

# LATE

**SB1032**

Submitted on: 2/5/2015

Testimony for CPN on Feb 5, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By   | Organization  | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|----------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Brent Lankford | Island Vaporz | Comments Only      | Yes                |

I stand in opposition for the following reasons:

- Electronic cigarettes are not tobacco products.
- Other products that contain nicotine and used to help people stop smoking are not included.
- The 80% tax would go to Hawaii cancer research special fund however nicotine alone has not been proven to cause cancer.
- The cancer research special fund is rumored to mismanage fund and an audit should be conducted before giving them more money.
- I saw on Hawaii news that one reason for the tax increase on electronic cigarettes would be to stop children from using electronic cigarettes. A person must be 18 years of age or older to purchase electronic cigarettes already by Hawaii State law.
- The added tax would be passed on to the customers making electronic cigarettes a less appealing choice to stop smoking.
- The electronic cigarette industry is beginning to grow and hire more people in a time when more money is being spent online and less people being employed locally. Randomly increasing regulations and taxes on businesses would hurt job growth.
- Much press has been unfairly negative to the electronic cigarette and fair studies need to be done. This is explained in Forbes recent article "New Surgeon General Should Prescribe Scientific Honesty On E-Cigarettes" published 2.02.15. I have provided a link to the article.

**LATE**

**SB1032**

Submitted on: 2/5/2015

Testimony for CPN on Feb 5, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 229

| <b>Submitted By</b> | <b>Organization</b> | <b>Testifier Position</b> | <b>Present at Hearing</b> |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Tim Michel          | Individual          | Oppose                    | No                        |

Comments: Oppose SB1032

Aloha Senators,

I am writing in strong opposition of SB1032. Expanding the term "Tobacco Products" by using the fact that something contains nicotine is like regulating diet pills by the definition "anything that contains caffeine". It is a ludicrous concept. This is all being done to vilify a product, e-cigarettes, that have been proven to be a safer alternative to combustible cigarettes. So what this comes down to is that you want money collected from a product that is a safer alternative to go to cessation programs for something many of them stopped using because of the aforementioned product. I see a flaw in that logic, let's see if you can find it. Nevermind the fact the money goes to programs that specifically make money for the drug industry by promoting the use of products such as the patch and gum, which, by the way, kids love! We can now talk about Chantix, let's not because it kills people. Not maybe, not probably, it kills people. With all due respect Senators, this is a rabbit hole you are being dragged down by special interest, that it will be hard to climb back out of. Please consider this carefully and Vote to oppose SB1032. Mahalo

**LATE**

Feb. 4 2015 11:50 pm

To whom it may concern (Hawaii State Legislature),

I Bradley Orsino have been a smoker since 2009. With that being said the use of electronic cigarettes have made it a healthy lifestyle for me. Been off the cigarettes since 2010. I have been part of this lifestyle, living a good and healthier life. Been encouraging other to stop the use of tobacco mainly big tobacco products that have been a big and major issue for centuries.

As you know a cigarette contains hundreds of chemicals that are harmful to us, as for the electronic "cigarettes" we use don't. It mainly consists of VG (vegetable glycerin) and natural flavorings. WHICH isn't harmful. Yes, you heard "vapor" might build up in your lungs. Wrong. As liquids we use aren't made from water or such water based products. I may bring this up because it may give you a better insight. Some are obvious but its good to hear from us that we know what we are doing; we know what is/are harmful for us. We educate ourselves of the use of these devices, liquids, etc.

With SB1032 hearing, 80% tax hike is ridiculous. Average pack of cigarettes cost about 8-10 dollars. As for a bottle of liquid, 12 dollars but it'll last us "vapers" or electronic cigarette users about 3-5 days. I cam say from being a former smoker, Used to smoke about 2 packs every two days. Killing me slowly, and other alternatives such patches and gum don't work. This bill will increase lung cancer by ten fold in Hawaii. We live in a great state; we are simply trying to quit a dangerous and life threatening habit. This bill isn't the way. What we need to do educate our state to the REAL threat, vapors aren't harmful, and smoke is. Think about it. This bill will also take away from honest business owners; they aren't trying to make a buck. BUT help former smokers like me or even you live healthier.... ill end this hear and ill say this. If this bill passes people will see the cost and go back into smoking, getting lung issues and what not. Please reconsider and lets all as a community talk over and come to a much more reasonable outcome. Aloha

