

## Abel, Pamela

---

**From:** Jim Weiler [jim@vaelek.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 11, 2014 2:47 AM  
**To:** Wallner, David; Gnam, Emily; jllewis@me.com; Clausius, Joseph; Leopold, Madelyn; Clear, Mark; Ragland, Nancy; Health; Cynda Solberg; jerry.halvorson@gmail.com; Wilcox, Judy; Edgar, Mark; Phair, Matthew; Lasky, Pat; Sieling, Renae; psoglin@cityofmadison.com; Subeck, Lisa; Zellers, Ledell; Cnare, Lauren; Vermeer, Michael; Bidar-Sielaff, Shiva; Rummel, Marsha; King, J Steven; Resnick, Scott; Skidmore, Paul; Cheeks, Maurice; Schmidt, Christopher; Palm, Lawrence; Dailey, Lucas; Strasser, John; Ahrens, David; Demarb, Denise; Weier, Anita  
**Subject:** Feelings on banning public use of electronic cigarettes

Park Commissioners, Board of Health members and Adlers,

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed equating of electronic cigarettes to the real thing in term of public use. I am a former Madison resident, now living in Columbus, but still working in Madison. E-cigs are not the evil that lawmakers and tobacco companies are trying to portray. I myself had tried many times unsuccessfully using a number of available methods over the course of a decade to quit smoking. I stumbled on to E-cigs in their very early days and they too failed (the same type tobacco companies are now selling). As the technology and designs evolved, I tried again and had excellent results. I have now been smoke free for over 2 years, and have brought no less than a dozen people along with me with the help of e-cigs, including my wife and mother. I still enjoy the benefits of untainted nicotine, and suffer none of the health implications of smoking.

The ultimate purpose of a smoking ban is to protect the health of the general public. However, numerous credible studies have been done that show there are no harmful effects to be had involving second hand vapor from an electronic device, even under worst case assumptions about exposure. The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch and reduce their health risks by an estimated 99%. By making e-cigarette users go outdoors, the City will be sending a strong message to traditional smokers that e-cigarettes are no safer than smoking. This will actually maintain the number of smokers in Madison, rather than help reduce smoking. This is a far more realistic risk to public health than any unfounded concerns about possible youth or non-smoker use uptake. In fact, the most recent report by the CDC showed that the dramatic increase in e-cigarette use over that past 3 years has not led to an increase in youth smoking. Youth smoking of traditional cigarttes continues to decline to record low levels.

E-cigarette use does not promote the smoking of traditional cigarettes, nor does it threaten the gains of tobacco control over the past few decades. In fact, by normalizing e-cigarette use over traditional smoking, the efforts of tobacco control are being supported. If anything, e-cigarette use denormalizes conventional smoking by setting the example of smokers choosing a far less harmful alternative to traditional smoking. The CDC surveys clearly show that there has been no "gateway effect" causing non-smokers to start smoking. As e-cigarettes have become more popular, all available evidence is showing that more and more smokers are quitting traditional cigarettes, including youth smokers.

So much of the regulatory drive surrounding electronic cigarette devices is sadly only about money, be it the direct loss of tobacco companies who clearly have no interest in public health, or via lawmakers directly or indirectly receiving contributions in exchange for votes. It is no secret that traditional cigarettes contain many chemicals that should unquestionably be illegal to distribute to the public. If neither product existed today, and both were proposed, traditional cigarettes would immediately be thrown out as being unsafe for consumption, while electronic cigarettes pose dangers to the individuals using them equal to that of ingesting caffeine, and no dangers whatsoever to bystanders who may be exposed to the vapor. Standing next to a running automobile poses a greater health risk than being in a room full of others that are vaping.

In closing, I urge you to please let the only factor weighing your decision on this matter to be the health and safety of the many individuals you represent, and please let your decision be based on researched facts beyond the biased studies performed with an agenda of discrediting this industry.

Thank you for listening,  
James and Michele Weiler