

File No. 131208

Committee Item No. 4

Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules

Date March 6, 2014

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date _____

Cmte Board

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Resolution
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ordinance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Legislative Digest
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Youth Commission Report
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Introduction Form
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	MOU
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grant Information Form
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grant Budget
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subcontract Budget
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Contract/Agreement
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Form 126 – Ethics Commission
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Award Letter
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Correspondence

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Environmental Review Determination</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Alisa Miller Date February 28, 2014

Completed by: _____ Date _____

[Health Code - Restrictions on Sale and Use of Electronic Cigarettes]

Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit the use of electronic cigarettes where smoking is otherwise prohibited; require a tobacco permit for the sale of electronic cigarettes; prohibit the sale of electronic cigarettes where the sale of tobacco products is otherwise prohibited; and making environmental findings.

NOTE: Additions are *single-underline italics Times New Roman*;
deletions are ~~*strike-through italics Times New Roman*~~.
Board amendment additions are double-underlined;
Board amendment deletions are ~~strikethrough normal~~.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 131208 and is incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. The San Francisco Health Code is hereby amended by adding Article 19N, Sections 19N.1 – 19N.9, to read as follows:

SEC. 19N.1 FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

(a) Electronic smoking devices, commonly referred to as electronic cigarettes or e-cigarettes, are battery-operated devices that may resemble cigarettes, although they do not contain tobacco leaf. People who use electronic smoking devices inhale vaporized liquid nicotine extracted from tobacco, or inhale other vaporized liquids, created by heat through an electronic ignition system, and exhale the vapor in a way that mimics smoking.

1 **(b) Electronic cigarettes are presently available for purchase and use in San Francisco.**

2 **(c) The FDA's Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Office of Compliance purchased two**
3 **samples of electronic cigarettes and components from two leading brands. These samples included 18**
4 **of the various flavored, nicotine, and no-nicotine cartridges offered for use with these products. These**
5 **cartridges were obtained to test some of the ingredients contained in them and inhaled by users of**
6 **electronic cigarettes. The FDA's Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Division of**
7 **Pharmaceutical Analysis (DPA) analyzed the cartridges from these electronic cigarettes for nicotine**
8 **content and for the presence of other tobacco constituents, some of which are known to be harmful to**
9 **humans, including those that are potentially carcinogenic or mutagenic. The DPA's analysis of the**
10 **electronic cigarette samples showed:**

11 **(1) The products contained detectable levels of known carcinogens and toxic chemicals to**
12 **which users could be exposed.**

13 **(2) Quality control processes used to manufacture these products are inconsistent or non-**
14 **existent.**

15 **(3) Tobacco-specific impurities suspected of being harmful to humans—anabasine, myosmine,**
16 **and β-nicotyrine—were detected in a majority of the samples tested.**

17 **(4) Three different electronic cigarette cartridges with the same label were tested and each**
18 **cartridge emitted a markedly different amount of nicotine with each puff. The nicotine levels per puff**
19 **ranged from 26.8 to 43.2 mcg nicotine/100 mL puff.**

20 **(d) The Surgeon General has found that the chemical nicotine is a powerful pharmacologic**
21 **agent that acts in the brain and throughout the body and is highly addictive. The United States**
22 **Department of Health and Human Services has concluded that nicotine is as addictive as cocaine or**
23 **heroin and is a highly toxic substance. Use of nicotine in any form may cause or contribute to**
24 **cardiovascular disease, complications of hypertension, reproductive disorders, cancers of many types,**
25 **and gastrointestinal disorders, including peptic ulcer disease and gastro esophageal reflux.**

1 (e) The FDA has raised concerns that electronic cigarettes, including but not limited to
2 flavored electronic cigarettes, can increase nicotine addiction among young people and may lead youth
3 to try conventional tobacco products. A CDC study showed that in 2011 4.7% of all high schoolers had
4 tried e-cigarettes and that in 2012 that number increased to 10.0% of all high schoolers. Electronic
5 cigarettes may not be legally sold to minors in California. Electronic smoking devices and other
6 unapproved nicotine delivery products have a high appeal to youth due to their high tech design and
7 availability in child-friendly flavors like cotton candy, bubble gum, chocolate chip cookie dough and
8 cookies and cream milkshake.

9 (f) Health authorities have also expressed concerns that the vapors released into the air
10 through the use of an electronic cigarette present a danger to others who breathe them.

11 (g) The use of an electronic cigarette in public is often indistinguishable from the use of
12 traditional tobacco products, prompting confusion among members of the public wherever smoking is
13 prohibited. Consequently, persons who smoke traditional tobacco products may be induced to do so in
14 areas where smoking is illegal under the mistaken belief that smoking is legal in such areas, or that the
15 ban on smoking in such areas is not being enforced.

16 (h) Owners of establishments such as office buildings and restaurants encounter similar
17 obstacles seeking to comply with the laws prohibiting smoking in certain locations. An owner may
18 request that a patron stop smoking cigarettes in a restaurant only to have the patron demonstrate that it
19 is an electronic cigarette. The Owner may also be placed in the position of having to confront and
20 examine the cigarettes of any number of customers absent a prohibition on the use of electronic
21 cigarettes where traditional cigarettes are banned.

22 (i) The agencies charged with enforcing compliance in enclosed and unenclosed spaces will
23 similarly have to devote considerable time and resources determining the individuals smoking
24 electronic cigarettes versus traditional cigarettes.
25

1 *(j) Some agencies in San Francisco have already adopted restrictions on e-cigarette usage*
2 *including San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Hospital, AT&T Ballpark, University of*
3 *California-San Francisco, San Francisco Department of Public Health and the San Francisco*
4 *International Airport.*

5 **SEC. 19N. 2 DEFINITIONS.**

6 *(a) "Director" means the Director of Public Health or his or her designee.*

7 *(b) "Electronic Cigarette" or "E-cigarette" means any device with a heating element, a*
8 *battery, or an electronic circuit that provides nicotine or other vaporized liquids to the user in a*
9 *manner that simulates smoking tobacco.*

10 *(c) "Establishment" means any store, stand, booth, concession or other enterprise that engages*
11 *in the retail sales of tobacco products and/or electronic cigarettes.*

