

From: Buzby, Maureen <mbuzby@cityofmelrose.org>

Sent: Jul 02, 2025 17:48:12.000000000 UTC

Subject: RE: Pittsfield July 2d AND North Reading update

To: mark@phai.org <mark@phai.org>

Cc: Kate Silbaugh <kbsilbaugh@gmail.com>; Ken Elstein <kenelstein@gmail.com>; Anthony Ishak <aishakpharmd@yahoo.com>

I hadn't seen this article. Thanks, Mark. We need a clipping service to help us keep up. I may have to change the parameters on my "Google Alert".

I'll be out this evening (fireworks on Boston Harbor) but look forward to Ken's reactions later.

BTW, just sat in on the North Reading Coalition Steering Committee Zoom meeting. An hour and 45 minutes! These folks are so committed but know they face an uphill battle. They are going to move forward with the multiple "public hearings" the Board of Health asked for. Tentative dates at 9/30 and 10/23 for evening meetings, and a daytime meeting at the senior center, date TBD.

They are also planning to ask for a second table at the North Reading National Night Out so they can have all their substance use/mental health resources at one table and NFG-focused materials at the other table.

North Reading also has an fall Apple Fest. They will table at that event as well.

They are looking for an NFG-focused banner. I'll share with them the artwork created by Metro North Boys and Girls Club. (I'll send you the most recent BGC newsletter – though I don't expect you to read/listen to everything.)

Lots of discussion about materials and logo or motto (might go with "Zero Starts Here").

And lots! of discussion about how and who to recruit for hearings. They are trying to get local docs. They want "lawyers" – Mark, your name came up. And Amy Luckiewicz, who attended the Reading Hearing loved the NP who treats nicotine dependent surgery patients. I'll reach out to her.

They will also try to get an ex-smoker. I'll reach out to Scott Francis (Sunshine Scotty). He's a South Shore resident and will go to in-person South Shore meetings and virtually attend zoom meetings in more far-flung locations. These NR meetings may not have a virtual option.

The Steering Committee wants to update the Board of Health but

Tobacco is not on the July 15th agenda. Marci is going to ask for it to be added to the meeting agenda.

I'm going to reach out to my Lahey contact and see if we can get a letter of support for NR.

I suggested they get their recycling committee involved since nicotine use results in tons – literally tons – of litter and hazardous waste. I'm going to

have a high school student do research on this topic to see what she can come up with. They want stats and graphics.

New Selectboard member (and SB liaison to CIT) is pro NFG.

As soon as things start up again after summer break they will try to get to school personnel as well as local PTO's to garner support.

Etc. Etc. Etc.

More than you needed to know but I know this town has been frustrating to some of you and I wanted to catch you up and allay some of your fears if that is possible. This group understands that Town Meeting is not the way they want to go. They are frustrated by the lack of BOH support and MTCP Tobacco Program Support.

Maybe at our next meeting we can talk about ways to support NR. And help find more LOCAL folks.

Thanks for reading this long email. If you did. 😊

Maureen

From: Mark Gottlieb <mark@phaionline.org>

Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 12:08 PM

To: Buzby, Maureen <mbuzby@cityofmelrose.org>

Cc: Kate Silbaugh <kbsilbaugh@gmail.com>; Ken Elstein <kenelstein@gmail.com>; Anthony Ishak <aishakpharmd@yahoo.com>; Mark Gottlieb <mark@phai.org>

Subject: Re: Pittsfield July 2d

I think this article explains the state of play pretty well.

https://pittsfield.com/story/78664/Pittsfield-Health-Board-Wants-Feedback-on-Tobacco-Ban.html?cat_id=all

I hope that Ken's presence will encourage the board to vote to hold a public hearing that we will have time to prepare for.

--

Mark Gottlieb, Executive Director
Public Health Advocacy Institute
at Northeastern University School of Law
360 Huntington Avenue / 117 Cushing Hall
Boston MA 02115

mark@phai.org

www.phai.org

[Publications](#)

This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message.

