



400 N. Broadway, Suite #1, Edmond, OK 73034
(405) 341-1899

To Whom It May Concern,

3/3/2014

My name is Sean Gore, I am the Chairman of (OVAL) or the Oklahoma Vapors Advocacy League and I am writing on behalf of everyone in Oregon who is trying to make the necessary improvements in their lives and their health throughout the state and who have chosen to move away from tobacco cigarettes by switching to e-cigarettes or personal vaporizers.

Individuals who are now vaping or using e-cigarettes have tried for years to get away from tobacco and its harmful effects, yet when they find something that actually works someone or some organization wants to penalize or ostracize us for taking a step that should in all rights be commended. Why I ask? Money! I say the health organizations have had 50 years to find a safer effective alternative and they failed. All this boils down to is demonizing the vapor industry in order to get them taxed so health care can get the revenues.

If these organizations and entities were really concerned about clean air and our health on state properties then why are we not addressing topics such as the chemicals emitted by fragranced consumer products like air fresheners in the very building you are serving now? Did you know that the very fragranced products used every day were tested and shown to emit more than 130 different volatile organic compounds and of these 24 are classified as toxic or hazardous under US Federal Laws, and each product emitted at least 1 of these compounds. The average product emitted more than 17 VOC's. Of these 1 to 8 were toxic or hazardous. Why aren't we concerned about this issue? Again, Money! Health organizations as well as the state do not profit from the sale of these products so it's not of much concern.

When is good news bad news? When people stop engaging in unhealthy behaviors that state government relies on for funding. In Oklahoma we now rank 39th nationally for its rate of adult smoking down from 47th just last year. There

were 14 million fewer cigarette tax stamps sold last year, a 5.2 percent drop. In coming years as the smoking rate continues to drop and more surveys are published it will be clear that e-cigarettes will have been a major factor in bringing down the smoking rate.

Ask yourself this, where do the state and the health organizations of most states get a majority of their funding? Answer, the tax stamps on the bottom of each pack of cigarettes in which Oklahoma for instance, the first 23 cents of each pack of cigarettes goes to the state's sinking fund to repay bonds. The revenue generated by an 80 cent increase supports multiple health uses, general government expenditures and local governments. Seventeen percent of the 80 cent tobacco tax goes to the states general revenue fund.

In the case of TSET (Tobacco Settlement Endowment Trust) and special interest groups such as the Lung/Heart Association and the Cancer Society this means money collected from payments generated through the 1998 Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement in Oklahoma, between the state and federal excise tax on cigarettes and also the tobacco settlement payments which are over half of the price of a pack of cigarettes. So if the majority of all tobacco smokers are switching to the much safer style of nicotine replacement such as the e-cigarette or PV's which are not sin taxed then what happens to these organizations funding? It disappears and they cease to exist!

Big Pharma is also at risk. They have created and marketed while spending millions to get there so called nicotine replacement and cessation products to the public. If the majority of today's smokers are switching to the e-cigarette or personal vaporizer instead of their products which are proving to be less effective, they stand to lose billions in revenue. Let's take Chantix for example. They've spent millions in marketing and research and it's even FDA approved and has been linked to over 500 suicides. I don't know of one e-cigarette or personal vaporizer that has been linked to any such case.

This is the case throughout Oregon and Oklahoma, as well as most states across the nation.

The e-cigarette market is projected to overtake the tobacco industry within this decade, truth be told they need people to buy tobacco products for their own survival. What is happening through TSET and bans trying to compare vaping with

smoking is basic indoctrination. If the health organizations, special interest groups and big pharma can demonize e-cigarettes through bribes using taxpayer dollars while screaming health issues then they can make it easier to get PV's and e-cigarettes taxed, thus saving their jobs and accomplishing self preservation.

Take for example, a health advisory issued by the Dr. Cline and the Oklahoma Department of Public Health shortly before Governor Fallin's executive order was announced. OSDH asserts that e-cigarette vapor contains a variety of toxic substances such as formaldehyde that can harm the health of bystanders. However, upon reviewing the citations used by OSDH to back up these claims, the studies appear to be misrepresented.

One study cited by OSDH says the formaldehyde that was detected in the test chamber at a minuet level, could be from the test subject's exhaled breath since it was detected before the subject actually used the electronic cigarette. The other study states that any contaminates that were detected in trace amounts in e-cigarettes were comparable to the reference product. The reference product used in the study happens to be the very same pharmaceutical nicotine inhaler product that is both promoted and provided by the OSDH to Oklahomans attempting to quit smoking. Why in the world would OSDH view e-cigarettes as a public health hazard while at the same time promoting a profitable pharmaceutical product that shares a comparable toxicology profile? Something isn't adding up. The more you follow the money, the more clear the picture.