12 **SEC. 19N.3 TOBACCO SALES PERMIT REQUIRED.**

13 *(a) An establishment must have a valid tobacco sales permit obtained pursuant to Health Code*
14 *Section 1009.52 to sell electronic cigarettes.*

15 *(b) The Director may enforce this section pursuant to Articles 19 et seq. of the Health Code*
16 *including but not limited to Article 19H.*

17 **SEC. 19N.4 PROHIBITING THE USE OF ELECTRONIC CIGARETTES WHEREVER**
18 **SMOKING OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS IS BANNED .**

19 *(a) The use of electronic cigarettes is prohibited wherever smoking of tobacco products is*
20 *prohibited by law including Articles 19 et seq. of the Health Code.*

21 *(b) The Director may enforce this section pursuant to Articles 19 et seq. of the Health Code*
22 *including but not limited to the Articles prohibiting smoking in certain spaces or areas.*

23 **SEC. 19N.5 PROHIBITING THE SALE OF ELECTRONIC CIGARETTES WHEREVER**
24 **THE SALE OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS IS PROHIBITED.**

1 a) The sale of electronic cigarettes is prohibited wherever the sale of tobacco products is
2 prohibited by law, including as prohibited in Articles 19 et seq. of the Health Code.

3 b) The Director may enforce this section pursuant to Articles 19 et seq. of the Health Code
4 including but not limited to Article 19J.

5 **SEC. 19N.6 CITY UNDERTAKING LIMITED TO PROMOTION OF GENERAL**
6 **WELFARE.**

7 In enacting and implementing this ordinance, the City is assuming an undertaking only to
8 promote the general welfare. It is not assuming, nor is it imposing on its officers and employees, an
9 obligation for breach of which it is liable in money damages to any person who claims that such breach
10 proximately caused injury.

11 **SEC. 19N.7 RULES AND REGULATIONS.**

12 The Director, after a noticed public hearing, may adopt rules and regulations to carry out the
13 provisions of this Article. Such rules and regulations shall take effect 15 days after the public hearing.
14 Violation of any such rule or regulation may be grounds for administrative or civil action against the
15 permittee pursuant to this Article.

16 **SEC. 19N.8 PREEMPTION.**

17 (a) Nothing in this Article shall be interpreted or applied so as to create any power, duty or
18 obligation in conflict with, or preempted by, any Federal or State law. Even if not preempted by
19 Federal or State law, the provisions of this Article shall not apply if the Federal or State law is more
20 restrictive.

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

1 (b) This Article shall not apply to any FDA-approved product marketed for therapeutic
2 purposes.

3 (c) This Article shall not affect any laws or regulations regarding medical cannabis.

4 **SEC. 19N.9 SEVERABILITY.**

5 If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase in this Article or
6 any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of
7 competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining
8 portions of this Article or any part thereof. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would
9 have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase thereof
10 irrespective of the fact that any one or more subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses,
11 or phrases be declared unconstitutional, or invalid, or ineffective.

12
13 Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
14 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
15 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
16 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

17
18 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
19 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

20 By:

21 Aleeta M. Van Runkle
22 Deputy City Attorney
23
24
25

SUPERVISOR MAR
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Health Code - Restrictions on Sale and Use of Electronic Cigarettes]

Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit the use of electronic cigarettes where smoking is otherwise prohibited; require a tobacco permit for the sale of electronic cigarettes; prohibit the sale of electronic cigarettes where the sale of tobacco products is otherwise prohibited; and making environmental findings.

Existing Law

The Health Code currently bans smoking in a variety of settings, both enclosed and unenclosed spaces. The Health Department enforces the prohibitions through inspections and a hearing process. The Board of Appeals hears any appeals from enforcement action taken by the Health Department.

The Health Department also permits tobacco retail stores. Tobacco sales are prohibited in certain settings, including pharmacies and stores containing pharmacies.

Amendments to Current Law

The proposed ordinance amends the San Francisco Health Code by adding Article 19N (Sections 19N.1 – 19N.9) to prohibit the use of electronic cigarettes where smoking is otherwise prohibited; require a tobacco permit for the sale of electronic cigarettes; and prohibit the sale of electronic cigarettes where the sale of tobacco products is otherwise prohibited.

Background Information

The FDA has raised concerns that electronic cigarettes, including but not limited to flavored electronic cigarettes, can increase nicotine addiction among young people and may lead youth to try conventional tobacco products. A CDC study showed that in 2011 4.7% of all high schoolers had tried e-cigarettes and that in 2012 that number increased to 10.0% of all high schoolers. Electronic cigarettes may not be legally sold to minors in California. Electronic smoking devices and other unapproved nicotine delivery products have a high appeal to youth due to their high tech design and availability in child-friendly flavors like chocolate and strawberry.

Health authorities have also expressed concerns that the vapors released into the air through the use of an electronic cigarette present a danger to others who breathe them.

The use of an electronic cigarette in public is often indistinguishable from the use of traditional tobacco products, prompting confusion among members of the public wherever smoking is prohibited. Consequently, persons who smoke traditional tobacco products may be induced to do so in areas where smoking is illegal under the mistaken belief that smoking is legal in such areas, or that the ban on smoking in such areas is not being enforced.

Owners of establishments such as office buildings and restaurants encounter similar obstacles seeking to comply with the laws prohibiting smoking in certain locations. An owner may request that a patron stop smoking cigarettes in a restaurant only to have the patron demonstrate that it is an electronic cigarette. The Owner may also be placed in the position of having to confront and examine the cigarettes of any number of customers absent a prohibition on the use of electronic cigarettes where traditional cigarettes are banned.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

February 28, 2014

File No. 131208

Sarah Jones
Environmental Review Officer
Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Wycko:

On December 17, 2013, Supervisor Mar introduced the following proposed legislation:

File No. 131208

Ordinance amending the San Francisco Health Code, by adding Article 11A, requiring: 1) the Department of Public Health (DPH) to provide written information outlining the rights and responsibilities of tenants, property owners, and Pest Control Operators regarding the prevention and treatment of bed bug infestations; 2) DPH to develop a training curriculum on bed bug abatement; 3) owners to respond to bed bug infestation complaints; 4) property owners to disclose bed bug infestation history for the previous two years; 5) DPH to collect and publish bed bug data on a quarterly basis; 6) establishing enforcement procedures; and 7) making environmental findings.

