators to participate in reparations to improve the park for all.

Give the individual options and penalty for failure

Gives a better option...doesn't affect the possibility of getting a job. Consequences if person doesn't follow through.

Gives a chance to repair a mistake.

Gives people a chance! Rules aren't always clear and that isn't always our fault. Intentions are a big part of this and well intentioned people would rather pay a fine for misunderstanding than have something go on record.

Volunteering opportunity is a nice thought for those tight on cash, although usually those people are also tight on time, too.

Gives them a chance before it impacts a background check.

good alternative option than the criminal justice system

Good approach for first time offenders but only if the offense was for parking, walking on snow, etc. and NOT for destruction of park property.

Good for first offenses, rules out those who "didn't know" or feel marginalized

Good idea

Good idea

Good idea. Poor people suffer with fines. The rest of us pay. Giving an option for community service would help

Good option. Stricter only if necessary.

Great idea.

Great suggestion

Great way to teach summertime through volunteer work. Helps community and doesn't hurt the person who failed to follow the rules.

Has some "teeth" in the punishment but not as nasty as Option A.

Higher fine means more of a cost to breaking the rule. Yes to this option.

Hold them accountable

Holds people accountable, but does not go on permanent records.

Hopefully helps teach and coach people to be a better citizen / person. Especially if they didn't know the rule vs. breaking the rule on purpose. That said people's nature is to break little rules (i.e. ones that don't cause huge issues) for their own good/benefit.

I am a fan of restorative justice

I am not a lawyer but it seems the violations for misdemeanors should be left in the hands of the justice system and not open to interpretations by a county park board

I assume the county would get to keep the whole fine and not share with the state which is good for the county.

I definitely like the idea of restitution. It makes more sense to do work in the park rather than do jail time. It would have to be done in a way that actually connects with the community and was not just punitive or it would just become a step before fines. Hard to know how to enforce it though. Depending on behavior 90 days in jail seems insane. I can't think of a park violation where that makes sense.

I do like this option even better than option A, but believe failure to comply with penalty should start at petty misdemeanor.

I do not approve on fines, court etc. might be better to continue education.

I don't know if any of this will work. People still need to open their wallets for payment, and I don't think that is going to happen.

I don't like the idea of a criminal record for walking on a ski trail. Some people don't even realize this is wrong.

I don't think people should be assessed a misdemeanor for these violations unless they're repeated often. I would rather see an administrative fine, with an option for community service. \$100 is a lot for some people to pay and I don't want to add to their economic insecurity by setting high fines or making these misdemeanors. Parks are great places for everyone, even if they don't have a lot of money.

I don't think a criminal charge for most is needed.

I feel like fines are usually given to the folks that will have the most trouble paying them, and I don't really think that's fair. I don't think they are necessary unless someone is stealing something or harming someone.

I feel that damage to a park - that results in the county needing to repair a structure or other facility, should be repaid by the criminal. If they burn a play area, that pay for it (cash and volunteer). Make them be held accountable for their actions. I feel accountability has become too lenient.

I find this economically better but aren't we sending the wrong message to those in our society who willfully break the very rules we set up to maintain order.

I guess I like this better. The volunteer work should be doing something in the park such as picking up trash on the grounds or landscaping.

i guess if you have to have something this is ok

I know this is the way the Three Rivers district handles violations, and think this is a good approach. There is still a financial deterrent for bad behavior, and the threat of legal action if it's unresolved, but it's a reasonable step up from education, especially for repeat or especially egregious offenders.

I like a fine that dissuades people from doing the activity but doesn't get reported to credit agencies to impact people's credit. I especially like the ability for people to work it off instead of paying the fine.

I like it.

I like option A better since it carries more weight and discourages violations to begin with

I like that it gives people a chance to reform.

I like that it is non-criminal and that there is a fee-free way to make amends (volunteer work).

I like the concept that a parking ticket isn't showing up on a criminal background check. The enforcement of park rules should be punitive but \$100 is enough to open most peoples eyes to the rule enforcement in the area. \$300 to \$1,000 is something that could prevent a local resident from being able to pay rent.

I like the fact this option does not create a criminal record.

I like the first part; dislike the second. Violations that go unpaid should be converted to a petty misdemeanor only.

I like the idea of it not being consider criminal and can be "paid" by volunteer work for those that don't have the means to pay.

I like the idea of volunteer work being an option. Have them cut buckthorn or do other natural resources enhancement tasks.

I like the idea of volunteering as a fine could be prohibitive to someone.

I like the inexpensive fine. However, the consequences of failure are problematic and makes it a way bigger deal than it likely should be.

I like the lack of effect on record. Volunteer option is also nice, May create options for someone w less \$\$.

I like the option for volunteer instead of fine option

I like the option for volunteer work.

I like the option of volunteer work as a substitution for the fine - actually directly benefit the park instead of ending up in a vague government account somewhere.

I like the option of volunteer work.

I like the option to hit harder if needed.

I like the reduction.

I like the volunteer aspect of this option

I like the volunteer work, especially if it included cleaning up in the parks.

I like the volunteer work.

I like this - it does feel fairer for many who use the park who may be of a lower SES.

I like this a lot. It allows people to learn from their mistakes and volunteer rather than pay a fine. It also doesn't show up on an employment background check so should not hinder the violator's life as long as they pay the fine or do volunteer work. Volunteer work is a great way to get people involved in the park (even if it's not their choice) and hopefully learn more. It also gives them the opportunity to engage with other members of the community.

I like this as it gives the person the ability to volunteer the offense away.

I like this because the limit is lower. There is still a penalty to be paid. They can appeal it. And they could volunteer instead of use money. But that it can't just be ignored.

I like this better. It has options, appeal process, and scaled consequences.

I like this even more. It'll allow RCSO to issue more citations without affecting people's employment for a simple tobacco violation.

I like this idea because it begins with a very minor fine for the minor infractions but if not paid, it converts to a more serious consequence.

I like this idea. It gives a person the chance to make things right before they are saddled with a mark on their

I like this one if they follow up on the people who don't comply.

I like this one. I don't think everyone deserves a record.

I like this option as it offers restitution and an opportunity to work off a fine if a person simply doesn't have the funds to pay the fine.

I like this option because it allows people to do work (maybe cleaning up the parks or nearby roads) without having a violation on their record but still provides a consequence for violations. Plus gives jobs for those overseeing the work.

I like this option best. If they have multiple noise violation then it would need to increase

I like this option better than Option A. Unless people are destroying property, or committing a crime - why do they need to do any jail time, or pay a lot of money for using a park after hours or parking somewhere?

I like this option better. I have seen evidence of vandalism that deserves some consequence (burning the planks on bridges and vandalism to benches, trees and docks)

I like this option more, doesn't clog up the courts, and still has teeth.

I like this option, still provides a penalty but doesn't go on record

I like this option, that would allow the person either to pay or volunteer to pay the fine off.

I like this option.

I like this solution. People should be responsible for their actions.

I like this.

I love this. More equitable. Love the idea of being able to do volunteer work instead of the fine for those unable to pay.

I prefer option A.

I prefer this option -- keep the violations out of the courts unless necessary.

I prefer this option. Having an avenue to resolve violations without thrusting people directly into the criminal justice system would be much better for our community and county. I would like to see community members involved in this hearing panel rather than from the criminal justice system.

I really like this option. \$100 or less is reasonable, and I like that people are able to give back to the community in exchange for a fine. I also like that something as trivial as a violation would result in something on their record, and wouldn't prevent them from being hired anywhere.

I support this approach - community service to cover the fine is an equitable option. As long as there are adequate times and resources available to volunteer their services.

I think administrative fines might be better for less serious violations

I think having them do community service is a great idea.

I think if it even escalates to a person actually receiving a fine, this would be the best course.

I think it carries the appropriate amount of deterrent.

I think it is better if it is non-criminal - unless they persist in doing it. I also like that volunteer work is an option - fines can really be a financial hardship.

I think the fine can even be less. Even \$50 is a tough amount to waste.

I think the punishment should fit the crime. For little things like, being in the park after hours, or walking on ski trails in the winter this sounds good. If they damage park property they should have to fix it/ pay for it to be repaired and some other volunteer work.

I think this is better as someone may have walked on a ski trail unintentionally, so should be fined and educated, but not have it go in record for employment later on. Especially if not done anything destructive in park before.

I think this is the best option. Especially the part about being able to turn a fine into community service. Not only does this mean that a person may not lose money (this being a huge problem for people already struggling financially), but working to improve the park will teach a better appreciation for the parks and natural spaces, and may discourage further violations by making people care more about the parks. This could be especially useful for a smoking ban in park grounds. Catch someone smoking, make them clean up litter (a great deal of which is cigarette butts) in the parks.

