

**From:** [mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov)  
**To:** [HTHTestimony](#)  
**Cc:** [mz9995@hotmail.com](mailto:mz9995@hotmail.com)  
**Subject:** \*Submitted testimony for SB1109 on Feb 13, 2015 13:35PM\*  
**Date:** Thursday, February 12, 2015 6:37:50 PM

---

**SB1109**

Submitted on: 2/12/2015

Testimony for HTH on Feb 13, 2015 13:35PM in Conference Room 414

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Present at Hearing</b>
Michael Zehner	Hawaii Smokers Alliance	Oppose	Yes

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)

**From:** [Francis Wong](#)  
**To:** [HTHTestimony](#)  
**Subject:** Strong Support for SB 1109, Relating to the Regulation of Tobacco Products  
**Date:** Friday, February 13, 2015 9:40:22 AM

---

February 13, 2015

To: The Honorable Josh Green, Chair  
The Honorable Glenn Wakai, Vice Chair  
Members, Senate Committee on Health

Re: Strong Support for SB 1109, Relating to the Regulation of Tobacco Products

Hrg: Friday, February 13, 2015 at 1:35 pm, Room 414

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in strong support of SB 1109. I strongly support prohibiting the use of Electronic Smoking Devices in places open to the public and places of employment. I support including “electronic smoking devices” in the definition of “tobacco product” and “smoke or smoking” in the smoke-free workplace law, and to prohibit the use of electronic smoking devices in the places where smoking is prohibited. Including electronic smoking devices will protect the public, reduce confusion within society, decrease distractions in the workplace, and maintain the social norm.

As a new industry, the dangers of ESDs continue to emerge and show inconsistent amounts of the addictive poison nicotine in the e-juice, dual use with cigarettes, and huge increases of use by middle and high school students. Contrary to popular belief, ESDs do not emit harmless water vapor. Instead, they emit an aerosol that contains nicotine, ultra-fine particles, volatile organic compounds, and other toxins.

SB 1109 is the first step to regulating ESDs and protecting employees, customers, and the public from inadvertent exposure to nicotine and other chemicals and poisons. ESDs are not FDA approved smoking cessation devices and should not be used in enclosed or partially enclosed public places. Prohibiting ESD use where smoking is prohibited will protect the public, reduce confusion within society, decrease distractions in the workplace, and maintain the social norm.

I urge you to pass SB 1109 in order to provide protection for the public. Failing to act may set us back decades.

Mahalo,

Francis Wong  
3522 Ala Aloalo Pl.  
Honolulu, HI 96818

**From:** [Kathryn Braun](#)  
**To:** [HTHTestimony](#)  
**Subject:** Strong Support for SB 1109, Relating to the Regulation of Tobacco Products  
**Date:** Friday, February 13, 2015 3:33:42 AM

---

February 13, 2015

To: The Honorable Josh Green, Chair  
The Honorable Glenn Wakai, Vice Chair  
Members, Senate Committee on Health

Re: Strong Support for SB 1109, Relating to the Regulation of Tobacco Products

Hrg: Friday, February 13, 2015 at 1:35 pm, Room 414

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in strong support of SB 1109. I strongly support prohibiting the use of Electronic Smoking Devices in places open to the public and places of employment. I support including “electronic smoking devices” in the definition of “tobacco product” and “smoke or smoking” in the smoke-free workplace law, and to prohibit the use of electronic smoking devices in the places where smoking is prohibited. Including electronic smoking devices will protect the public, reduce confusion within society, decrease distractions in the workplace, and maintain the social norm.

As a new industry, the dangers of ESDs continue to emerge and show inconsistent amounts of the addictive poison nicotine in the e-juice, dual use with cigarettes, and huge increases of use by middle and high school students. Contrary to popular belief, ESDs do not emit harmless water vapor. Instead, they emit an aerosol that contains nicotine, ultra-fine particles, volatile organic compounds, and other toxins.

