

Senator Dyson,

I am writing you today regarding SB209, Regulation of Smoking in Public. Although I am a believer that smoking is bad for us, both first and second hand, I do not feel it is the State's place to dictate what should and should not occur on the people's property. Secondly, and most importantly to me, I feel that there is language in the specific bill that should not be there at all. The House and Senate are sliding in restrictions on devices, e-cigarettes, that continually are proven to be a safer, if not healthy, alternative to smokers who are trying to quit. Why would any elected official want to create legislation that would keep people from quitting smoking?

I would like to hear why you believe that electronic cigarettes should be included in this Bill, and would also like to hear your sources of information that state that those devices should be included. The House and Senate have already proved their lack of knowledge regarding this subject, by the way they wrote the bill.

Across the country, there has been a "knee-jerk" reaction to the "fad" of vaping, and it's starting to get out of hand. The common excuse for the restrictions has been "We just don't know". Isn't it the job of the legislature to be 100% informed of something before they create legislation on it? More and more each day, new research studies are conducted stating what the vaping community already knows, e-cigarettes are not harmful to the user or bystanders.

And, what of the businesses that would be affected by this legislation? Any business should be able to have the choice of whether or not to allow smoking or vaping on their premises. If I do not want to go to a restaurant because they allow smoking, I do not go. It's a choice, and does not require the state to hold my hand when making that choice. If a business doesn't allow people to use electronic cigarettes, I will also choose not to give them my business. Also, businesses that deal in electronic cigarettes would also be included in this prohibition. How are customers to sample the product before they make a purchase? This will dissuade customers from buying new product, ultimately effecting the profit margin of said business. Doesn't seem very helpful to Alaskan businesses.

My final question to you is this. If the word comes out that the use of electronic cigarettes is in fact safe for the population, will you lead the fight to reverse that portion of the bill?

In closing, please do not allow this bill to prove was written. It is not beneficial for Alaska, and I guarantee it will waste the people's money. If you are set in moving forward, please remove the definitions of electronic cigarette, and remove the addition of electronic cigarette to the definition of smoking. Please visit [www.CASAA.org](http://www.CASAA.org) and learn about the benefits and actual research that has been done on these devices. Specifically, please read the Drexel study at <http://publichealth.drexel.edu/~media/files/publichealth/ms08.pdf> so you can see that there are zero health risks at a second hand level with regards to electronic cigarettes.

Thank you for your time,

Jason Finney  
North Pole  
907-322-1301