I think this is the better option of the two. I think that the smaller fine that avoids the already overburdened court system and doesn't go on peoples' records for employment is preferable for the vast majority of offences. I also think that the ability to do volunteer work as an option to pay it off is a very good one and I think would be helpful for folks who don't have very much money. I think you're more likely to get people who will come and work than will pay the fine if they're broke. I think that it's likely to create a greater investment in the park for them in the future than a fine would as well, so hopefully they'll be less likely to reoffend in the parks.

I would prefer this. Avoid the cost of the regular courts. Volunteer time to help clean up parks would be great.

I would rather see violations handed through administrative fines, but fines still disproportionately are given based on race and disproportionately affect lower income individuals.

If enforced, best option, accidental violations would not cause much impact to people, however, stronger violations can be applied as misdemeanors

If it is enforced - fine. But how about when cities are the responder. Not the sheriff?

If society could embrace value of programs to hit a reset button - and not just militarized guidance system, well that would be something. With all of the free wheeling lawlessness we've witnessed in the past 3 years alone, we could have our entire city litter free, fresh trees planted and watered, graffiti scrubbed off, fresh paint - should be glowing by now!

If there needs to be a fee this option seems to have a small amount which I appreciate.

If this is enforced, it may help repeat offenders

Interesting idea but again, damage to a park needs to carry a penalty as many people use the park.

Is a more equitable consequence. I like the option for volunteer work and I appreciate that it can convert to something more substantial if someone tries to brush this off.

It allows people who can't afford or don't want to pay a fine to do volunteer work instead

It becomes a Strike 1, 2, & 3 type approach that hopefully curbs behavior

It considers underprivileged individuals and their inability to pay a fine. It can become more serious if ignored. Further, it could help cut costs for park maintenance.

It gives a consequence without harming peoples ability to work or get housing

It gives people a chance to make or right .

It gives violators the chance to make amends and holds them accountable to a greater degree if they don't follow through

It is handled outside of the court system. Volunteer work can be substituted for the fine. It wouldn't show up on a background check.

It is necessary to state that vandalism and other destruction of property could carry heavier fines than a Misdemeanor or petty Misdemeanor.

It is still a punishment and reason to follow rules, without being so severe.

It may change or correct the behavior of someone carrying out an ordinance violation with ruining their record, but if it does not change the behavior, it will go onto their record.

It might result in more enforcement, and thus more compliance.

It seems to better match the level of the crime

It seems to offer a solution that is commensurate with the problem.

it sends a message with consequences for non adherence or blatant disregard

It should not be a misdemeanor to start with. This is good.

It wouldn't be on someone's record and it has a non- monetary option

It's a consequence that also can add \$\$ to the County treasury and/or result in the offender helping with park maintenance.

It's a deterrent

It's a less "frightening" fine, so it might not deter violations.

It's better than the first option but it's still not great.

It's better than the petty misdemeanor, but still unnecessary

It's not appealing. We need to leverage public safety resources for other needs than ticketing park use or cigarette smoking. Especially for areas like Vadnais that do not have their own police force.

It's somewhat like restitution.

It's a disincentive for people who might be misbehaving. It gets them punished for their problems but it doesn't hurt their record.

It's a lot less punitive so it may be used for repeated offenders.

It's more flexible and matched to the level of offense, with consequences appropriate for the seriousness.

It's more reasonable than the first option

It's not an overly egregious financial penalty, and the opportunity to have people do sweat equity in lieu of a dollar fine is very appealing.

It's not! Why turn this into a court/jail thing. Use volunteer work as a solution instead! Picking up refuse left behind by folks who don't care for our earth is plentiful!!

It's not. You have a serious problem in county parks with people not following the rules. The cross country ski community is starting to avoid places like Tamarak, Como and Battle Creek. You have to decide if you support cross country skiing or not.

its not draconian

Keep the courts available for more significant offenses.

Keeps people accountable but there should be other ways to hold them accountable....

Keeps people from being eliminated from a job. Offers alternatives to financial burden. On the other hand - if you obey the rules there is no problem with employment or having to pay a fine.

Less cost, option for volunteer work

Less impact to poor, BIPOC community members. Volunteer work instead.

Less likely to have unintended consequences.

Less money. Less aggressive in record. Had ability to escalate if not taken seriously.

Less police state !

less punitive than the above

Less punitive while still encouraging compliance

Less severe punishment for minor infractions

Less strict, but should convert to petty misdemeanor first.

Less work flowing through the court system. Effects are less severe and more proportional to the violation.

Like

Like it. Especially option for community service

Like the non monetary option

Like the tiered approach

Limited punishment for relatively inconsequential crimes.

Loosening up the jail facilities

Love it

Love the idea that they do community service! Trash pickup of trails and parks. Graffiti cleanup would be awesome

Love the volunteer work option.

Love this choice. Work it off using all unpaid volunteers as supervisors

Love this idea.

Love this option. Seems to be more suited to "the penalty fitting the crime". Easier to administer vs. Automatically going on record....but has increasing penalty for Non compliance.

low fines

Lower level action which is appropriate for non violent and non dangerous activities

Makes even more sense.

makes more sense

Making violations a non-criminal offense is a sensible approach.

many people will interpret this as there being no penalty for bad behavior

Might be more receptive to the public

Might provide enough deterrent without permanent consequences for a minor offense

Minor penalty, which should present no life long record issues. Comfortable appeals process, and volunteer opportunities available in lieu of fine. Still allowing harder fine for anyone genuinely brazen enough not to care or pay.

Moderates fees and work allows for alternate reparations.

More appealing.

More appropriate fines, outside court system. Opportunity to participate in service to community instead.

More equitable

more equitable

More equitable and appropriate to the circumstance

More fair for ALL

More likely to be enforced

More likely to be enforced since it doesn't burden the court system. Volunteer time can be used to improve the parks.

More of a minor offense when someone did something dumb in their past.

More opportunity to change ones ways, and contribute to society in a positive way

More realistic option.

More reasonable

More reasonable

Much better because it can keep minor violations from affecting people's job and housing prospects.

Much better than anything that goes on a person's record. Still could create economic burden.

much easier to enforce and comply

Much lower fee with option to volunteer and no impact on ability to obtain employment as long as they pay the fee or volunteer

Much more reasonable and less traumatizing to people just trying to stay healthy

n/a

Needs more of a penalty for violation.

No

no comment

No fine should be less than \$100. The work program is another administrative headache. Does it really work? I like the failure to pay converts to a misdemeanor, etc.

No opinion

No opinion

No record created. Still opportunity to escalate for repeat offenses. Like this approach.

No record, low fine, community service. Win win win

No. Most of the people abusing the park appear to be homeless or addiction issues. I don't think they would show up for these things.

Non criminal Like chance to volunteer in place of financial impact

Non criminal offense... is appealing.

Non monetary option

Non-criminal offense

Non-criminal offense seems more reasonable.

Non-criminal.

None

not a bug enough deterrent.

Not a single thing. People who commit crimes should have their job status, college and rent applications, and immigration status impacted. They are criminals.

Not appealing

Not enough staff to supervise the volunteer work idea, appealing as it is if carried through. If people don't behave and break the rules even after being "educated" they need to be held accountable, whoever they are.

Not having something on your record for something petty and non violent. With a community service option!

Not in background check

Not motivational enough

not much

Not much other than volunteer aspect

Not much.

not on record. alternative penalty allows greater flexibility in penalties.

Not punitive enough

Not serious enough.

Not strict enough. Have repeat offenses

Not sure.

Not tying up the court system

Not wasting the courts' time. Violations could be dealt with in a timely matter.

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

Nothing

nothing

Nothing - almost as good as a slap on the wrist. Need consequences for inappropriate behavior and violation of park rules. People need to respect the rule of law and follow it to have a civilization that functions.

Nothing - penalties not enough

Nothing but same as above.

NOTHING NOT A DETERRENT

nothing,

Nothing, because the true criminals will not abide by this and won't be in the position to pay any fine.

Nothing, this is too complicated.

Nothing!

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Nothing. Keep the above fine in place.

Nothing. Never ever will they give that kind of penalty for repeat offenders. Won't happen and 100 is nothing to a smoker who spends that in a week smoking

Nothing. There are no consequences for one's actions anymore.

Novel and interesting, but untried. Still has option to convert to fine if not paid/ volunteering

Offering a non-financial penalty, especially for those individuals who are unable to pay the fine.

OK for lesser violations (walking on a ski trail) but not for vandalizing property, littering, disturbing the peace.

on the surface there are still consequences for violating rules.

Opportunity to learn and do better. It also levels the playing field. The rich don't care about fines, the poor are devastated by them. Small fines and education are great for everyone

Option for low income. Allows mistakes to be worked off.

option of volunteer work as substitution for the fine

Options

Park violations should be non-criminal offenses unless violators are not responsive to the penalty.