The Governor in Oklahoma abused her power and side stepped the legislative process while stepping on legislator's toes when she signed an Executive Order banning the use of electronic cigarettes and personal vaporizers on state properties. There was no imminent risk to human health to constitute such an order. The legislators of our great state have been working diligently with OVAL to find acceptable and reasonable regulations for the new e-cigarette and vaping industry and we have made great progress working together. Please don't put your agendas ahead of those of the people. I humbly ask you not to buy into the scare tactics that you would base your decisions on. Such as cherry picked, outdated and inconsistent studies used to mis-inform.

If health organizations were truly concerned about taking action and promoting real and lasting solutions for health vs. self preservation they would

stand with organizations such as OVAL along with other groups like the National Vapers Club, Consumer Advocates for a Smoke Free Alternative Association (CASAA) and help adults move away from tobacco products while implementing laws to prevent our youth from possessing or purchasing any of these products that are meant for adults. That's the first step that needs to be taken, but yet through lies, misinformation and bribes these organizations are trying to influence local communities as well as the states to impede on individuals civil liberties.

I've been to several proposed ban meetings where these organizations were involved and have read the misinformation they put out yet; I have found not one concrete basis they can use for truly banning e-cigarettes.

Jonathan Small, Vice President for Policy, at the Oklahoma Council of Public Affairs, which is the state's largest free market and limited government think tank states and I quote: "It's alarming, their use of taxpayer dollars to influence citizens and local communities into banning safe and effective alternatives to traditional smoking products." He goes further to say "TSET should be about real and lasting solutions for health care, not the selective discriminatory efforts of biased bureaucrats. It is time for citizens and lawmakers to reform the current operations of TSET" End quote.

I've heard things such as public persona or opinion, role modeling, nicotine, we don't know what's in them, clean air, targeting minors w/ flavors, it's a precursor to smoking and it's a health risks to the user. Why would anybody make comments based on rumors and inconclusive evidence where there is no overwhelming creditable burden of proof?

Let's address these issues shall we?

1. Persona or Role Modeling – Is it ok to want to ban or prohibit something that poses no major health risk to the user or the public simply because one thinks they are nasty or doesn't like them or it looks like smoking. What gives another the right to impede on someone else's civil liberties simply because they don't agree? I believe seeing someone try to move away from something that does cause harm to others is being more of a role model than someone who tries to impose their will upon others simply because

they don't like it. The last time I checked this was still a democracy and it should be instilled in each and every one of us that even though we may not like or agree with something and if it does not pose a major risk to our fellow human beings then it is not our right to impede on another's civil liberties to express one's self. First and foremost it is the parent's job to be the role models in their children's life. This society is so about blaming something or someone else other than where the responsibility actually lies. When does responsible parenting come back into our society?

Is it ok to try and ban someone from using something that causes no apparent risk to others, but can help make positive improvements in that person's life from a building or park simply because they aren't appealing to someone's eye or it looks like smoking and could site enforcement issues? Personal vaporizers do not resemble nor smell like traditional cigarettes so enforcement issues are not a problem. That's simply an excuse not to do ones job. These organizations want to preach role modeling, but only to what suits them at that time.

2. Nicotine – Toxic and It Effects the Nervous System and Heart - While putting any form of foreign substance into the body should be discouraged it cannot however be totally avoided. Nicotine is a stimulant similar to caffeine and poses no more of a health risk to the user when used in the E-liquid any more than caffeine would when drinking a cup of coffee. It is the other 64 carcinogens in traditional cigarette smoke that pose the major health risk. Although, while nicotine is addictive and toxic at high levels and should at all times be kept away from children and pets, the dose makes the poison (Principal of Toxicology). Current FDA approved nicotine replacement products have a history of sickening children. Studies indicate that oral ingestion of nicotine below 50mg/60mg per unit volume weight is not harmful to adults. Nicotine in e-liquids sold to the consumer does not contain more than 36mg and it is not orally consumed, but inhaled.

Over the past decade, new research has taught us more about how nicotine affects the brain and the body. For example, a lower incidence of

Alzheimer's Disease in smokers. This transformation with nicotine happened when the nicotine patch was introduced. In 2000, a study performed at Stanford revealed surprising results about nicotine's effects on blood vessels. Contrary to popular opinion, the study showed that nicotine actually boosts the growth of new blood vessels. The discovery may lead to new treatments for diabetes.

Also in 2006, Duke Scientists found that people with depression who were treated with nicotine patches reported a decrease in their depressive feelings.

