

Dear Committee members,

I oppose SB 663. I have never been a smoker but I have seen family members, friends and others quit smoking and dramatically reduce nicotine use quickly and easily with vaporizers.

A new study published last month in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health concludes that a stable and high rate of success can be achieved for smoking cessation when products are purchased at vape shops where professional advice can be obtained (the study has been submitted separately for the record and is online at <http://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/12/4/3428/htm>).

Oregon has never licensed the retail sale of tobacco through the OLCC, nor should it do so now. Unlike alcohol and cannabis, nicotine is not a mind- altering substance and its regulation does not fit well within the mission of the OLCC. This agency is already heavily tasked with the duties to regulate alcohol. If OLCC fails to adequately regulate alcohol, people could die. Now the agency must create a whole new branch of itself for the regulation of cannabis. Many question whether the OLCC is up to these two giant tasks. These prime responsibilities should not be diluted on a whim or an afterthought amendment. The OLCC does not have expertise in electronic cigarettes, vaporizers, and the use of these rapidly developing products to support smoking cessation.

Neither vape store owners nor consumers need the assistance of the OLCC in regulating the industry. The industry should be understood as a mix of two dramatically different groups: the Big Tobacco companies that sell "cigalike" electronic cigarettes found in convenience stores, and the independent start-ups who deal in vaporizers online and in vape shops. This latter group is largely made up of ex-smokers. They tend to be passionate about their lifesaving mission and vigilant in self-regulatory efforts, including reputational punishment pressure to keep the industry honest. Big Tobacco is just trying to stay alive while the vape industry is helping people break free. SB 663 and the other anti- ecig / vape laws unwittingly help Big Tobacco to everyone's detriment.

There is no good cause to regulate electronic cigarettes and vaporizers more stringently than combustible cigarettes have ever been treated. A report published in the December 2014 issue of Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, found e-liquid to contain as advertised, a mixture of water, glycerin and/or propylene glycol, nicotine and flavor, all GRAS (generally recognized as safe for human consumption). Combustible cigarettes delivered 1500 times more harmful and potentially harmful constituents (HPHC). The aerosol from e-cigarettes showed HPHC content similar to the control air blanks (ambient air), rather than to the conventional cigarettes. Aerosol nicotine from ecigarettes were 85 percent lower than nicotine yield from conventional cigarettes.

[The report is submitted separately and is online at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0273230014002505>]

The electronic cigarette and vaporizer harm reduction strategies can best be thought of along the lines of the many homeopathic and naturopathic treatments unregulated by the FDA or the state, and sold in great volume through health food stores and on the internet.

Oregon should be wary of stamping out such a potentially beneficial new avenue to smoking cessation; the state should hesitate to tread where it does not fully understand the opportunities and ramifications in this dynamic field.

Were SB 663 to pass, it would again be far easier to buy and sell combustible cigarettes than electronic noncombustible alternatives.

The

OLCC would be stretched too thin to satisfactorily address three distinct regulatory missions in alcohol, cannabis and electronic cigarettes.

The -2 Amendment of SB 663 would create a protected class of ecig and vape providers unresponsive to consumers. The old lady in rural Oregon doesn't want to go to an OLCC licensed vape lounge to supplant her cigarettes. Online sales might suit her fine. She may or may not care whether she can vape in a retail store, but you can bet she doesn't want to be treated like an illicit drug user for kicking the cigarette habit.

Demonizing electronic cigarettes and vaporizers does not protect Oregonians or children; it protects Big Tobacco. These are not gateways, they are exits. SB 663 and similar laws would attempt to close the exits of a burning building just because some hellbent, gatecrashing teenagers might storm the wrong way into the building.

Laws only play into the psychology of rebellion and scarcity that motivates a hellbent teen. Parents and community members need to do their jobs in protecting kids; they are better at it than the state is anyway.

Adult smokers should not be treated like children to protect or punish when they opt to save their own lives with electronic cigarettes and vaporizers.

Panic over the loss of cigarette tax revenue is the elephant in the room for all these bill hearings. We need to be prepared for sin tax revenues to drop, and ready to celebrate the change in lifestyles. Don't create a new sin where none exists! Have some faith that these new technologies offer an opportunity to realize lower Oregon Health Plan costs and higher productivity across the state. We can be cigarette free in a generation by letting freedom work here.

I would further like to add for the record that the last minute addition of OLCC licensure for electronic cigarette and vaporizer sales within an amendment of an unrelated bill is deceptive, dishonest, despicable and cowardly. This is a clear attempt to circumvent the will of the people and businesses of Oregon.

Thank you for your time,

Angela Eckhardt  
127 Hwy 82, Lostine, Ore.  
541-569-2406