Parks are used by people of all levels of income, and thus fines for minor infractions should not negatively impact people of lower income significantly more than those with higher income. The idea that someone could use volunteer work as a substitute to the fine is a great idea. The volunteer work could be focused on park improvement which is far more valuable than the \$100.00 fine anyways.

Penalty for an offense that is posted seems reasonable to me

Penalty is less severe. Wouldn't show up on a background check.

Penalty not steep enough

People are still held responsible for their actions but minor violations are less likely to follow someone around forever on their criminal record.

People can volunteer in lieu of a fine

People fined more likely to be able to pay.

People need some incentive not to break the law. An administrative fine is not enough.

People need to learn to follow the rules and the law. Don't make exceptions. Parents need to teach their kids to be good citizens and respect everyone and the rules.

People still are held accountable for their actions but they won't have anything on a permanent record or be unreasonably fined.

People tag and destroy property today. Why lighten up.

People will be accountable for following rules.

People won't care about this and will make things worse. There will be pressure not to convert.

Perhaps the Sheriff would issue more citations as they are less severe and better data on violations could be tracked and problems addressed

Petty victimless crimes should not work against employment. This would greatly help poorer people sustain. Thank you for considering this.

Pigs

Possibility of volunteer work instead of fine.

Prefer this option for most violations.

Preferable and seems more equitable.

Prevents stupid infractions from permanently affecting ones life, and still allows for some sort of consequences for not following the rules.

Probably also ok

Probably appropriate for most offenses.

Probably more reasonable but too many words

Probably the least discriminatory.

Provides a better solution and more consequences for not complying with the rules

Provides a penalty that doesn't hurt employment. There is also provisions for ignoring the penalty which is good.

Punishment fits the crime.

Puts responsibility where it should go, on the violator with an opportunity to correct it and seems fair for all

Raise the amount no matter what.

Rather see the parks enforcement more aggressive. Leave fines as is.

Reasonable

Reasonable for first offense.

Reasonable for first offenses.

Reduced potential negative impacts while still providing deterrence.

Same answers as above.

Same as above, and this type of thing showing up on a background check seems wack

Same as above.

See my above comments

Seems fair and manageable.

Seems fair and provides action accountability.

Seems like a light fine to me. Nobody will care, and nobody will pay, and there will be nobody will enforce.

Seems like a more practical/affordable solution for violators.

Seems like an appropriate dollar amount. Substituting volunteer work for those unable to pay is a good option.

Seems more equitable

Seems more fair depending on the violation.

Seems more in line with the type of violation.

Seems more reasonable than something going on a background check originally, many options to correct the issue, I think in practice though it may end up worse.

Seems more to the point -- for the Parks to make direct connection with people and log them into its system (in case of further issues or infractions) -- rather than getting them in trouble with the wider legal system from the start. I support offering a non-monetary option. I'd still classify infractions differently (as I wrote above).

Seems most appropriate.

Seems reasonable

Seems reasonable as well as a way to incentivize people to obey rules

Seems reasonable, and enough to be able to enforce basic public decency laws. I am all for fines and enforcing laws like litter and public-area damage laws. If the laws are too extreme, the police will just decide not to try to enforce them.

Seems speedier than court system and no residual carryover to records unless the failure clause comes into play

Seems to better fit the "crimes"

Seems to fit crime more

Should not be a misdemeanor.

Shouldn't be a crime

Similar to my above comment - this feels more in-line than the existing severe punishment.

Small penalty, chance to make it right

Smaller fines with consequences for not paying them

Sounds better

Sounds better than option 1

Sounds even more reasonable!

Sounds fair

Sounds great. Give choice of volunteer work. If violation occurs again, assign clean up duty at parks. Also add education of why not to perform a violation.

Sounds OK

Sounds ok

Sounds reasonable.

Stay off of background checks

Still a Consequence but does not over react.

Still a penalty for damaging property, but seems more appropriate for things like walking on a ski trail in winter.

Still has a fine, but less of a long term impact

Still has an option for actual deterrent

Still holds the person who committed the offense accountable, but some offenses like damaging park property are clearly more wrong than walking on a trail after hours. Can't we separate these different types of offenses? It's not clear why equity is tied to people following rules. Everyone is capable of following rules but breaking some rules should be punished more harshly than others.

Still signals the value of shared public space. Reduces possible impact on livelihood for people of limited means, and young people.

stop with the fines and big brother attitude

Supportive of this, it seems to give more leeway for corrective behavior.

Take out jail and I'm in.

teach and outreach and forgive these

That is a good option too. Administrative fines always better than criminal ones.

That it does not go on their record but it might teach them to not do it again.

That it is a non-criminal offense, and could be appealed.

The ability to do volunteer work.

The ability to use volunteer work rather than money to settle the fine seems reasonable to make it easier for those with more limited means. The discretion to convert to a misdemeanor for failure to settle the administrative fine.

The appeals board.

The criminal system is not involved at all which for minor offenses like not realizing you were improperly on a ski trail.

The failure to pay the fine is a good deterrent.

The fine amount is small which is good. Also, the opportunity to sub volunteer work helps with equitable enforcement.

The fine has to be in line with the activity. My previous comments state this. If there is destruction of property, why would the fine be less than \$100 Why would the fine be the same as parking in the wrong place? The taxpayer ends up paying for the cost of repairing property damage...or cleaning up garbage.....so the fines need to match the crime. Having a "gesture fine" is not going to prevent the issues.

The fine is still too high, but different fines should be attached to different violations depending on the severity or damage. Volunteer work should absolutely be substituted and I don't mean picking up trash. If you're concerned about equity and you have a violation, assign them to parks administrative support so they can work on some skills like data entry or answering phones instead.

The first half of this is beautiful, the second half is extreme. Failure to pay the fine should result in option A.

The first part is more appealing than the first option, but this still seems very overkill.

The first part seems good

The initial options sound more manageable, more equitably distributing punishments with smaller fines and volunteer options.

The lower fine

The non-criminal offense is heading towards equity, especially since MN is likely to pursue court cases against POC.

The non-criminal offense Paris is appealing. It is heading towards equity, since our state is unfortunately so much more likely to pursue court cases against POC.

The official penalty should better match practice. If most violations are treated with education, I think a big fine and marks on a record are totally a problem. Lowest fine possible so people could actually pay it. I don't like the conversion to a misdemeanor/90 days in Jail--Jesus. Far too severe in my opinion. Is there an option where jail isn't even on the table for a park violation? Let's try for that one.

The opportunity to learn from a mistake

The option for decriminalizing the punishments.

The option to volunteer is great

The penalty is more proportional to the violation.

The possibility of community work for paying the fine.

The possibility of substituting volunteer work for the fine. The opportunity for restitution.

The presence of a potential misdemeanor conviction as a sword-of-Damocles approach creates a stronger disincentive to criminal behavior than does the petty misdemeanor.

the price is lower for breaking the rules. I think many people break the rules on accident

The violation is not a criminal offense

The volunteer work is the best idea.

There are consequences for ignoring the initial penalty

There are options here, and it doesn't affect someone's livelihood.

There definitely needs to be a penalty for damaging the park or making it unsafe and these need to be enforced.

There is flexibility for people who may just not be able to afford paying a large monetary fine, or any fine at all.

There is nothing appealing about monetary fines.

There is still a threat of a larger fine and stricter punishment. Breaking the rules results in consequences. Those consequences have to be enough to deter people from doing the offense repeatedly.

This allows for a degree of "education" about the violation, and also, if non-compliant, stronger penalties

This allows someone who does not have the money an alternative. Additionally it allows someone who cannot get go the courts(maybe they work 2 jobs) access through another route.

This also seems just and may allow for more options.

This also seems very reasonable to me, and I like the appeal option and the volunteer work aspect.

This approach sounds like the the most reasonable approach to enforcing the rules of the park system. It also carries the best chance of education in hopes to change behavior, rather than resentment. Affecting someone's record for petty offenses could lead to far greater issues by barring employment, bringing upon lower wages, desperation, crime, and unproductively. If the individual ignores the hearing panel, then the further escalation of penalty's stated above is fair.

This better with the addition of community service and for minor offense to no go on the record.

This converts to a misdemeanor if they fail to pay the fine or missing volunteer work.

This could be a good option too.

This could work in most cases...as long as the person actually pays or does the work

This does let people know that there are consequences to the behavior.

This feels like a nice balance and provides options for those with violations to pay a fine or volunteer time.

This feels more equity-based to me, although I don't have enough knowledge to really back that up. If someone is regularly causing trouble, I would want parks to be able to take stronger action with them. However, ideally we'd still avoid things being done at the discretion of any one person, to keep unconscious bias out.

This free seems more reasonable and allows one to volunteer to make amends instead of pay money they may not readily have. I like that if it's not taken care of, it then is elevated. This seems like the best option.

This gives people the opportunity to make it right on their own by helping the community especially for the low income population. This also shows that more serious consequences result if you don't take responsibility for your actions.

