

*Email received on March 11, 2015*

Representative Seaton,

After reading through the documents of this bill, I felt the need to properly inform you of some of the misinformation being presented by the sponsor. The provided PowerPoint presentation in the documents section regarding electronic cigarettes has many false or half-truths throughout it. This letter will follow the outline of that presentation in order to correct the statements made.

Firstly, the lack of factual information regarding equipment types is astounding. The terms vape-pen, e-hookah, and hookah pen are in no way used by anyone other than those attempting to outright ban the use of electronic cigarettes. Cartomizers are not a tank system, and are actually seldom used today. Tank systems are either of two type, clearomizer or Refillable Tank Atomizer(RTA). Devices are not “hacked” or modified, but rather a person can take one design and find ways to make it better. This is one of the founding principles of our country, ingenuity. The industry has self-evolved into its own systems of checks and balances to ensure the safety of the product users, without government interference. And finally regarding systems, dry herb vaporizers are NOT electronic cigarettes. This is one of the largest misconceptions to what the industry is about. The inclusion of the slide showing these types of systems shows exactly what the author is trying to do, demonize a potential life saving system.

Regarding the health effects, especially to bystander, the author fails to mentions much needed facts when making their case. Let’s take carcinogens for instance. Nearly anything can create a possible carcinogen when burned. The cited studies by the author do just that; take a device, use it well beyond its intended settings, and blatantly say that it created a carcinogen. They fail to mention that at the proper settings, there were no detection of any potentially harmful substance, just the worst case scenario from a device that would be completely unusable. A more unbiased study, which states both proper and improper usage would be <http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMc1413069>. Notice that when used properly, they determined that there were no harmful byproducts. But, when you are looking to find a result, stretch something beyond its limits to achieve that desired result. With that said, there have been several studies stating that threat to bystanders is at a zero risk, including <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/14/18/abstract>. Or we can take it a step further and show that testing done on electronic cigarettes can be compared to a standard air blank, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0273230014002505>.

Finally, the use of words like “Could” or “Can” is a sign that the author has little factual evidence to support the statements they have made. The potential for something to cause harm also means that the potential to not cause harm exists. Evidence also shows, contrary to the presentation, that the use of electronic cigarettes does work as a cessation method in the battle against tobacco addiction, see <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24846453>.

In closing, electronic cigarettes are not a tobacco product, and have been ruled as such in a Nevada court. It is time that they are not demonized as being such, because they do have the potential to be a significant weapon against big tobacco. This bill should not be allowed any further passage all because the sight of it offended someone. That is not what our state government is for.

Thank you,

Jason Finney

North Pole, AK

907-322-1301