This legislation is being transmitted to you for environmental review.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Alisa Miller".

By: Alisa Miller, Committee Clerk
Rules Committee

Attachment

- c: Monica Pereira, Environmental Planning
- Nannie Turrell, Environmental Planning

*Not a project under CEQA
Guide lines Sections 15060(c)
and 15378 because there
is no direct or indirect
physical change in the
environment.
Nannie Turrell
Feb. 28, 2014*

Evans, Derek

From: Liz Williams [liz.williams@no-smoke.org]
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 3:45 PM
To: Mar, Eric (BOS); Evans, Derek
Cc: Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Campos, David; Chiu, David; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Tang, Katy; Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS)
Subject: letter of support for e-cigarette proposal
Attachments: Letter to San Francisco BOS_02.28.14.pdf

Hello,

Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights would like to submit the attached letter of support for San Francisco's proposal to prohibit the use of e-cigarettes in smokefree spaces.

Additionally, we'd like to submit the following two documents:

Electronic Cigarettes and Secondhand Aerosol
<http://www.no-smoke.org/pdf/ecigarette-secondhand-aerosol.pdf>


U.S. State and Local Laws Regulating Use of Electronic Cigarettes
<http://www.no-smoke.org/pdf/ecigslaws.pdf>

Thank you,
Liz Williams

Liz Williams
Project Manager
Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights
American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation
2530 San Pablo Ave, Suite J
Berkeley, CA 94702
Phone: 510-841-3032 x314
Fax: 510-841-3071
liz.williams@no-smoke.org
www.no-smoke.org

Are you a member of ANR? Our work depends on the support of our members. Please [click here](#) to view our membership options. We would love to have you join us!

Show your support for smokefree air by putting a static-cling decal in your window at work, home, or the car. To purchase, visit: <http://www.no-smoke.org/aboutus.php?id=440>.



ANR AMERICANS FOR NONSMOKERS' RIGHTS

Defending your right to breathe smokefree air since 1976

February 28, 2014

Supervisor Eric Mar
Vice-Chair of Neighborhood Services and Safety Committee
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

cc: Honorable Mayor Ed Lee and Supervisors

Dear Supervisor Mar,

On behalf of our members in San Francisco, Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights encourages the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to prohibit the use of electronic cigarettes (or e-cigarettes) and other electronic nicotine delivery devices in smokefree venues, where workers and patron will be exposed to the secondhand aerosol they emit.

E-cigarette companies and proponents claim that the aerosol emitted is completely harmless and only contains "water vapor." However, recent research on the constituents of e-cigarettes shows that the aerosol emitted into the air contains lead, chromium, nickel, and other metals, as well as silicate particles and nicotine, so while some may believe the product is "safer," use of the product certainly isn't harmless or risk-free (see attached fact sheet). Although e-cigarettes contribute less to indoor air pollution than tobacco cigarettes, they are not emission-free.

San Francisco would be in good company in prohibiting the use of e-cigarettes in enclosed public places and workplaces, including restaurants and bars. Currently, more than 100 municipalities and three states include e-cigarettes as products prohibited for use in smokefree environments, and New York City and Chicago will implement similar laws at the end of April. We would love to add San Francisco to that list. Other California cities are now or will soon consider this same issue, including Los Angeles and San Diego.

Electronic nicotine delivery devices heat and vaporize a solution containing nicotine and are often designed to mimic the look and feel of a real cigarette. They come in a variety of flavors and nicotine levels, all claiming to be a safer alternative to smoking cigarettes.

Electronic nicotine delivery devices are currently unregulated, which leaves a great deal of unknowns not only about potential health risks to the user (and non-user exposed to the secondhand aerosol), but also about product manufacturing quality and safety. The burden of proof should rest on the manufacturers to demonstrate that their products are safe. While the FDA can and should regulate the production of e-cigarettes, cities and states can and are enacting laws that regulate when and where e-cigarettes can be used, along with laws that regulate sales to minors and where the product can be sold.

While research shows that the levels of toxins in e-cigarette aerosol are lower than in tobacco smoke, the levels are *higher* than what are found in FDA-approved nicotine inhalers, and there is evidence that at least 10 chemicals identified in the aerosol are on the California Prop 65 list of dangerous carcinogens and reproductive toxins, including Acetaldehyde, Benzene, Cadmium, Formaldehyde, Isoprene, Lead, Nickel, Nicotine, N-Nitrosornicotine, and Toluene.

E-cigarette proponents argue that e-cigarettes are safer, healthier, and help people quit tobacco smoking. It may be true that e-cigarettes, in general, are less polluting than tobacco cigarettes, but e-cigarette still emit pollutants and toxins into the air. Given the current science base, we should take the precautionary approach and ensure individuals are not exposed to the secondhand aerosol in smokefree environments.


E-cigarette manufacturers and proponents are using unrestrained marketing tactics, especially aimed at young adults via online media, to normalize product use and to promote e-cigarettes as a "safe" alternative to smoking and as an easy way to quit smoking. There is also a concerted effort by e-cigarette companies and proponents to prevent regulation of the product, and now that the three major U.S. tobacco companies—Altria, RJ Reynolds, and Lorillard—have bought or developed e-cigarette brands, we expect to see even more aggressive and deceptive marketing and lobbying. For instance, Los Angeles radio stations are airing ads by Blu E-cigarettes, owned by Lorillard Tobacco Company, and Vuse E-cigarettes, an RJ Reynolds product, asking people to attend their City Council hearing to oppose the proposed ordinance.

The City of San Francisco has the opportunity to protect public health from exposure to secondhand aerosol. We have enough science to make an intelligent decision that secondhand aerosol is not harmless, and that it is a new source of air pollution that contains ultrafine particles, toxicants, and carcinogens.

Given these facts, Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights urges the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to prohibit the use of e-cigarettes and other electronic nicotine delivery devices in all smokefree places and workplaces, at all times, without exception.