3. We Don't Know What's In Them – Yes we do.

Propylene Glycol - a preservative that has been around since the 1950's and is used in almost everything we eat and come in contact with on a daily basis. Make up, Food Preservatives, etc. It is even used in hospitals or with a breathing treatment where Albuterol is distributed to the lungs. The PG is a binding agent and is used as the delivery vehicle to carry the steroid to the lungs.

Vegetable Glycerin – Is of a sweet nature and of low toxicity. It is a simple polyol compound that is widely used in pharmaceutical formulations.

US Food Grade Flavorings – I don't think I need to explain what food flavorings are for, it's pretty self explanatory.

Distilled Water – Same

Nicotine – We just went over that.

Those 5 ingredients are what make up the e-liquids and should be the only ingredients allowed to make e-liquids. All approved by the FDA for human consumption.

4. Clean Air - It's a Health Risk to the User or Others - Again, if they had done their homework they would have found more and more studies coming out

every day in favor of e-cigarettes and their positive effects on health and safety.

Three recent studies on the effects of second hand vapor have confirmed there is no apparent health risk from the PV or E-Cigarette to the user or bystanders whether indoor or outdoor. I would like to refer to three of those studies. Two of which were conducted in the United States and the last one in Europe within the last two years.

US Studies:

1. The first called Peering through the Mist: “What does the chemistry of contaminants in electronic cigarettes tell us about health risks” conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn, PhD with the Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, School of Public Health at Drexel University in 2013 confirmed that chemicals in electronic cigarettes pose minimal health risk. The study which has been peer reviewed and published in the BMC Public Health Journal, reviewed over 9,000 observations about the chemistry of the vapor and the liquid in e-cigarettes, Dr. Burstyn was able to determine that the levels of contaminants e-cigarette users are exposed to are insignificant, far below levels that would pose any health risk. Additionally, there is NO health risk to bystanders further stating that there is no serious concern about the contaminants such as volatile organic compounds (formaldehyde, acrolein, etc.) in the liquid or produced by heating. While these contaminants are present, they have been detected at problematic levels only in a few studies that apparently were based on unrealistic levels of heating. The frequently stated concern about contamination of the liquid by nontrivial quantity of ethylene glycol or diethylene glycol remains based on a single sample of an early technology product (and even this did not rise to the level of health concern) and has not been replicated since. Proposals to ban e-cigarettes in places where smoking is banned have been based on

concern there is a potential risk to bystanders, but the study shows there is no concern.

2. Informa Healthcare did an inhalation toxicology study in 2012 on the Comparison of the effects of e-cigarette vapor and cigarette smoke on indoor air quality. The conclusion of the study said and I quote **“The current study indicates that there are very low indoor air quality impacts from the use of an electronic cigarette based on the risk screening of measured emissions. It also indicates no apparent risk to human health from e-cigarette emissions based on the compounds analyzed.”**

European Study:

The biological and chemical toxicology research laboratory in Verbania, Italy along with the Onassis Cardiac Surgery Center in Athens, Greece presented an abstract at the SRNT meeting 2012 in Helsinki, Finland on the Characterization of chemical released to the environment by electronic cigarettes use (ClearStream-AIR project): is passive vaping a reality? The conclusions of that study follow as such: “The above experiment, within the limits of the observed parameters, has underlined that e-smoking does not produce detectable amounts of toxic and carcinogenic substances in the air of an enclosed space. Further studies are needed to better understand all the involved aspects. However this preliminary assessment indicates that passive vaping impact, when compared to the traditional cigarette smoking, is so low that it is just detectable, and it does not have the toxic and carcinogenic characteristics of cigarette smoking. The absence of combustion and the lack of sidestream smoking, with it’s know toxic effects are probably the main reasons for the differences observed in air pollution characteristics between e-cigarettes and tobacco smoking.

On the basis of the obtained results on ARPA data about urban pollution, we can conclude by saying that it could be more unhealthy to breath air in big cities compared to staying in the same room with someone who is vaping.

Dr. Konstantinos Farsalinos who was one of the doctors involved with this study also conducted studies on stiffening of the arteries, cardio vascular, cardiac cells, and cardio O2 supply to the heart. All conclusions showed no apparent change after using e-cigarettes however, did show considerable negative change in all areas after smoking a traditional tobacco cigarette.