This gives people the opportunity to work the fine off and doesn't create another court case. Leave the courts out of these small infractions.

This gives the offending party the opportunity to settle the situation without the offense going on their record.

This gives the public more equitable ways for correcting a violation.

This is a better option

This is a better option because a person learns a valuable experience volunteering and it gives any one a chance to change first.

This is a better solution

This is a good option. Less of a fine, but hold people accountable for violating the rules

This is a great option

This is a great option if individual is subject to volunteer work.

This is a less restrictive penalty and also provides the opportunity to educate the violator through volunteer work.

This is a more educational method of enforcement. I think this is more appropriate

This is a nice middle of the road option. It is a real consequence without being unduly harsh

This is a reasonable option as long as it is enforced

This is a reasonable response to an public offense.

This is also a good idea as it doesn't have such harsh penalties. Serves as a tough reminder rather than a harsh crime penalty

This is also a good option but not converting it to a misdemeanor. That's too harsh I think.

This is better for low level offenses such as parking issues, biking recklessly , or other rule violations. I believe this is how many other park systems operate

This is better option as the consequences increase if person fails to meet initial fine. I also like the idea of volunteer work as a result of violation. This helps if someone does not have the finances to pay.

This is by far the best option, in my opinion. Studies have repeatedly shown that harsh penalties don't do a good job of preventing crime, they only punish those that have done the crime. These heavy punishments disproportionately affect the poorest citizens of our communities, pushing them further into poverty. This route is restorative, allowing people to learn the codes and participate in their community through volunteer work

This is fair, has a fair escalation path, allows time to remediate

This is fantastic- close to what i suggested. This allows fir mistakes by park attendees and users, with a benefit to the park system- which could result in a positive outcome for the violator and the park. With \$1,000 fines/ not sure the collection rate.

This is far more equitable. Many park users cannot pay a \$1000 fine.

This is good for people that did not intentionally try to break the rules.

This is good helps keep bad eliminates out

This is good starting point.

This is good yes

This is in line with the intent of current practice - educate first. The person had a chance to take responsibility for their actions. If they do so, then the consequences are minor. Like that volunteer work could be substituted.

This is less onerous and may be best if you cannot have different penalties for different types of offenses. I like the idea of doing volunteer work instead of the fine.

This is more accessible and doesn't continue to punish people in the future

This is more appealing because it's using more common sense rules.

This is more appealing, however, there are still some violations that don't make a lot of sense. Let's also consider which actions would be violations, and not focus solely on the fines themselves.

This is more appropriate and a better use of the court system for more important issues.

This is more equitable than being charged with something that is easily found on your record, people make mistakes or don't read signs and ordinances and then consequently do something stupid.

This is more fair for those who cannot afford or want to to use another way besides money to pay for their crime or violation.

This is more fair. But if the person damaged property they should have to repair, replace, or make restitution.

This is more socially constructive with some volunteer work being an option. If it's property destruction, a ticket is OK, but if it's incidental damage to a ski trail, most people won't know that causes damage. Education is important too for these options.

This is most equitable, especially since it can be paid off with volunteer service.

This is much better than the other option. Nobody should be getting a misdemeanor for breaking rules at a park. Many people aren't even aware of park rules, and misdemeanor offenses can take away job opportunities.

This is much better than the other options! This gives the offender the ability to still gain employment, learn from mistakes, and hopefully gain pride through hard work

This is much more reasonable for the type of offenses we are talking about. This also provides an option other than money to resolve. After all, any crime for which the penalty is a fine is legal for the rich.

This is my preference. It discontinues the racial issues that relate to inability to pay a large fine and going on a person's record which would affect employability.

This is not appealing. While the concept of volunteering is good, it is ineffective and takes more staff time than is worth the help. If someone makes the personal decision to damage property/act inappropriately, then they PAY the consequences.

This is not going to work either. Next thing will be, if the person doesn't pay or volunteer, it will go away, because there's not enough staff to followup.

This is potentially less expensive than having the courts deal with fines.

This is preferable. People shouldn't get a criminal record for say being in the park too late.

This is similar to Option-A in that any enforcement effort results in monetary or incarceration punishment. That could have unintended consequences, especially for those not in a good position to pay fines and where jail or record of violations would further negatively impact them.

This is the best option and volunteer work should be in the parks with litter cleanup, etc.

This is the best option if there must be a fine/punishment. This will not impact a person's future unless they fail to volunteer or pay the fine.

this is the best option. many park visitors are low income. Don't make life harder for them for minor violations. The park should be a welcoming place.

This is too complicated and adds unnecessary administrative cost. Just fine and be done with it! Don't make this more complicated than it needs to be.

This is what I would prefer. Keep out of the criminal system and no attorney cost.

This makes more sense. I think community service is always a beneficial experience.

This makes no sense!

This makes sense for very minor violations

This makes sense.

This makes the most sense for smaller offenses like damaging a ski trail

This more realistically reflects the level of harm done, and does more to encourage a behavior change to positive outcome and community connection.

This one

This option B could be a first time offense consequence with a second offense resulting in the option A consequence.

This option could keep the park even cleaner

This option is a little more fair but still problematic.

this option is good too

This option will not clog the courts. Community services requires people to actually do something for their wrong-doings.

This provides additional options for meeting the requirements of the violation consequence.

This reduces impacts on the courts, and reduces fines and eliminated impact on escaping poverty if you comply; better for lower income people, who likely use parks more often.

This seems a better solution. It still supports the restrictions, but doesn't initially have as detrimental an effect on the violator. \$100 is a substantial amount for many young people.

This seems a little more fair, depending on the violation.

This seems a reasonable penalty plus volunteer work may change the person's mind about violating park rules.

This seems appropriate for the type of violations that would occur. I assume that actual criminal activity that occurs in the parks would be prosecuted as such on top of any admin fine.

This seems fair as long there is a path for noncompliance.

This seems fair. Again, it teaches responsibility and citizenship.

This seems good to me. There is still accountability, with options to avoid paying fines for those who can't or don't want to pay them. Maybe there could also be an education-related option, where people learn about why what they did matters.

This seems just. Volunteering is a good penalty.

This seems less punitive and better for those who may not understand the seriousness/consequence of a citation

This seems like a better option as it will not appear on permanent records but still is a significant incentive to follow the rules.

This seems like a fairer way to enforce park ordinance.

This seems like a good middle ground, decriminalize the activity.

This seems more aligned with restorative justice and offers space for correcting the action without lasting consequences. I appreciate the "second chance" approach here

This seems more fair to people.

This seems more fair.

This seems more in accordance with the level of most incidents and seems more fair.

This seems more practical and easier to enforce

This seems reasonable

This seems reasonable and appropriate. Violating park rules should result in fines, not a criminal record.

This seems reasonable and fair.

This seems reasonable, but I don't like the idea of jail time.

This seems reasonable.

This seems reasonable.

This seems reasonable. It sounds less difficult to enforce and helps avoid unintended consequences

This seems the best option.

This seems the least damaging way to enforce rules

This seems the most reasonable.

This seems to be a sensible approach for most violations. However, serious offenses such as damage to park property should be dealt with more harshly

This seems to be the best option. Its a lower administrative burden for the county as well as a lower barrier for park users who make mistakes.

This seems very fair for those of us who may unintentionally violate rules.

This seems very reasonable for many offenses, especially inadvertent ones.

This solution seems more equitable than the plan above.

This sounds better to me!

This sounds like a great option for first offenses that are not serious in nature. Repeat offenses should be considered petty misdemeanors.

This sounds more appealing

This sounds more reasonable.

This will do nothing.

This won't automatically show up on a background check. If the person persists in being unlawful, then it will. This is more fair.

This works too

This would be a bigger step backwards.

This would be a good policy too

This would be good for people who made a mistake and want to rectify it.

this would be great

This would help keep the person with the violation accountable for their actions

This would provide opportunity for building awareness of the ordinance without negative long-term impact to the individual. The impact of the offenses listed in the ordinance are unequal. Could these be categorized in some way?

Totally the right call. No way should a violation of park ordinances, even repeated ones, have such a heavy load financially and it should not lead to jail time whatsoever. Education should continue to be the main focus of sheriff's deputies.

two low of fine

Under this policy the repair to the damage would not be covered so much by the fine(s). Instead the people paying taxes would pick up a greater share of the costs of repairing damage. This would appeal to those that want to do the damage and have a smaller penalty. This would also appeal to those leaving graffiti, since there would be less money to remove it and their art project would be visible to the public for a longer period of time

Unknowingly committing a violation could not be penalized as severely. This makes sense but criminal violations must still be penalized.

Unnecessary to criminalize, and requires additional resources to build out the hearing process. Better to use the existing infrastructure of the petty misdemeanor system

Using the panel instead of court- better use of resources. Administrative fine goes to the city/ county. Depending on the issue, \$100 might be too little to deter some individuals. For others, having the opportunity to work it off/ volunteer time is a better option. Gives more options.