Thank you for your leadership and desire to make San Francisco the best place to live, work, and visit. Please feel free to contact me at 510-841-3045 if you have any questions, comments, or feedback.

Sincerely,



Cynthia Hallett, MPH
Executive Director

Attachments: Electronic Cigarettes and Secondhand Aerosol fact sheet
List of Cities and States with e-cigarette laws

Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights is a national, member-based, not-for-profit organization based in Berkeley, CA that is dedicated to helping nonsmokers breathe smokefree air since 1976.

Evans, Derek

From: Greg Porter [gregoryaporter@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 3:27 PM
To: Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Chiu, David; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Tang, Katy; Wiener, Scott; Campos, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Evans, Derek; Board of Supervisors
Subject: Banning Vaping is just plain uninformed nonsense

As a citizen, I am thrilled to see that vaping has taken root and is reducing the use of cigarettes in public spaces and in private among my friends.

Please take my informed view into consideration:

- Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products.
- The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor.
- A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure.
- Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible.
- The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%.
- **By switching to a smokeless product, I personally have greatly reduced my health risks.**

Please see the CASAA.org website, as well as the CASAA Research Library, for more information.

Greg Porter

File 131 208

From: Chris Ory [mailto:mail@changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 11:54 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208. It is important for all of you to know the eCigs are not and should not be treated the same as smoking cigarettes. A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. The city of San Francisco should be promoting the use of eCigs in place of smoking conventional cigarettes. Please vote for a healthier San Francisco by encouraging smokers to stop smoking and switch to the simulated smoke of an eCigs. It's the right choice for smokers and it's the right choice for San Francisco. Here are some of the benefits of eCigs that you, our representatives, should care about: it's healthier, it bothers the people around much less if at all, there are no cigarette butts to be thrown on the ground, less cigarette-related injury or illness for Healthy San Francisco to pay the bill for, less chance of cigarette-related fires. All of these benefits lead to a happier and healthier San Francisco. Please vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 and please work to encourage every smoker to stop smoking and choose the healthier option of eCigs.

Sincerely,
Chris Ory
Alameda, California

There are now 2 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Ian Baker [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 It is import for all of you to know the eCigs are not and should not be treated the same as smoking cigarettes. A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. The city of San Francisco should be promoting the use of eCigs in place of smoking conventional cigarettes. Please vote for a healthier San Francisco by encouraging smokers to stop smoking and switch to the simulated smoke of an eCigs. It's the right choice for smokers and it's the right choice for San Francisco. Here are some of the benefits of eCigs that you, our representatives, should care about: it's healthier it bothers the people around much less if at all there are no cigarette butts to be thrown on the ground less cigarette related injury or illness for Healthy San Francisco to pay the bill for less chance of cigarette related fires All of these benefits lead to a happier and healthier San Francisco. Please vite NO on Ordinance No. 131208 and please work to encourage every smoker to stop smoking and choose the healthier option of eCigs.

Sincerely,
Ian Baker San Francisco, California

There are now 3 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Rebecca Pier [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:00 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 It is import for all of you to know the eCigs are not and should not be treated the same as smoking cigarettes. A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. The city of San Francisco should be promoting the use of eCigs in place of smoking conventional cigarettes. Please vote for a healthier San Francisco by encouraging smokers to stop smoking and switch to the simulated smoke of an eCigs. It's the right choice for smokers and it's the right choice for San Francisco. Here are some of the benefits of eCigs that you, our representatives, should care about: it's healthier it bothers the people around much less if at all there are no cigarette butts to be thrown on the ground less cigarette related injury or illness for Healthy San Francisco to pay the bill for less chance of cigarette related fires All of these benefits lead to a happier and healthier San Francisco. Please vite NO on Ordinance No. 131208 and please work to encourage every smoker to stop smoking and choose the healthier option of eCigs.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Pier San Francisco, California

There are now 4 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: nicole aptekar [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:04 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 It is import for all of you to know the eCigs are not and should not be treated the same as smoking cigarettes. A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. The city of San Francisco should be promoting the use of eCigs in place of smoking conventional cigarettes. Please vote for a healthier San Francisco by encouraging smokers to stop smoking and switch to the simulated smoke of an eCigs. It's the right choice for smokers and it's the right choice for San Francisco. Here are some of the benefits of eCigs that you, our representatives, should care about: it's healthier it bothers the people around much less if at all there are no cigarette butts to be thrown on the ground less cigarette related injury or illness for Healthy San Francisco to pay the bill for less chance of cigarette related fires All of these benefits lead to a happier and healthier San Francisco. Please vite NO on Ordinance No. 131208 and please work to encourage every smoker to stop smoking and choose the healthier option of eCigs.

Sincerely,
nicole aptekar san francisco, California

There are now 5 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Micah Scott [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:07 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 It is import for all of you to know the eCigs are not and should not be treated the same as smoking cigarettes. A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. The city of San Francisco should be promoting the use of eCigs in place of smoking conventional cigarettes. Please vote for a healthier San Francisco by encouraging smokers to stop smoking and switch to the simulated smoke of an eCigs. It's the right choice for smokers and it's the right choice for San Francisco. Here are some of the benefits of eCigs that you, our representatives, should care about: it's healthier it bothers the people around much less if at all there are no cigarette butts to be thrown on the ground less cigarette related injury or illness for Healthy San Francisco to pay the bill for less chance of cigarette related fires All of these benefits lead to a happier and healthier San Francisco. Please vite NO on Ordinance No. 131208 and please work to encourage every smoker to stop smoking and choose the healthier option of eCigs.

Sincerely,
Micah Scott San Francisco, California

There are now 6 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Melissa Piercey [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:18 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208. It is important for all of you to know the eCigs are not and should not be treated the same as smoking cigarettes. A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. The city of San Francisco should be promoting the use of eCigs in place of smoking conventional cigarettes. Please vote for a healthier San Francisco by encouraging smokers to stop smoking and switch to the simulated smoke of an eCigs. It's the right choice for smokers and it's the right choice for San Francisco. Here are some of the benefits of eCigs that you, our representatives, should care about: it's healthier, it bothers the people around much less if at all, there are no cigarette butts to be thrown on the ground, less cigarette-related injury or illness for Healthy San Francisco, to pay the bill for less chance of cigarette-related fires. All of these benefits lead to a happier and healthier San Francisco. Please vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 and please work to encourage every smoker to stop smoking and choose the healthier option of eCigs.