SB 1109 is the first step to regulating ESDs and protecting employees, customers, and the public from inadvertent exposure to nicotine and other chemicals and poisons. ESDs are not FDA approved smoking cessation devices and should not be used in enclosed or partially enclosed public places. Prohibiting ESD use where smoking is prohibited will protect the public, reduce confusion within society, decrease distractions in the workplace, and maintain the social norm.

I urge you to pass SB 1109 in order to provide protection for the public. Failing to act may set us back decades.

Mahalo,

Kathryn Braun  
625 Iolani Ave #504  
Honolulu, HI 96813

- We do not need to pass a law when businesses already apply restrictions on vaping if they choose.
- It should not be restricted to smoking areas by law because it's not smoke!
- Is people using ecigs in doors really causing that much of a problem that an individual establishment cannot handle it and needs a specific law written? I was at Chili's a few weeks ago with a group of about 6 friends. 2 of the people in the group took out electronic cigarettes and a Chili's staff member simply stated it was not allowed. My friends went outside.
- Let the FDA finish their studies & decide.
- When people are using ecigs to stop smoking let's not force them to be standing next to smokers tempting them to pick up the cancer sticks again!
- Individual businesses should be allowed to decide if they want to allow vaping in their establishments so they have the choice to cater to people using these devices.
- It would be expensive to resign everything. Maybe \$100,000 to \$200,000? Why do we need to put tax money to this when individual places can simply choose not to or to allow it?
- American Council on Science and Health published an article 2.11.15 sites more studies done that prove ecigs are nowhere near the risks of cigarettes and thus should not be shunned as such.



99-082 Kauhale St, Suite #B1  
Aiea, Hawaii 96701  
(808) 486-0402  
Devin@pcgamerzhawaii.com

February 12, 2015

To: The Senate

From: Devin Wolery, PC Gamerz, Inc., Director of Operations

RE: SB757, SB18, SB1109 – Oppose.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony.

PC Gamerz, is the only LAN center focused on eSports gaming in the state of Hawaii. We are also a Vape Lounge, operating as such for the last 6 years. We have had many customers that have switched from smoking cigarettes to using advanced vaporizer devices. They were able to make that switch, by being able to use the vaporizer in our store. If they had to go outside to use it, they would be with the same group of cigarette smokers they were trying to get away from. We stand in Strong Opposition to the bills listed above for the following:

- Vapor products contain no tobacco, produce no smoke, and have not been demonstrated to have the detrimental effects of combustible tobacco products. In fact, the FDA has taken appropriate and proportional regulation seriously and to date has not issued regulations for the product because they seemingly understand the potential this product has to switch people over from actual tobacco, which kills 480,000 people per year. Further, Mitch Zeller, Director of the Center for Tobacco Products at the FDA recently stated:
  - "If a current smoker, otherwise unable or unwilling to quit, completely substituted all of the combusting cigarettes that they smoked with an electronic cigarette at the individual level, that person would probably be significantly reducing their risk."
- The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has wisely taken its time on developing regulations for the vapor product industry and has not determined that these products are in fact tobacco products . At this time, with the exception of youth access laws targeted at keeping electronic cigarettes out of the hands of those below the age of 18, we feel that any action by state legislatures with regard to electronic cigarettes is premature.
- With current smoke free policies/laws which are largely self enforced, it is impossible to enforce an e-cigarette usage ban. As the products can be used discreetly without anyone else knowing. Vaper's just need to hold it in longer and then exhale faster. It will then dissipate within seconds and is undetectable.



99-082 Kauhale St, Suite #B1  
Aiea, Hawaii 96701  
(808) 486-0402  
Devin@pcgamerzhawaii.com