Sincerely,  
Bradley Santos Orsino

**LATE**

**SB1032**

Submitted on: 2/4/2015

Testimony for CPN on Feb 5, 2015 09:00AM in Conference Room 229

| Submitted By                   | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| EDWIN RAY A'ALONA<br>DELA CRUZ | Individual   | Oppose             | No                 |

THESE TWO THINGS SHOULD SAY IT ALL. WHY MESS UP SOMETHING THAT IS HELPING PEOPLE QUIT THE AWFUL HABIT OF SMOKING? FOR THE RECORD I AM A FORMER SMOKER THAT QUIT USING AN ECIG. I HAVE NOT HAD A CIGARETTE SINCE OCTOBER OF 2008. I USED TO BE A 2 PACK A DAY SMOKER.

#1

The American Heart Association isn't known for being all that into smoking. But vaping? It can get down with it, in certain cases.

The group has taken a remarkably measured stance on e-cigarettes, suggesting in a lengthy statement this weekend that the technology could help smokers quit, and refraining from outright condemning the tech, like other organizations have.

It's something of a win for the industry, which is expected to top \$5 billion in revenues this year. At every turn, health groups and politicians have taken shots at vaping and the companies who make e-liquid, suggesting that they are every bit as dangerous as cigarettes, despite there being some evidence (and the common sense-argument) that they're leaps and bounds safer than combustibles.

The AHA had avoided making any sort of statement until now. In a 20-page policy paper, the association cites research that suggests vaping is less dangerous than smoking and suggests it can be used as a smoking cessation aid.

"E-cigarettes either do not contain or have lower levels of several tobacco-derived harmful and potentially harmful constituents compared with cigarettes and smokeless tobacco," it states. E-cigarettes also "present an opportunity for harm reduction if smokers use them as substitutes for cigarettes."

That's not to say that the AHA wholeheartedly endorses the use of e-cigarettes. Like many other health organizations (and like some in the industry itself), the group suggests that e-cigs should be regulated much like tobacco products are now, and it also cites the oft-stated worry that e-cigs could "renormalize" tobacco use and serve as a gateway for children and teens to get into smoking.

Those worries were to be expected, coming from a group that has spent decades trying to get people to quit smoking. But the levelheadedness of the policy statement overall has to be seen as a win for vapers and e-cigarette companies—it would have been easy for the organization to condemn e-cigarettes outright.

Instead, the group said that more longitudinal and long-term studies on their effects are needed (an idea that few would disagree with), and that secondhand exposure to e-cig vapors is likely to be much less dangerous than exposure to tobacco smoke.

The AHA said that it supports FDA regulation of e-cigarettes, but that it doesn't want the regulations dominated by "major US cigarette manufacturers," who could "promote dual use to sell more conventional cigarettes" and could "steer e-cigarette users to combustible products and thereby increase rather than recreate nicotine and tobacco addiction."

That's not an unfounded fear, either, as big tobacco has spent millions lobbying to make the barrier to entry so high in the e-cig market that the small companies pushing innovation in the space will be smoked out.

Finally, the group suggested that e-cigarettes should be taxed enough so as to discourage children from buying them, "while retaining or increasing differentials with combustible products by increasing taxes on combustibles." In other words: Tax smokers more, tax vapers less.

The move puts the AHA in the company of the FDA, which, earlier this year, suggested that it's certainly not a good thing to encourage people to take up vaping—but admitted that the habit is most likely much safer than smoking.

#2

The news: Fifty-three scientists have written to the UN's World Health Organization Director General Margaret Chan cautioning her not to classify e-cigarettes as tobacco products, which would then lead to stricter regulatory controls on the nascent industry.

The scientists say that e-cigarettes are "part of the solution" to worldwide tobacco addiction.

"These products could be among the most significant health innovations of the 21st century — perhaps saving hundreds of millions of lives. The urge to control and suppress them as tobacco products should be resisted," they said.

"Policies should be evidence-based and proportionate to risk, and give due weight to the significant reductions in risk that are achieved when a smoker switches to a low risk nicotine product."