Sincerely,
Melissa Piercey San Francisco, California

There are now 7 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Alain Bloch [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 It is import for all of you to know the eCigs are not and should not be treated the same as smoking cigarettes. A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. The city of San Francisco should be promoting the use of eCigs in place of smoking conventional cigarettes. Please vote for a healthier San Francisco by encouraging smokers to stop smoking and switch to the simulated smoke of an eCigs. It's the right choice for smokers and it's the right choice for San Francisco. Here are some of the benefits of eCigs that you, our representatives, should care about: it's healthier it bothers the people around much less if at all there are no cigarette butts to be thrown on the ground less cigarette related injury or illness for Healthy San Francisco to pay the bill for less chance of cigarette related fires All of these benefits lead to a happier and healthier San Francisco. Please vite NO on Ordinance No. 131208 and please work to encourage every smoker to stop smoking and choose the healthier option of eCigs.

Sincerely,
Alain Bloch California, California

There are now 8 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Christina Jenkins [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:29 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. I'm not a smoker myself, however many of my friends are. They've steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes, and their health is paramount to me. Please don't put obstacles in the way of my friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Christina Jenkins Berkeley, California

There are now 9 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Sean Williams [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:34 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Sean Williams Fremont, California

There are now 10 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Jason Kelly [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:46 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Jason Kelly San Francisco, California

There are now 11 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Eric Nicholas [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:47 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Eric Nicholas San Francisco, California

There are now 12 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Whitney Moses [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:48 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Whitney Moses San Francisco, California

There are now 13 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Sam Selfridge [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 1:17 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Sam Selfridge CARPINTERIA, California

There are now 14 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Reed Kennedy [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 2:25 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Reed Kennedy San Francisco, California

There are now 15 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Jerry Sellari [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 5:42 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Jerry Sellari San Francisco, California

There are now 16 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: debra cleaver [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 7:42 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
debra cleaver san francisco, California

There are now 17 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Roberta Gibson [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 10:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Roberta Gibson Sacramento, California

There are now 18 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Yanick jUIN [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 10:57 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Yanick jUIN san francisco, California

There are now 19 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Dena Rod [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 11:28 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Dena Rod San Francisco, California

There are now 20 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Jonathan Perri [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 10:38 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Jonathan Perri San Francisco, California

There are now 22 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Eric Lukoff [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 9:11 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Eric Lukoff San Francisco, California

There are now 21 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Alina Bonano [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 5:08 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Alina Bonano Bronx, New York

There are now 25 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Aaron Muszalski [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 5:26 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Aaron Muszalski San Francisco, California

There are now 26 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Stephen Koenig [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 5:31 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Stephen Koenig San Francisco, California

There are now 27 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: David Remahl [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 5:32 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
David Remahl Woodside, California

There are now 28 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Meliza Gough [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 5:59 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Meliza Gough San Francisco, California

There are now 29 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Sam Putman [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 6:25 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr. Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Sam Putman Oakland, California

There are now 30 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Bryce Hidysmith [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 7:16 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Bryce Hidysmith San Francisco, California

There are now 31 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Shannon Lee [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 8:09 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Shannon Lee San Francisco, California

There are now 33 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Steve Simitzis [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 8:09 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Steve Simitzis San Francisco, California

There are now 32 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Susan Barron [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 9:56 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Susan Barron Oakland, California

There are now 36 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: keith herrington [mailto:mail@changemail.org]
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 12:21 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
keith herrington San Francisco, California

There are now 38 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Sami Zerrade [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 12:26 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr. Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Sami Zerrade San Francisco, California

There are now 39 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Danielle Dunker [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 12:33 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Danielle Dunker San Mateo, California

There are now 40 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: James Allen Jr [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 9:31 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
James Allen Jr San Francisco, California

There are now 34 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Nicole Maron [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 10:37 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Nicole Maron San Francisco, California

There are now 35 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:
<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

File 131208
N 55

From: Leslie Chicoine [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 11:39 AM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Leslie Chicoine SF, California

There are now 23 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 131208: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

From: Lee Dotson [mailto:mail@changemail.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 3:39 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 I'm a San Francisco resident, and I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, but I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned. The content of e-cigarette vapor is identical to the haze from nightclub smoke machines! • Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products. • The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor. • A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. • Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible. • The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%. By switching to a smokeless product, you have greatly reduced your health risks. • Many people are steadily switched from toxic and terrible traditional cigarettes to vapor-based e-cigarettes. Please don't put obstacles in the way of our friends' and family's health! For more information: <http://blog.casaa.org/2014/02/call-to-action-san-francisco-california.html>

Sincerely,
Lee Dotson San Francisco, California

There are now 24 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=d25e3858801f>

Evans, Derek

From: Jared Grippe [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 12:07 PM
To: Evans, Derek
Subject: New petition to you: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear Derek Evans,

Jared Grippe started a petition "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" targeting you on Change.org that's starting to pick up steam.

Change.org is the world's largest petition platform that gives anyone, anywhere the tools they need to start, join and win campaigns for change. Change.org never starts petitions on our own -- petitions on the website, like "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco", are started by users.

While "Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco" is active, you'll receive an email each time a signer leaves a comment explaining why he or she is signing. You'll also receive periodic updates about the petition's status.

Here's what you can do right now to resolve the petition:

- Review the petition. Here's a link:
 - <http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco>
- See the 5 signers and their reasons for signing on the petition page.
- Respond to the petition creator by sending a message here:
 - <http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=dd3bf7af4013>

Sincerely,
Change.org

There are now 5 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=dd3bf7af4013>



Evans, Derek

From: Chris Ory [mailto:changemail.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 11:54 AM
To: Evans, Derek
Subject: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco

Dear Derek Evans,

I just signed Jared Grippe's petition "[Edwin M. Lee: Don't ban eCigs in San Francisco](#)" on Change.org.