On Wed, Jul 2, 2025 at 9:10 AM Buzby, Maureen
<mbuzby@cityofmelrose.org> wrote:

When I spoke with the Pittsfield Board several months ago, they were very interested in how much outreach I did with retailers in my area. A city council member was very concerned about having more public input. I think they will hold a public hearing. We'll see.

At the Rockport meeting the other night a board member said, "we don't need to hold a public hearing, right"? I told him that was technically correct but I personally believed that they should follow whatever protocol they used for other significant tobacco reg changes they have implemented. (Joyce said they always held public hearings.) I told the board that when we first passed NFG in this area we were accused by the opposition (in the press) of doing it "in the dark of night". Fortunately, we had all kinds of proof of all the effort we made to make sure there was publicity and multiple outreach to retailers.

From: Kate Silbaugh <kbsilbaugh@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 8:45 AM
To: Buzby, Maureen <mbuzby@cityofmelrose.org>
Cc: Ken Elstein <kenelstein@gmail.com>; Anthony Ishak <aishakpharmd@yahoo.com>; Mark Gottlieb <mark@phai.org>
Subject: Re: Pittsfield July 2d

It's unusual language, so perhaps it means putting the language on another agenda as a final. That said, municipalities may adopt NFG without a public hearing—it's not a state law requirement. Fingers crossed. Kate

On Tue, Jul 1, 2025 at 3:57 PM Buzby, Maureen
<mbuzby@cityofmelrose.org> wrote:

Thank you, Ken. I assume you are correct.
Having the meeting in person only means that many of us who would normally zoom in won't be able to but that will be true for the opposition as well.
And if it is the intent for the board to review and vote on the draft our attendance won't be quite as necessary - - other than to be in the room as a sign of support for the policy.
Next month is a different story. If the meeting is in person only I will try to be there.
Thank you for going, Ken!

From: Ken Elstein <kenelstein@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 2:26 PM
To: Kate Silbaugh <kbsilbaugh@gmail.com>; Anthony Ishak <aishakpharmd@yahoo.com>; Mark Gottlieb <mark@phai.org>; Buzby, Maureen <mbuzby@cityofmelrose.org>
Subject: Pittsfield July 2d

Attached is the agenda (hard to find) for Pittsfield's BoH meeting tomorrow night. I expect to be there in person. As posted, the meeting is in-person only.

I had intended to speak for five minutes or less during their regular Public Comment section. However, they have posted "**Tobacco Regulations Review- Vote on Draft**" as the next item on the agenda. I am guessing this would be for the draft posted for a future Public Hearing. Is that correct?

****CITY OF MELROSE PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE:

Please be advised that the Massachusetts Attorney General has determined that email is a public record unless the content of the email falls within one of the stated exemptions under the Massachusetts Public Records Laws.****

****CITY OF MELROSE PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE: Please be advised that the Massachusetts Attorney General has determined that email is a public record unless the content of the email falls within one of the stated exemptions under the Massachusetts Public Records Laws.****

****CITY OF MELROSE PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE: Please be advised that the Massachusetts Attorney General has determined that email is a public record unless the content of the email falls within one

of the stated exemptions under the Massachusetts Public Records Laws.****

****CITY OF MELROSE PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE: Please be advised that the Massachusetts Attorney General has determined that email is a public record unless the content of the email falls within one of the stated exemptions under the Massachusetts Public Records Laws.****

****CITY OF MELROSE PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE: Please be advised that the Massachusetts Attorney General has determined that email is a public record unless the content of the email falls within one of the stated exemptions under the Massachusetts Public Records Laws.****

****CITY OF MELROSE PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE: Please be advised that the Massachusetts Attorney General has determined that email is a public record unless the content of the email falls within one of the stated exemptions under the Massachusetts Public Records Laws.****