- A study came out within the last 2 days that shows that vaporizer aerosol nicotine was 85% lower than cigarette smoke. Mainstream cigarette smoke (the same stuff a smoker inhales while smoking) had about 1,500 times more harmful and potentially-harmful constituents (HPHC) than e-cigarette aerosol, **or puffing on room air.**
  - <http://acsh.org/2015/02/machine-puffed-e-cigs-yielded-vapor-containing-exactly-what-you-expect-much-else/>
- Many businesses already have a policy in place banning vaporizer use. And many businesses embrace it and use it to gain that demographic of customers. While we respect and honor an individual's right to not get smoke or vape blown in their face while out at a bar, we also honor the right for certain businesses to allow vaping if they so choose. And while we do not think many restaurants, bars, hotels, etc will choose to allow vaping, we do think it should be their choice. This is important to us, not because we think it is OK to vape in movie theaters or planes... But because a ban like this would effect the way we conduct business in our vape shops - a place where people expect there to be vaping.
- When this law was passed on this Big Island, they spent around \$20,000 to change signage. To change it across the state, could possibly cost upwards of \$300,000. And to make this a law, based off possibilities . Just does not seem appropriate. We should be waiting for the FDA to rule on it. Before sending people back to the trenches with the cigarette smoke.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Devin Wolery

Director of Operations

www.PCGamerzhawaii.com

**From:** [mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov)  
**To:** [HTHTestimony](#)  
**Cc:** [vinkim@gmail.com](mailto:vinkim@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** \*Submitted testimony for SB1109 on Feb 13, 2015 13:35PM\*  
**Date:** Thursday, February 12, 2015 5:57:52 PM

---

**SB1109**

Submitted on: 2/12/2015

Testimony for HTH on Feb 13, 2015 13:35PM in Conference Room 414

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Present at Hearing</b>
Vin Kim	Individual	Oppose	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)



## Testimony in Opposition of HB940, SB757, SB18 & SB1109

Justin Wolery  
PC Gamerz, Inc,  
99-082 Kauhale Street #B12  
(808) 348-1636

I am writing to express my strong opposition to HB940, SB757, SB18 and SB1109 that propose restricting the use of vaping devices (I will not use the erroneous, nonsensical term “electronic smoking device” as no smoke or burning is involved.) in places where tobacco smoking is prohibited.

The reasons for banning tobacco smoke in indoor areas and other places is a health issue, due to the proven dangers of second hand smoke exposure of long periods of time. No such health risk is present with Vaping devices. I can refer you to a very large study performed by Drexel university involving over 8,000 participants in which group A was vaping in an enclosed room for long periods of time while group B was simply “breathing” and another enclosed space as a control group.

The study found air quality was actually BETTER in the room where people where vaping due to the anti-microbial nature of Propylene Glycol contained in electronic cigarette vapor. In fact most hospitals currently pump the stuff into their ventilation systems to help control the spread of disease while ironically setting policys that prohibit e-cigarette use in their facilitys.

This Study was performed by Dr Igor Burstyn, PHD, of the Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, Drexel University. You can read the full study here:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/159590828/Drexel-University-E-cig-Study#scribd>

Another study was recently published on Sciencedirect.com comparing the effects of e-cigarette vapor vs traditional cigarettes, as well as a comparison to normal air aka breathing normally. The results seem to both confirm and elaborate on the drexel univesity study as well as refute recent erroneous studys claiming all sorts of nonsense about formaldehyde and other dangers put forth by anti-vaping propagandists.

The highlights of this study include:

- The e-cigarettes contained and delivered mostly glycerin and/or PG and water.
- Aerosol nicotine content was 85% lower than the cigarette smoke nicotine.
- The levels of HPHCs in aerosol were consistent with the air blanks (<2 µg/puff).
- Mainstream cigarette smoke HPHCs (~3000 µg/puff) were 1500 times higher than e-cigarette HPHCs.
- No significant contribution of tested HPHC classes was found for the e-cigarettes.



The full study can be read here:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0273230014002505>

In short, the proposed bills are attempting to solve a problem that does not exist. Additionally any business is already free to set a policy prohibiting the use of vaping devices in their establishments, and these policies are largely respected by the vape community. We should not, therefore, restrict the ability of business and organizations supportive of vaping use to cater to that demographic.

Lastly, the updated signage requirements proposed would incur a large cost, recently when the big island implemented similar changes to signage requirements, the cost to implement them was estimated at over \$20,000 - the costs for the entire state will surely be orders of magnitude higher, and for what?

Thank you for taking the time to read my testimony.

-Justin Wolery