I urge all of you to vote NO on Ordinance No. 131208 It is import for all of you to know the eCigs are not and should not be treated the same as smoking cigarettes. A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure. The city of San Francisco should be promoting the use of eCigs in place of smoking conventional cigarettes. Please vote for a healthier San Francisco by encouraging smokers to stop smoking and switch to the simulated smoke of an eCigs. It's the right choice for smokers and it's the right choice for San Francisco. Here are some of the benefits of eCigs that you, our representatives, should care about: it's healthier it bothers the people around much less if at all there are no cigarette butts to be thrown on the ground less cigarette related injury or illness for Healthy San Francisco to pay the bill for less chance of cigarette related fires All of these benefits lead to a happier and healthier San Francisco. Please vite NO on Ordinance No. 131208 and please work to encourage every smoker to stop smoking and choose the healthier option of eCigs.

Sincerely,
Chris Ory alameda, California

There are now 2 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to Jared Grippe by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/edwin-m-lee-don-t-ban-ecigs-in-san-francisco/responses/new?response=dd3bf7af4013>



From: Board of Supervisors
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 131208: no e-cigarettes in San Francisco smokefree environments!

-----Original Message-----

From: jpk@rawbw.com [<mailto:jpk@rawbw.com>]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 5:27 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Subject: no e-cigarettes in San Francisco smokefree environments!

I am writing to urge you to support a STRONG ordinance that prohibit the use of e-cigarettes at ALL times and in ALL venues that are required to be smokefree, without exemptions.

If e-cigarette users want to vape, that's their decision.
They do not have the right to force others to breathe in the emissions.

And the facts are compelling: e-cigarettes do NOT just emit "harmless water vapor."
Secondhand e-cigarette aerosol contains nicotine, ultrafine particles, and measureable levels of toxins that cause cancer. There is no reason to force anyone to breathe this in.

And: we do not know the long-term health effects.
With secondhand smoke, we did not act for decades, we waited until a mountain of evidence arrived, and as a result THOUSAND OF PEOPLE DIED while we waited.
This time let's act now. The evidence we already have is compelling: this product puts toxics into the air. There is no reason to force others to breathe it in. And there's no reason to wait.

And let's be clear who we're fighting here: the tobacco industry.
Yes, the same tobacco industry that fought San Francisco's smokefree laws, that sued the city, that fought to keep America smoking, is now trying to bring back a kind of smoking to workplaces and public places so as to weaken the laws we have enacted and endanger the health of nonsmokers.

And: this is NOT a ban. No one would be stopped from using e-cigarettes. This would simply protect clean air in otherwise smokefree places. This simply applies the same rules as for cigarettes. Smokers have gotten used to those rules. So can e-cigarette users.

I work in, shop, dine, visit, and love San San Francisco.

I urge you to support a STRONG ordinance that prohibit the use of e-cigarettes at ALL times and in ALL venues that are required to be smokefree, without exemptions.

Thank you,

Jonathan Krueger

Evans, Derek

From: Delos Reyes, Ma Elloi Glenn T. [MGDeLosReyes@mednet.ucla.edu] on behalf of Ong, Michael M.D. [MOng@mednet.ucla.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 9:45 AM
To: Yee, Norman (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS)
Cc: Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Chiu, David; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Tang, Katy; Wiener, Scott; Campos, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Evans, Derek; Board of Supervisors; Simpson, Alexandria (CPDH-CDIC-TCS); Smith, Derek; Ong, Michael M.D.
Subject: Letter of Support for the Regulation of E-Cigarettes in the City of San Francisco
Attachments: TEROc Letter to City of SF.PDF

Dear all,

Please see attached TEROc's Letter of Support for the Regulation of E-Cigarettes in the City of San Francisco.

Best,

Michael Ong, M.D. Ph.D.
Associate Professor in Residence
Division of General Internal Medicine & Health Services Research
Department of Medicine
David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA
10940 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90024
T: (310) 794-0154
F: (310) 794-0723
E: mong@mednet.ucla.edu

IMPORTANT WARNING: This email (and any attachments) is only intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. You, the recipient, are obligated to maintain it in a safe, secure and confidential manner. Unauthorized redisclosure or failure to maintain confidentiality may subject you to federal and state penalties. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify us by return email, and delete this message from your computer.

Evans, Derek

From: Board of Supervisors
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 4:59 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Evans, Derek
Subject: File 131208: Letter of Support for the Regulation of E-Cigarettes in the City of San Francisco
Attachments: TEROC Letter to City of SF.PDF

From: Delos Reyes, Ma Elloi Glenn T. [mailto:MGDeLosReyes@mednet.ucla.edu] **On Behalf Of** Ong, Michael M.D.
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 4:12 PM
To: Board of Supervisors
Cc: Ong, Michael M.D.; Simpson, Alexandria (CPDH-CDIC-TCS); Smith, Derek
Subject: Letter of Support for the Regulation of E-Cigarettes in the City of San Francisco

Dear Supervisor Campos,

Please see attached Letter of Support for the Regulation of E-Cigarettes in the City of San Francisco.

Best,

Michael Ong, M.D. Ph.D.
Associate Professor in Residence
Division of General Internal Medicine & Health Services Research
Department of Medicine
David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA
10940 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90024
T: (310) 794-0154
F: (310) 794-0723
E: mong@mednet.ucla.edu

IMPORTANT WARNING: This email (and any attachments) is only intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. You, the recipient, are obligated to maintain it in a safe, secure and confidential manner. Unauthorized redisclosure or failure to maintain confidentiality may subject you to federal and state penalties. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify us by return email, and delete this message from your computer.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
TOBACCO EDUCATION AND RESEARCH OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

MEMBERS:

MICHAEL ONG, M.D., Ph.D.
CHAIRPERSON
Associate Professor in Residence
Division of General Internal Medicine and
Health Services Research
Department of Medicine
University of California, Los Angeles

ALAN HENDERSON, Dr.P.H., C.H.E.S.
VICE CHAIRPERSON
Professor Emeritus
California State University, Long Beach