Leaked documents demonstrate that the WHO views electronic cigarettes as a "threat" to global health and desires to classify them as regular tobacco products under the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC); 178 countries are party to the agreement, and regulation could threaten some of the \$3 billion in worldwide sales posted in 2013. Big Tobacco for once is backing the scientists, insisting the devices allow smokers to have a less-risky alternative. (Major cigarette companies, of course, see e-cigarettes as both a major potential competitor and the future of the industry.)

The background: Science doesn't adequately understand the potential health effects of e-cigarettes. One major literature review by researchers from the University of California, San Francisco, found that 84 studies provided no evidence that e-cigarettes help regular smokers quit.

"Many people are using e-cigarettes because they are hoping to quit smoking. Smokers who use e-cigarettes are actually less likely to quit smoking than smokers who aren't using e-cigarettes," says lead author Stanton Glantz. Other researchers say that e-cigarettes are also used in tandem with regular ones, making it very unclear whether they're useful in smoking cessation.

On the other hand, a London study surveyed 5,863 smokers over five years and found that e-cigarette users were 60% more likely than those who used other over-the-counter solutions to quit. The results found that 20% of e-cigarette users were no longer using traditional cigarettes, compared with 8% of users who used other products and 17% who used nothing at all and just went cold turkey.

Study author Jamie Brown is "cautiously optimistic" about the potential harm-reduction uses of e-cigarettes but "the trade-off is we cannot definitively rule out that an unmeasured factor may have influenced the result."

A more recent study published in the journal Tobacco Control surveyed 60 daily smokers aged 18-35 and found that passive exposure to e-cigarettes was associated with a significantly higher desire and urge to consume both e-cigarette and real cigarette smoke.

"It's important to note that there could be effects of being in the company of an e-cigarette user, particularly for young smokers. For example, it's possible that [it] may promote less quitting," says lead author Andrea C. King, director of the Clinical Addictions Research laboratory at the University of Chicago.

"The results provide the first evidence in a controlled setting that [e-cigarette] exposure may evoke smoking urges in young adult daily smokers," the authors of the research say.

For some, the potential benefits of e-cigarettes far outweigh the harms, and there's no evidence that regulating them as harshly as real cigarettes would be beneficial to

society.

"There simply is no product on the market that's more dangerous than tobacco cigarettes, and nobody in their right mind would argue that cigarette smoking is less hazardous or even equally hazardous to vaping," said Michael B. Siegel, a community health sciences professor at Boston University who specializes in tobacco control.

Big Tobacco is big on whatever allows them to keep selling tobacco products en masse and are keen to reform their terrible public image by supporting harm reduction technology. Scientists for the industry are working on harm reduction devices like an electronic sleeve that burns tobacco at a lower temperature, supposedly preventing harmful tar from entering the lungs.

Analyst Richard Essex says that "hard qualitative analysis showed that political, social and economic factors are now major challenges for" tobacco companies. And while these giants would obviously prefer that people keep buying the 6 trillion traditional cigarettes sold worldwide each year, major tobacco companies like Philip Morris see huge survival and growth opportunities in electronic smoking devices.

For its part, the WHO says that the safety of electronic cigarettes are "illusive" and that their effects on the human body is impossible to determine because "the chemicals used in electronic cigarettes have not been fully disclosed, and there are no adequate data on their emissions."

Why you should care: This really is the future of tobacco smoking. Few would claim that e-cigarettes are as dangerous as real cigarettes, but the data is still out on whether they really are the panacea the e-cigarette industry claims they are. And regulation may be coming, or be quashed, before scientists adequately understand their effects.

February 5, 2015

**Regarding Bills SB1220 & SB1032**

- 1. Thanks to E Cigs I no longer use nicotine and I have smoked since age 12 and I am now 66.**
- 2. Not all who smoke get cancer and sometimes people who never smoked get cancer.**
- 3. Raising the price will not stop teenagers from smoking. It might make them steal more to get the money.**
- 4. To me there is more harmful ingredients in the air we breath from exhaust pipes and chemicals and Vog.**
- 5. The Truth is Alcohol destroys more lives and families than any cigarette ever did.**

**I Vote No To ANY RAISES IN TAX FOR E CIGS**

Sincerely,

*Lottie Stanback*

Lottie Stanback

P.O. Box 161094  
Hon., HI 96816

- 6. Less fines caused by cigarettes and no butts left on ground.*
- 7. Would burden the people who smoke financially in a already hurting economy.*