Very fair

Very reasonable

Violating park rules should not be treated as a criminal offense.

Violation fine needs to be higher than \$100

Volunteer hours and limited financial impacts.

Volunteer hours. Hearing panel. Administrative fine. I love all of that.

Volunteer or have it go on your record. Perfect.

Volunteer time would be great for people who are lower income, but get fined for not following a rule just because of not knowing it (such as walking on a ski trail in winter).

Volunteer work as a punishment is great especially if it involves helping improve the park where the violation occurred.

Volunteer work as an option love it! There needs to be an option for a violation to be in court with real repercussions. But yeah, small mistakes don't need to follow kids forever.

Volunteer work at the local parks is the way to go! Win Win

Volunteer work component

volunteer work is a great idea

Volunteer work is an excellent idea. Keeping a violation off the offender's record is laudable. I like that there is still a misdemeanor threat.

Volunteer work is good for keeping parks in good shape. Good to have an escalation path if things don't go well.

Volunteer work option

volunteer work seems like a nice way. if you get caught smoking in the park, volunteer and help pick up trash. i would not go as far as jail time, however, a small fine would be reasonable.

Volunteer work to substitute a fine when applicable and the converted misdemeanor.

Volunteer work would be great. It might have more meaningful impact than simply a fine.

Walking on a ski trail so in no way be a criminal offense

We need more volunteers

Who is doing the policing?

Will not show up on background check and possibly impact employment

Work at the park may earn respect of the park.

Would be fair for minor violations.

Yes - this one gives people the option to not be jerks.

Yes no need to criminalize this

Yes teaches a lesson in having to give the violators time up volunteer and comes with a strong secondary cause if not honoring the volunteer requirement.

Yes, free up police time, enforcement could be by park personnel not law enforcement

Yes, this is better! I would rather their violation/s benefit the community.

Yes, this is good- not on your record, give some teeth to the ordinance for repeat offenders,

Yes, volunteer work was going to be my suggestion.

Yes, work physically then hitting them with money or a bad ding on their employment won't fix the problem.

Yes. Fair and reasonable. And may encourage better enforcement as the consequences are not so damming. (Less likely to let those who look like you slide when the punishment is not so severe.)

Yes. The fact that it would not be a criminal offense anymore is good. However, your final consequence is still pretty substantial for something minimal occurring in a park. I would suggest failure to pay the fine or volunteer converts the ticket to \$300 fine and if it's unpaid, you send it to a collection agency. Perhaps, you can obtain the unpaid fees from a person's tax returns. Get rid of this jail time and \$1000 fee. That's crazy.

You are just creating more work for the County and how do you monitor Volunteer work? I would suggest having a fine that will hurt if violated.

You blow the shot you've been given with this option, that's on you and you deserve the results.

Young people who unwittingly violate the rules would not have it on their record and would have the option to volunteer instead of paying a fine. Repeat offenders would not have this option. Seems like a reasonable level of response.

Although I prefer this route, I do feel like \$100 may not cover actual damage done. Would prefer the flexibility of raising that if the damage is more costly.

I like there there is follow up and the person responsible has to go through a process with the option of volunteer work.

I think a fine of \$100 does not incent anyone to change behavior. It should be at least \$300....I do agree with the volunteer work and conversion to misdemeanor

"Appealing to me, more like a civil citation, community service is good."

Volunteering for damaging something is a better approach than taking people's money - someone is likely to better learn the lesson intended by the consequence. This is a good option.

Littering/tobacco violations should have the option of community service

Equity... reaches people where they are at. No one should not be able to get a job b/c they were in a park to late.

Much less intimidating - appropriate for MOST sections of ordinance.

This would be appropriate for some of the lesser violations. Like smoking.

Asks for peoples time, something they may have and gives an opportunity to learn and give back. \$\$ penalties could send a family plummeting.

More flexibility re: scheduling, time off work, transportation if dealing with county staff rather than courts

This is preferred to the other potential options...but only after education first.

Non-criminal

Yes, I support this. Encourages equity and does not have an lifelong impact.

This seems like a more positive way to change behavior.

Anything that can be enforced and create accountability to deter obnoxious behavior would be encouraged, especially for those us who live next to these parks and see rude behavior routinely.

Volunteer work tied to the community is appealing to me.

Costs less to the person and wouldn't impact job prospects

I like that this person would invest their time back into the parks -- that seems like a great way to recoup the loss/damage. I also like that it wouldn't show up on one's record and that it doesn't go through the courts.

I would like if there was some incentive for people to follow the rules. This seems like enough to keep people following the rules, but not too harsh.

Love everything about this. Should be sufficient to deter violations while preventing indirect negative impact to employment or housing.

Might actually get enforcement

No higher fines and enforcement.

nothing

Nothing

Nothing.

Possibly more equitable. Violators of park rules and ordinances need prosecution.

Really? Jail time? That's absurd. It costs a lot more to house an inmate. The punishment does not fit the crime.

Seems mor appropriate for those utilizing outdoor resources. Step based approach.

This is not stiff enough

This seems like a more appropriate.

This seems reasonable.

Fines and Penalties Option B - Questions, Concerns & Suggested Solutions

Option B: Violations result in an administrative fine.

Please use this space for questions or concerns *and* suggested solutions.

The volunteer component needs to be flexible to accommodate non traditional work schedules and family/childcare obligations.

There is no need to convert this to jail time! Work with the State to take pending fees out of tax returns just like back child support payments.

there is not enough to keep someone from committing the offense if you minimize punishments too much

There is quite a hammer if they don't do option B. Can the Administrative Fine (option B) be converted to a petty misdemeanor (option A) then to a misdemeanor as a last resort? \

There needs to be low barriers to doing the volunteer work. (Transport provided, or on a bus line)

There shouldn't be additional punitive enhancements.

There was a guy who was walking on the ski trails a lot at Battle Creek the last two years and was threatening skiers who politely asked him to quit walking on the trails. He was so threatening that I won't ski there by myself any more. I'm much more concerned about this type of behavior than I am a parking violation and I wish the sheriff's department would focus on something besides parking violations.

There will always be a very small per cent of park users who misbehave. For the well-being of all park users, there needs to be enforcement of park regulations and state statutes within the boundaries of public parks.

These are petty violations. I like the idea of substituting work for a fine.

This criminalizes poverty and those unable to pay. This is wrong.

This doesn't have the teeth to keep people from doing it

This isn't even a slap on the wrist and will do nothing to deter offences.

this may be beneficial for the people who intend to break the rules on purpose (poachers, trash dumpers, vandalism). Also, would the sheriff still use education over citation?

This provides a space for options without permanent repercussions

This seems like a slap on the hand and folks will just break the rules again. Volunteer work would be good. Less time to get into trouble and pay back for the trouble they caused.

This seems like it'll be poorly managed, has the potential for discrimination and civilian panels have no place in enforcement of any kind. I strongly oppose this.

This seems to be a mere slap on the wrist. Currently we have seen areas of Hennepin County in particular that have been overtaken with lawlessness and criminals. We should have sufficient laws in place to help incentivize people doing the right thing and following the law.

This still allows for disproportionate enforcement if "education" is still an option before citation. Perhaps create a multi strike rule in which a person always gets a (documented) warning the first time for a given ordinance followed by a citation the next time for the same ordinance. You could also incorporate something like 5 ordinance violations of any type will result in a citation for any future violation regardless of which ordinance.

Too easy to throw people under the bus if they don't understand the process for appealing/converting their fine. Do better.

Too harsh for non-compliant, too light to likely compel compliance

Too light

Transitions nicely into the gross misdemeanor

Transportation to be able to volunteer could be an issue for those with low income.

Unfortunately, the people this would hurt most are those who probably don't make a lot of money if they have a job.

Violation fine needs to be higher than \$100

Violators should first be reminded about park rules as necessary without inevitable 'punishment', giving violators a chance to rectify their offending behavior. Fines are okay as a second step if they are not compliant, and fines can go higher if the violation warrants it.

Volunteer work can be cleaning up the park where the violation took place or other clean up efforts.

We need a stronger fine for repeat offenders/

WE WANT RAMSEY COUNTY TO PATROL MORE AND ENFORCE MORE.

What about repeat offenses? What would be the penalty/ fine for that?

What if this is a low income household with no vehicle or way of getting to the volunteer opportunities?

What's it cost to jail someone for 90 days? \$7,000? \$20,000? I can find support for both those numbers online quickly, let's assume the truth is somewhere in the middle. WHY WOULD YOU SPEND \$7k+ FOR A FAILURE TO PAY A \$100 FINE? ARE YOU IN THE HABBIT OF TAKING TAX PAYER MONEY AND FLUSHING IT DOWN THE TOILETS IN THE JAIL?!?!? These are at best petty crimes, and usually less than that, state law and city ordinances are what you'd be charging people with for anything serious (and even those have some silly bit in them.)