DENISE ADAMS-SIMMS, M.P.H.
Executive Director
San Diego Black Health Associates

LOURDES BAEZCONDE-GARBANATI, Ph.D.,
M.P.H., M.A.
Associate Professor in Preventive Medicine and Sociology
Institute for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Research
Keck School of Medicine
University of Southern California

VICKI BAUMAN
Prevention Director
Stanislaus County Office of Education

WENDEL BRUNNER, Ph.D., M.D., M.P.H.
Director of Public Health
Contra Costa Health Services

PATRICIA ETEM, M.P.H.
Executive Consultant
CIVIC Communications

LAWRENCE W. GREEN, Dr.P.H., ScD. (Hon.)
Professor
Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics
School of Medicine and Comprehensive Cancer Center
University of California San Francisco

PAMELA LING, M.D., M.P.H.
Associate Professor
Department of Medicine
University of California, San Francisco

MYRON DEAN QUON, Esq.
Executive Director
National Asian Pacific American Families
Against Substance Abuse

DOROTHY RICE, Sc.D. (Hon.)
Professor Emeritus
Institute for Health and Aging
School of Nursing
University of California, San Francisco

SHU-HONG ZHU, Ph.D., M.S.
Professor
Department of Family and Preventive Medicine
University of California, San Diego

February 20, 2014

Supervisor David Campos
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Letter of Support for the Regulation of E-Cigarettes in the City of
San Francisco

Dear Supervisor Campos:

The Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee (TEROC) is a legislatively mandated oversight committee (California Health and Safety Code Sections 104365-104370) that monitors the use of Proposition 99 tobacco tax revenues for tobacco control, prevention education, and tobacco-related research in California. In performing this mandate, the Committee provides advice to the California Department of Public Health, the University of California, and the California Department of Education regarding the administration of the Proposition 99-funded programs. The Committee is also responsible for periodically producing a state master plan for tobacco control and tobacco-related research, and making recommendations to the State Legislature for improving tobacco control and tobacco-related research efforts in California.

TEROC supports the proposed ordinance that would regulate electronic cigarette (e-cigarette) sales by requiring vendors to obtain a Tobacco Retailer's License from the City, disallow sale of the product where cigarettes cannot be sold, and disallow the use of e-cigarettes wherever cigarettes cannot presently be smoked. This proposed ordinance is consistent with TEROC's official position on e-cigarettes, adopted at the Committee's May 22, 2013 meeting, which states:

"TEROC opposes the use of e-cigarettes in all areas where other tobacco products are banned."

In addition, this proposed ordinance is consistent with the laws enacted by 61 other California cities and counties that regulate the sale of e-cigarettes the same as other tobacco products and 44 cities and counties who prohibit the use of e-cigarettes in some outdoor areas, some indoor areas, or both, by including e-cigarettes in their existing smoke-free laws.



David Campos
Page 2
February 20, 2014

Smoke-free policies protect nonsmokers from exposure to toxins and encourage smoking cessation. Introducing e-cigarettes into clean air environments reinforces the act of smoking as socially acceptable, and makes enforcement of existing laws that protect the public from secondhand smoke difficult due to the similarities with cigarettes. Early data has shown that e-cigarette emissions can contain carcinogens and toxic chemicals, which may result in additional potential harm to the public.


According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the percentage of U.S. middle and high school students who used e-cigarettes more than doubled from 2011 to 2012, from 4.7 percent to 10.0 percent. In 2012, more than 1.78 million middle and high school students nationwide had tried e-cigarettes. The CDC study also found that 76.3 percent of middle and high school students who used e-cigarettes in the last 30 days had also smoked cigarettes. With emerging tobacco products like e-cigarettes on the rise, this vulnerable population needs protection from exposure to these products.

For these reasons, TEROC supports the City of San Francisco in its efforts to regulate e-cigarette sales and use anywhere smoking is currently prohibited.

If you have any questions regarding this subject, please do not hesitate to contact me at MOng@Mednet.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Ong', with a stylized, cursive script.

Michael Ong, M.D., Ph.D.
Chairperson

cc: Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Norman Yee

Evans, Derek

From: Cristina Lindow [cristina.lindow@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 2:29 PM
To: Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Chiu, David; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Tang, Katy; Wiener, Scott; Campos, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Evans, Derek; Board of Supervisors
Subject: I do not support Ordinance No. 131208

I am a San Francisco resident and while I support banning sales of e-cigarettes to minors, I OPPOSE banning e-cigarette use where smoking is banned.

I have finally been able to quit smoking after 16 years of being a pack a day smoker by switching to smoke free e cigarettes. My sister and brother in law have also quit smoking by using these smokeless nicotine products. I have tried patches, gum, medication, meditation, everything, and this is the only product that has worked for me.

Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products.

The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor.

A comprehensive review conducted by Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University School of Public Health based on over 9,000 observations of e-cigarette liquid and vapor found "no apparent concern" for bystanders exposed to e-cigarette vapor, even under "worst case" assumptions about exposure.

Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible.

The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%.

By switching to a smokeless product, I have greatly reduced my health risks, and I think it is a mistake to ban these products.

Please visit the CASAA.org website, as well as the CASAA Research Library, for more information.

Sincerely,

Cristina Lindow

Evans, Derek

From: Serena Chen [Serena.Chen@lung.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 2:20 PM
To: Campos, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS)
Cc: Evans, Derek
Subject: Regulating Electronic Smoking Devices and their Emissions
Attachments: LOS San Francisco_E-cig 2.25.14.pdf

Dear Supervisors Campos, Yee, and Mar:

Attached please find the American Lung Association in California's letter of support for legislation that will restrict the sale of electronic smoking devices and restrictions on their use in public.

Serena

Serena Chen | Regional Advocacy Director
American Lung Association in California
424 Pendleton Way
Oakland, CA 94621
Phone: 510.982.3191
Fax: 510.638.8984
Serena.Chen@lung.org | <http://www.lung.org/california>

American Lung Association in California – State of Tobacco Control 2014

Read the report and learn how to RAISE YOUR GRADES at www.lung.org/california





1531 I Street
Suite 201
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-554-5864 phone
916-442-8585 fax

lung.org/california

February 25, 2014

The Honorable Eric Mar, Member,
Neighborhood Services and Safety Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Pl #244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisor Mar:

The American Lung Association in California supports the San Francisco Board of Supervisors' action to protect the public health of San Francisco residents by including electronic cigarettes in its tobacco retailer permit and smokefree air laws.