5. Targeting Minors w/ Flavors – In the past year, the lobbying arms of groups like American Cancer, Heart, and Lung have become so virulently against e-cigarettes that they have even began opposing simple bills to ban sales to minors because they aren't defining e-cigarettes in proposed laws as 'tobacco products' and subjecting them to the same taxation as products like cigars. Yet, they are at the very heart of the organizations screaming that the e-cigarette industry is targeting minors with all of the flavors. In state after state, we keep finding that while pro-vapor advocates are pushing for statutory age limits these groups are opposing these measures. Why on GOD's green earth would anybody oppose legislation as such? E-cigarettes are not a tobacco product, they are a by-product of tobacco. That would be like saying all sugar must be a sugarcane product. Simply not true. The real reason for all of the flavors is because when a person gives up analog (tobacco) cigarettes their sense of smell and taste come back. Just because we are aging doesn't mean we don't enjoy good flavors as adults. I would like to reference DR. Farsalinos with the Onassis Cardiac Surgery Center whom conducted a survey titled "Impact of Flavor Variability on Electronic Cigarette Use Experience: An Internet Study: The study's conclusion which states and I quote "The results of this survey indicate that EC liquid flavorings play a major role in the overall experience of dedicated users and support the hypothesis that they are important contributors in reducing or eliminating smoking consumption. This should be considered by the health authorities; based on the current minimal adoption of ECs by youngsters, it is reasonable to support that any proposed regulation should ensure that flavorings are available to EC consumers while at the same time restrictions to the use, by youngsters (especially non-smokers) should be imposed in order to avoid future penetration of EC use to this population."

6. E-Cigarettes are a Precursor to Smoking – E-Cigarettes are not a precursor to smoking and there are studies coming out continuously stating as to such.

A study that came out in Forbes Magazine on October 31, 2013 titled Study Suggest E-Cigarettes Are Not a Gateway to the Conventional Kind and was conducted by Theodore Wagener, an assistant professor of general and community pediatrics at the University Of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center. Professor Wagener conducted a survey of 1,300 college students and found that only 43 (3.3 percent) said e-cigarettes were the first form of nicotine they'd tried. Of those, only one (2.3 percent) later started smoking conventional cigarettes. "It didn't seem as though it really proved to be a gateway to anything," said Wagener, who described his results at a meeting of the American Association for Cancer Research. Wagener further went on to say in HealthDay that most teens and adults who use e-cigarettes seem to be using them to stop smoking or at least to reduce the harm from smoking tobacco.

Another study titled "Adolescent Males' Awareness of and Willingness to Try Electronic Cigarettes found and I Quote "Most adolescent males were aware of e-cigarettes, and a substantial minority were willing to try them. ASH (Action on Smoking and Health) conducted a study in Great Britain among young adults and young people in 2013. They concluded among children regular use of e-cigarettes is extremely rare. Children who had heard of e-cigarettes were asked about their use and knowledge of them. What little use that is reported is confined almost entirely to children who currently smoke or used to smoke. Among young people who have never smoked 1% have "tried e-cigarettes once or twice" 0% report continued e-cigarette use and 0% expect to try an e-cigarette soon.

Dr. Richard Carmona, who served as the 17th Surgeon General of the United States stated in a letter pertaining to the New York City ban proposal that, "The history suggest that we need more viable alternatives in this fight against tobacco." He went on further to say, "He believes that one such alternative is the electronic cigarette and that he is extremely concerned that well-intentioned but scientifically un-supported efforts to ban e-cigarettes could contribute to a giant step backward in the effort to defeat tobacco smoking."

With the credible 3rd party studies that continuously keep coming out in favor of e-cigarettes and personal vaporizers I ask why, why, are the health organizations and special interest groups lying to us? These are the very organizations that we have come to depend on and trust to tell us what is safe and what is not, and they have proven they are willing to lie and provide non-credible data to misinform and scare us into submission to save their own jobs and funding. I'm sorry, but frankly the public is tired of being lied to. It's time these organizations start doing their research and telling the truth while being held accountable for their actions. They have access to very same data that we do and if we can find it I know very well they can too. These organizations should be the ones sponsoring these studies. These organizations should be the ones introducing legislation to help protect our youth, yet the only thing they seem to care about is saving their own necks and to do whatever it takes to accomplish that goal. So, back to truth as stated in the beginning of this address, the truth is Funding through Taxation (Money)! With the rapid change from traditional analog cigarettes to the much safer e-cigarettes which are not subjected to the excise taxation as its predecessors are, these organizations are losing Millions of Dollars in funding.

I have been able to truthfully and successfully offer accurate rebuttal to every single one of their claims while showing an overwhelming burden of proof. It's time they are forced to tell the truth and until they can show creditable evidence through research and science stating otherwise they need to stop!

Thank you,
Sean Gore
Chairman - OVAL