When the penalty is minimal, the likelihood of it making the person change is minimal. I worry that people would be MORE inclined to be repeat offenders if the penalty is lessened. I can understand lessening it for parking issues but not other things.

Who is going to pay for this hearing panel

Why can't failure to pay just result in nothing? or a petty misdemeanor? If the county is focused on equity, they should not be focused on any type of penalty that could result in criminalization.

Why not burden them with a hearing panel and if they blow it off they obviously haven't got the message and could be fined.

Will increase crime

Will it stop repeat offenders?

Will lead to people ignoring it.

Will they be more common now?

Will this deter people from ruining the park

Wonder if ramsey county sheriffs are able to administer / enforce this type of administrative fine- or if it would have to be county or park employees (which could make it more challenging). Does the county have enough staff to conduct these type of hearing/appeal process? If they do not- than this solution is not viable.

Would decreased consequences actually ended up with more aggressive enforcement? I.e. police less likely to give warnings?

Would it be possible to permanently ban repeat offenders from the park?

Would like info on how often they are converted to misdemeanors and if that disproportionately affects low income residents.

Would repeat violations have an option to grow penalties?

Would serious vandalism and other offenses be passed on to the criminal justice system?

Would still hope education is the priority with fine used as last resort or for repeat offenders or serious violations.

Would the hearing panel have accessible hours (i.e., schedules hearings outside of 8am-4pm)? Would volunteer work be supervised (I vote yes, or require a witness to sign arresting that the individual completed x number volunteer guess)? Would the volunteer work tie back to the park? Or be related to their infraction? I like the idea of volunteering to in the park (cleaning graffiti, picking up litter, volunteering at a park sponsored event).

Yes, try to make them obey the laws, but I'd rather force them to sit in a two hour "Civics class" session or do volunteer work. Not \$1000 or 90 days !!!

You're still not addressing the real problem. That is, maybe some of that stuff is truly criminal, some of it is BS laws that shouldn't be even illegal in the first place, and some of it should be a fine for a minor issue. Which is which? Details matter!

Fine is too low, could be \$100 or more. Agree with the rest. Several others agree with this comment

"At likely \$100-\$1000"

Would the smoking fine be the same other offenses? Smoking fine is just as important as these others

Make volunteer work be mandatory as part of punishment. "If you trash the park, clean it up."

Not all ordinance violations are equal severity - consider breaking down further.

Some ordinance sections likely still require more severe penalties - consider degree of impact on others and resources.

Might be too light to discourage late night parties or other disruptive behavior.

Is there another option for people who don't have the money to pay fines and can't get off work to participate in volunteer work so they can avoid additional penalties?

multi pronged approach

Gives discretion and should be monitored for any potential bias in the level of fee required, # of volunteering hours, etc.

Difference between intentional damage to property and enjoying parks at all hours, would want to see a graded response/reaction by the system to fit the offense.

This is why we need to make it non-criminal. There is nothing dangerous about a person being in a park after hours if no other crime is being committed.

Again, knowing that racial profiling is statistically proven, I think that this kind of punishment is excessive. And then if someone cannot afford to pay their fine, they are in a worse predicament. It is discriminatory.

^Ditto

How are escalations handled for people to repeatedly offend?

As a white person, I feel it is unlikely I will be charged if I break one of these rules. For my son, I do not trust at all that he wouldn't be punished as a person of color.

How will this adequately reflect someone who does something very aggressive - damaging park property, for example - vs. something very minor?

Violations and associated fines are not posted in the park

Ordinance and practice should match. If education is the best method, education should be what is allowed under ordinance - not financial penalties.

Just another opportunity for selective enforcement.

Could there be a tiered fee? Some things (e.g., walking on a ski trail) are less of an offense than others (e.g., damaging park property)... seems we could find a way to attach costs to these things that are better aligned.

Keep status quo.

Park rules should be clearly posted at all entrances. Rules to protect wildlife should be posted near water bodies and pavilions to help ensure wildlife are not harassed.

The offender will have a chance to demonstrate contrition and given a chance to change behavior.

too wordy administrative fine suggests no real impact, and this is stated in the beginning of the paragraph. Once seeing those words, there may be no need to read further, as any concern is eliminated.

Other ideas for Fines and Penalties

A combination of the two - up to \$300 fine with no criminal record and conversion to a misdemeanor seems a good middle ground target.

A fee based on income, but I don't think we're quite there yet as a society

A fine or option to work and no further action if the person doesn't comply.

A friendly reminder is nice for people who may not be aware of policies, and small fines up to larger fines are good for repeat offenders or people causing trouble to others

A hybrid of the two options seems the more reasonable action to me. Violations result in an administrative fine. This is a non-criminal offense with a maximum penalty of \$300. Depending upon the severity of the act, there is a possibility of volunteer work being substituted for the fine. Appeals are through the court system. A petty misdemeanor may show up in an employment background check. Failure to pay the fine or participate in volunteer work could result in it being converted to a petty misdemeanor with a maximum \$500 fine and up to 60 days in jail.

All enforcement must be equitable to people of a races, religions, genders, etc.

Allow for misdemeanors for really destructive or dangerous behavior and allow for education or administrative fines/ volunteer work for more minor violations.

Anything criminal or malicious, graffiti, etc should be dealt with accordingly with current laws. Anything noncriminal or damage causing should be education, warning, etc.

As I said previously, I recommend having a list where people get a warning or two before a fine. You need a list, though, or officers won't know if the person has received several warnings. It also makes the person take it more seriously if they know a record is being kept.

base fines on ability to pay. use restorative justice process for violations to help educate the person about the impact their behavior has on the community--the costs of their mistakes or choices.

both options seem valuable.

Can there be different consequences for different infractions? A combination of the two, leaning more toward option B?

Community awareness of regulations would be helpful. I've lived within a couple miles of Lake Johanna for 20 years and have never read the rules. When I read them before taking this survey, I felt the need for more explanation. E.g. where is a "designated" ice skating area? Can i ice fish anywhere? Can boaters blare music on the lake? I had no idea inner tubes weren't allowed. Awareness of rules could be included in school or extra curricular activities, city newsletter, etc.

Consider breaking the vandalism out of it and use option A there, option B for more minor stuff.

Cooperative people should always be issued warnings for their first minor infraction before issuing citations.

Could have ramping severity for multiple violations. First offense doesn't go on records, but your 5th for damaging property does.

Could you please make fishing areas (and more importantly, non-areas) and fishing dates clearer and enforce that? Could you find ways to enforce - or at least have rules and penalties - around littering?

Define a scale of offenses and charge accordingly.

Depending on what the person was caught violating for, I'd think connecting them to resources to get to the root of the problem may be helpful. Committing a criminal offense is obviously different, but then I wonder what's left in these park violations. Again, I'd need more data to suggest a better option.

Don't lessen the potential penalties but use good judgement in administering the penalties and aim for an improvement in behavior and respect for the facilities rather than penalties for those who violate the rules -- use extreme penalties only in response to extreme violations.

Don't set up fines or penalties that aren't enforced uniformly.

Don't waste time having rules that aren't enforced...regardless of the fine.

Effective, visible police presence intermittently during the day and during closing time. Video camera monitoring with clear public signs : " Smile you are on camera" or similar.

either of the two work for me. what are the typical crimes, and does the consequence make sense? it seems absurd that if someone walks on a ski trail it might be on their permanent record. I'm sure everyone has better things to do with their time then give out citations for that.

Either of these options are more appealing than the current misdemeanor citation, however, citation statistics were not provided and I do not have an understanding of the impact to all stakeholders.

Enforce violations that would infringe upon another person's health, safety or access to equally enjoy a park.
Enforce violations that would damage or be a nuisance to flora, fauna and all aspects of nature.

Enforcement

Enforcement. Cross country skiers should have the confidence that the rules are being followed. They deserve to feel safe. They don't deserve to be chased out of parks by unleashed dogs. If the parks are truest for everyone, everyone should feel safe and use the trails in a safe manner. If not, people will go elsewhere

Escalate the fine for repeat offenders while issuing first time offenders misdemeanor with \$150 fine

Fees and fines affect the poor much more than the average person. The fines should not be too much that it starts a poor person down the rabbit hole of ever increasing fines. Is there a way to ensure this doesn't happen?

Financial penalties should only be used when damage or harm is done. We know that it is easy to profile people and that BIPOC community members will continue to be cited for violations at a higher rate than white people because of the racism inherent in society. Adding monetary punishments only serves to widen disparities when poor people can't pay fines. We either increase access and reduce barriers or we continue to operate in ways that harm.

Fine plus community service (or double community service in lieu of any fine).

Fines should cover the cost of the damage done, as well as being punitive to prevent other bad behaviors.

Fines should first be community service and oriented toward restorative practices. Violations that result in damage or diminished enjoyment for others should be prioritized.

Fining should be a final option and only used in extreme cases

From my experience at Tony Schmidt park, the county is not enforcing ordinances well. Most weekend days, there are people using loudspeakers, boats not following the speed limit hours, etc. The county needs to do a better job enforcing the rules.

get rid of fines unless its a criminal matter

Have lived in Ramsey Co over 30 years, and yet to see any park ordinance enforced

Having a tiered system where a second and third offense would escalate the penalty to a misdemeanor might be a better option.

Having people volunteer for violations to the ordinance would be great. Especially cleaning up the park.

How often are fines issued? Tempest in a teapot.

I believe that there should be a range of different fines Depending on the underlying offense. I find polluting littering in our public areas to be very offensive prefer them to still Have a potentially high penalty. But I don't care of people walk on a trail in winter. And of course vandalism of public property can be problematic.

I do believe that the penalty should fit the crime, the penalties should be different for walking through the park after hours and for damaging property. They are way different offenses.

I don't know enough about violations to comment on this. If the Sheriff's office already "uses education to change behavior that is unsafe or violates the ordinance, and issues citations as a last resort" then probably the best solution is to change any resulting citation from a criminal citation to a petty citation (I'm not completely sure what the difference is). A \$100 fine is not a real deterrent. I would suggest setting the minimum value higher - at least \$200. I like the option of volunteer work being substituted for the fine.

I don't like fines at all. Fines affect mostly the people least able to pay. I like the sheriff's office educational approach the best.

I don't have an opinion about the penalty, I would just like people to follow the rules and respect others and property.

I have no comment on the above, except we need the fines etc., whatever needs to be done to prevent people from even thinking about, or misusing parks and property. I see no reason to change.

I like the idea of combining these ideas. Have it go through the park with a low fine and opportunity for volunteering. And if not paid then up the fine fee. We need to have the opportunity to provide messaging in multiple languages. I also have concern about treating property damage and minor rule breaks (like walking outside of park hours) as the same offenses.

I like the second option but I think the maximum should be cut in half.

I like the thoughtfulness of the options and support them both. I would vote option b.

i live in the winona reservation and the saint paul reservation of the river shores, the old growth forest, cliffs, driftless regional geology are all OURS, not yours. they are continuous along the shores along #61 and you should not possess but only pray and preserve over any other uses as homelands and sacred ground

I prefer education

I strongly support option B

I think any cash fine should be proportional to the violator's income (like speeding tickets in Switzerland). Any flat rate fine ends up being potentially devastating to poor people and not severe enough for well-to-do people who can just pay the fine and keep on breaking the rules.

I think the first offense should be administrative. Offenses thereafter shall increase in severity based on seriousness of offense. No need for small things to be turned into big things especially when police hand out citations disproportionately to POC.

I think the longer the parks are open, the stricter the consequences should be for causing problems as criminal activity increases at night. That would be a fair trade off to ensure the continued safety and quite atmosphere the home owners are used to.

I think there should be only a warning for first and or second offense. Maybe be a written warning for a second offense.

I think there needs to some of the crimes that still remain a more serious punishment.

I think there should be better signage in the park for park rules- especially for ski trails use in winter, and better enforcement of the rules. I think a lot of the time, people improperly use trails because it is the most convenient way to get from point A to point B, and there aren't great alternatives- maybe this could be a focus to improve rule compliance.

I would like this option if it instead converted to a petty misdemeanor.

I would like to see all violations of rules/laws in parks result in community service hours to improve the parks

I'd like to see a combination of all 3. Start with the administrative fine. Failure to do that converts to petty misdemeanor with employment check, and failure to do that one results in full misdemeanor with addition on background record. This would require some things to be reclassified though. Not everything can fall into a misdemeanor, just as not everything can fall into an administrative fee. Lastly, for things like littering or defacing which is something that can be fixed, a part of the fee should be having the individual who did the deed also being required to participate in cleaning up the deed.

I'd prefer to see the restorative justice of volunteering as a go-to rather than a 'possibility'.

I'm not sure what good options are

If a violation is not causing monetary or physical damage to another person or public property and/or would not be considered a misdemeanor outside the bounds of the public space then no fine or criminal charge should be levied against the violator.

If someone is doing something that is actively destroying property or committing an actual crime, then you can just arrest them. Walking on a path in winter or smoking a cigarette is neither of those things.

If the county believes the misdemeanor-level charge to be a problem, I'd like to see data on how many misdemeanor charges have been levelled in the past five years, and how many of those charges have resulted in conviction of a misdemeanor (not a petty misdemeanor). My gut says the numbers is very, very low, which makes this proposal seem like a solution in search of a problem.

If the majority of issues are for parking, why not have parking fines that are separate from other violations. Parking is not the same as destruction of property.

In my experience there isn't enough enforcement to make most of this fair and equitable.

In place of money or incarceration options, have you considered rehabilitation efforts; i.e. mandatory education on park rules or a period of time where a person would not be allowed to use the parks in lieu of stricter punishments?

In think enforcement of the rules is more important than the fines the rules carry.

Increase the fines and publish them for public shaming

Instead of a fine, work to clean or improve parks

Instead of focusing on the negative, how about reinforcing the positive? Something like posting signs of what's prohibited, included with a sign about treating others the way that you want to be treated.

Is the Ramsey County Board prioritizing quantity of park use over quality of park use. I suspect there is a direct correlation between the number of users and the amount of supervision (enforcement) and maintenance required.

It may make sense to have a mix of petty misdemeanors and administrative fines depending on the section of ordinance and the impact of the offense on others.

It would be nice to see a non-criminal, non-monetary option that still gets the point across. Like up to xx hours picking up litter or spent maintaining the park lawns/gardens, requirement to clean graffiti if they placed it there, etc.

Keep it as it is. If these ordinances are not enforced or if they don't come with consequences, people will no longer follow them. If you don't not start seriously enforcing these ordinances, people will stop using the park system. Parks are for everyone, not just the people who break the rules.

Keep ordinance as is but educate on first offense but prosecute on second offense.

Keep the current laws in place. I have never seen a public safety officer write out a ticket for someone who acknowledged that they were violating the rules and apologized and followed instructions to immediately cease their activity and leave the park. If you do not have a big stick and just slap people on the wrist they will just do it again. I find it hard to believe the County would even consider or propose such a rule to provide public safety with sufficient consequences for violating the established rules.

Law enforcement officers should have some leeway to determine what is problematic behavior and issue citations/arrests accordingly. The activity particularly happening in Langton Lake area is an embarrassment to our great community. Instead of relaxing punishment for criminals, please enforce the laws that help us law-abiding taxpayers who have young families.

Leave the ordinance as misdemeanors

Leave things the same and stop this insane quest to pretend everything is equal in society by closing our eyes and sticking our fingers in our ears and going nananananananana, while we are driving down the road at 35 miles a hour because we are mad there are a few potholes. if there are actually ordinances that seem like they are unneeded, get rid of those. But the idea you are oging to change how the law is enforced because you don't like the figures on who is breaking it is frankly disgusting and an insult to everyone of all race who doesn't break the law.

Lower the fine, and it should be an administrative ticket, if community service is substituted it needs to be meaningful and skill related. I wonder if overall this is a waste of time? Where's your data on how many citations are issued and to what demographics? I think this is just another one of those smokescreens to remove accountability to the society you are a member of under the guise of equity.

Lowering the potential thresholds seems like a reasonable idea, particularly given the Officers have a bit of discretion to cite individuals for violation. I can see where this can lead to personal bias coming into play. Lowering the potential risk is a good idea, as long as serious violations can still be handled via state statutes. (Park damage, threatening, intimidating behavior, or behavior that risks safety of others.)

Make crimes/penalties/fines consistent across all county jurisdictions. Minor offenses that don't lead to injury such as parking violations, littering, or disruptive behavior should be treated the same whether it occurs in a park, a library, or a county office property.

Make the fine enough to clean the damage or volunteer to clean. Make it hurt through time, then hefty fines for those that do not follow through. After that if they still don't show, days in jail and adding to background checks can be added.

Make the fines more expensive. \$100.00 is a mere slap on the wrist. People spend more than that going out for dinner!!

Maybe community service/volunteer work should be the penalty for all.

Might there be a space for fines, etc that scale up for repeated violations? I don't know how much of that we see, but if we do see it, it would be good to plan tools to handle it.

Mix part 1 of option B with a failure to pay the fine resulting in option A. Anything more than that unfairly punishes people of misfortune.

MORE DOG PARKS ESP IN THE MACGROVE/ HIGHLAND PARK AREA. Many of us suggested that for the Ford Plant site but apparently the per sq ft was deemed not profitable enough to be spend on a dog park. I don't have a car so getting to the High Bridge or Mendota Hgts one (of the few where you can see your dog at all times) is prohibitive bc of cost / reliability to take an Uber/Lyft

More education about park use and litter. Some folks throw bottles, wrappers, even used diapers into the brush. They may think this is a polite way to dispose of things they do not want to carry out to a can. I think some multilingual signs about littering would help this problem. Also, not sure people should be drinking beer or alcohol all over the park either. It would be nice if people did that only in picnic areas. Finally more school education about protecting the environment might raise awareness. When I was a kid I did not throw trash on the ground. I think I learned that in school and from television (eg Woodsy Owl campaign). There does not seem to be similar education effort now.

More education of what the rules of the parks actually are. In your example of walking on the skis trails, more signage, volunteers telling walkers they aren't allowed to walk on the trails and directing them to other trails that DO allow walkers. Eliminating closed hours, or adding more open hours would help with the "in the park after dark" issues. Parking violations seem to be something that should be judged independently from other violations.

My earlier comments can help with this. Law abiding citizens can get a park permit to use it (quietly) all night long. The county gets the revenue and we still enforce reasonable laws.

Narrow what constitutes a penalty.

No criminal charges, even if the fine is not paid. Should operate like library fines.

None

None of these options will do any good without enforcement. I've seen so many people walking on groomed ski trails and there is never anyone around to educate or cite the folks. So can we improve enforcement, first?

None.

Nothing but same as above.

One written warning ticket for the first offense and the second time a fine with the option B approach. This means that when someone does the first offense it must be recorded into the computer system so that if it happens again the next officer can check and see that the rule breaker is a scofflaw and ticket him the second time.

Option B + repeated offenses (maybe 3 or more in a 12 month period?) would carry higher penalties

Option B but with a tiered fine system not to exceed \$500 after multiple violations of the same ordinance.

Option B is ideal, though conversion to a petty misdemeanor is better.

Option of paying a fine or volunteering in parks

Pay a fine. Volunteer. If neither are done THEN get courts/permanent record violations.

Perhaps fit the fine to the costs of fixing the damage and the costs of the actions needed to get the damager to pay the fine.

Please don't change to this because this isn't even a slap on the wrist.

Police should just ask people to leave or stop whatever rules they're breaking. criminalizing or fining people is a major overreach and I don't think will be a deterrent to anyone.

Remember, its the threat of arrest which most often prevents violations. Folks would much rather pay a fine than get arrested. But fines alone will be a far less effective method of prevention than charges. So unless you want to hire more staff and officers to enforce the fines, you will most assuredly get more violations.

Required annual participation in a park clean up.

Research has shown that fines are less effective than education, for example speed limit we're followed better with shock advertisements than after fines. Fines have the Problem of execution. Spend your money on educating people.

Rules are always easier to follow and enforce when they are simple and it makes sense for the majority of the people. The more complicated the rules and punishment, the more difficult it is to follow and added unnecessary bureaucracy to enforcement. KISS...

See above.

Should fine car owners for violations that occur in parking.

Since in practice few citations are issued, no changes seem needed.

Skip the fines and use work in the parks instead.

Skip the fines, make everyone do volunteer work.

Small monetary fine is appropriate

Smoking is a higher offense than walking on a ski trail (which I could see myself doing on accident). Penalties accordingly.

So hard to enforce that it is limited to who calls the police.

Some offenders just made a mistake or didn't pay attention or never learned to think or care enough about other people's rights. Let's help them be good citizens as graciously as we can. "More is accomplished with honey."

Some violations are much more damaging than others. Parking or sleeping in a car causes no damage; graffiti, starting a fire, walking over ski trails or pulling out signs all cause various damage and need repair. Solution: one doing damage must pay for repairs or do them within specific amount of time. If not, convert to misdemeanor with fine and up to 90 days in jail.

Specific fines that more directly apply to the severity of the violation. Clear information about these fines posted throughout the park.

Still am at a loss here. Are there signs at the park entrances, prohibiting certain people from entering? Now that's something that should come down if exists.

Stop pandering to criminals. Uphold the law!

Stop policing minor and useless ordinances.

The latter option seems reasonable if the escalation of penalty could be up to a petty misdemeanor rather than a misdemeanor that could result in jail time

The legal response should be tiered, not the either-or scenarios. Such as first offense: written warning that does not go on a criminal record. Second offense: administrative fine. Third offense: put something on a person's criminal record/possible jail.

The park staff members are not park police, and I visit lots of parks and have yet to see any park police. Asking park stewards to police visitor's behavior is ridiculous. It looks like a money making scheme, not something that will improve the quality of the parks.

The parks seem minimally supervised, so how would these be enforced?

The scale of fines/punishment needs to be incremental in relation to the severity of the violation. Socioeconomic and racial factors need to be taken into consideration when creating ordinances/laws.

There need to be cameras installed in parking lots to capture car break-ins. I have lost track of how many smashed car windows I have witnessed while parked at the Winthrop lot in Battle Creek Park.

There needs to be some penalty. How about a restriction on the person buying cigarettes. How could we monitor that. How about with our peace officers offering free non smoking classes. Maybe I am being humorous, but what is a good penalty?

There should only be violations for purposeful criminal conduct or damage to property.

This administrative stuff - how about- you break it, you fix it and then some. Those who learn their lessons can teach others- what used to be a low level crime has in my opinion become pretty serious. That is all I have to say.

This is a ridiculous waster of law enforcement's time. They are already stretched thin and there are far more important crimes being committed. Priorities like catalytic converter theft, house break ins, vandalism and of course shootings should take precedence over park hours, smoking in parks incidents! We need to be concerned out the big stuff not the minutia

Tie the fine to Drivers License or ID renewal if they fail to send it in.

Use education first and only resort to fines after multiple infractions (unless particularly egregious such as destroying park property)

Use the admin fine unless repeat offender. Then consider upping charges.

Walking on ski trails should not be penalized at all. Too many parks cut off the walking trails in the winter and then we have no place to go. Provide parallel trails or reduce the ski trails. Allow walkers, runners and bikers to utilize the park in the winter.

What About single parents with kids? Maybe have some volunteer options that are a child friendly or provide daycare.

What if we didn't try to make money off of people who have nowhere else to go who just want a good night's sleep

What is and is not a violation needs to be more clearly defined as damaging park property should carry a different weight than walking on groomed ski trails. I believe that a person's ability to get a job, rent a home, etc should not be affected by something like walking on groomed trails. But, feel that damaging public property should be either a petty misdemeanor or misdemeanor.

What is now seems good. I think there should be an option that if something is egregious(?) rangers have an option. But there should be a team to look over the events before going to legal

Whatever you do, enforce it and create respect for the rules.

Why is the County spending time on this (which only helps criminals) versus looking for ways to help enhance the park system and surrounding communities. I believe that your priorities should be re-evaluated. Parks should be a safe spot for all people, including young children. If people break the law, law enforcement should have the tools to utilize. Already, law enforcement utilizes judgment about when to write citations or arrest. Why are you going to tie their hands and not allow them to uphold the law and healthy communities?

would favor B. I don't know the frequency of offences to judge how big an impact either would have.

Would like to see volunteer work be considered yet it could be another potential equity challenge for some families. What if the kids who do not have jobs have to work for the county? Also: What responsibility do parents have for their kids?

Would make the fine 300.00 or option for community service. Keep 1st offenses non- criminal

Would there be a tier in place for the higher cost of the damage the greater the fine? If graffiti costs \$200 to pay someone to paint over it, would the fine still be under \$100? I would think the cost to repair or replace the damage should be paid by the offender + \$100. Otherwise there's little deterrent to vandalism. On one side of this is the negative equity impacts on individuals. The other side is an entire community that may not be able to use park facilities because of vandalism, or a sense of insecurity that the park is unsafe.

Would there be a way for solution b to have two categories of offences? Like for the more egregious offences like damaging park property it could revert to a full misdemeanor upon not paying or working, and for the more innocuous offences like walking on a ski trail or being there after dark could revert to a petty misdemeanor? That way there would still be a consequence to not handling it while it was an administrative fine, but not in a way that becomes disproportionately punitive for the smallest offences.

You can't make blanket laws to cover everything. Go through each law, and figure out how serious it is. Use REAL DATA from actual people. Do real work in figuring out what you're doing, and the impact of these laws. As I said... DETAILS MATTER!

Allow others in the park to report the offense.

How about option B with the fine of \$1000.

I think either of these two should work as education and deterrence, although I am partial to volunteer work as a substitution. I think the fine has to sting a little, so \$100 does not like it would hurt much. Jailing seems like too much for this level of crime. Maybe if there is a pattern of violations.

I think this all is creating a problem. Administrative nightmare and is also creating an equity issue.

Neither of the two options have financial penalties that would be sufficient to address significant park damage and restitution due to vandalism or graffiti. One size fits all violations doesn't work here - why can't you make distinctions re. the seriousness of the offenses?