The American Lung Association is concerned that very little is known about the health effects of electronic cigarettes and of the vapors that they release, or what the health consequences of them might be. Two initial studies have found formaldehyde, benzene and tobacco-specific nitrosamines (a cancer-causing chemical) coming from the secondhand emissions from e-cigarettes. While we have a lot more to learn about these products, it's clear that there is much to be concerned about and there's a lot more than just "water vapor" in these products. In addition, it is important to note that e-cigarettes have not been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to be safe and effective in helping smokers quit cigarettes.

And finally, it's worth highlighting that the e-cigarette industry appears to be using the same playbook as the cigarette companies did a generation ago. We are deeply concerned that these products are starting kids on a lifetime addiction to nicotine. According to one researcher, there are more than 250 e-cigarette brands for sale today, over half of which offered fruit or candy-flavors. We've seen candy-flavors including Captain Crunch, gummy bear, cotton candy, Atomic Fireball and fruit loops.

It is critical for communities to remain on the cutting edge in protecting their residents from new and emerging tobacco products, and this law does just that. We applaud San Francisco for taking this important action to protect public health.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Amazeen
Vice President, Programs & Advocacy

Cc: Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Derek Evans, Clerk, Neighborhood Services and Safety Committee

Evans, Derek

From: nancy francine [bcnapala@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 1:43 PM
To: lobbol@mail.com
Subject: International Rothschild Jewry: The New Hitler's of the 21st Century

March 1st, 2014

International Rothschild Jewry: The New Hitler's of the 21st Century

The International JEWISH Rothschild Banking Cartel, headquartered in the CITY of London, United Kingdom, is the new Nazi Germany of our time. International Rothschild Jewry have become the new Hitler's of the 21st Century.

The International Rothschild Empire owns and controls the vast majority of the world's wealth- both in financial and in resource terms. Their primary currency is GOLD. It has been estimated that they collectively own and control over one half of the world's gold supply, estimated to be at over \$500 TRILLION US dollars.

This Global Fascist Banking Cartel is evil, ruthless and diabolical to its very core and is using every means at its command today to procure wealth, power and authority solely unto itself.

They own and control the global media, the global militaries, the global intelligence agencies, the global agricultural institutions, the global pharmaceutical industries, the global political establishments, the global religious institutions, the global development establishments, the global land, mineral and water resources and a majority of the world's nations through their nationwide network of centralized banks.

Their primary goal today is to REDUCE the world's population with global eugenics/depopulation campaigns aimed at eliminating over 5 BILLION of the world's citizens.

There are a number of ways they are accomplishing this goal. Their primary global depopulation/eugenics operation is Global Climate Change. By purposely NOT solving this threat with alternative/free energy systems and continuing forward with an antiquated and highly polluting hydrocarbon economy, they are condemning present and future generations to a world of drastic food, water and land shortages as the planet rapidly warms. This will, in turn, destroy the lives of countless BILLIONS throughout the world in the fullness of time.

Another way they are accomplishing this goal is with PURPOSEFUL underdevelopment policies and strategies (primarily in the 3rd world) which ALREADY takes the lives of up to 40 MILLION innocent men, women and children every year through hunger, starvation, disease and malnutrition (that's over 6 jewish holocausts annually) . The only term that can possibly describe this mass level of global genocide is: THE GREAT HOLOCAUST.

Wars, the propagation of GMO (genetically modified) food, fluoridated water, vaccines, radiation releases and purposely engineered famines, pestilences, pandemics and diseases are other diversified ways they are carrying out their pro-DEATH agenda worldwide amongst the peoples and nations of the world.

The International Jewish Rothschild Banking Cartel promotes an international permanent war economy and

is itself nothing short of an international war crimes racketeering syndicate. It is the most vicious and ruthless empire that has ever arisen in the history of the world. This insidiously evil, wicked and diabolical force in world affairs has been responsible for the deaths of billions of human beings in the past and is setting itself up to be responsible for the deaths of billions more in the future if they are not stopped. The Rothschild Jews are quickly becoming the GREATEST mass murderers in all of human history.

As such, the International Jewish Rothschild Banking Cartel has turned itself into the SUPREME enemy of Mankind, as well as becoming the SUPREME enemy of all other LIFE on Earth.

Runaway Global Climate Change has ALREADY resulting in a "locked-in" 5-10 degree Fahrenheit increase in global temperatures by 2100. This increase, by all accounts, will prove to be absolutely CATASTROPHIC for the health, well-being and survivability of the human enterprise on into the foreseeable future.

Massive radiation releases into the global environment through the use of Depleted Uranium (DU) munitions, nuclear power plants leaks and nuclear reactor complex disasters such as at Fukushima, Japan, are slated to KILL life for generations to come as the lethality of this radioactivity quickly moves into the genetic gene pool of all life on Earth in the years and decades to come. DU has a half life of 3.5 BILLION years, which means it will go on killing life for literally, time immemorial.

Recognizing these threats to our survival and continuity as a species, it is high time to forcibly REMOVE, PUNISH and EXTERMINATE those who bear prime responsibility for this calculated, cold blooded global and inter-generational genocide: International Rothschild Jewry. As it was right and proper to remove Hitler and destroy the German 3rd Reich during World War 2, so it is high time to remove and destroy the Jewish "Nazi" 4th Reich today.

I hereby issue a clarion call to all freedom fighters and defenders of life, liberty and justice worldwide to use any and all means available to wipe this Jewish Rothschild scourge from off the face of this planet for all time. Let us never forget that it was the Rothschild Jew who was primarily responsible for funding the Nazi 3rd Reich, who were primarily responsible for killing 6 million Jews during World War 2. These are the people that funded International Communism through Marx, Trotsky and Stalin that ended up killing over 60 million of their fellow Russian citizens. These are the people who funded Mao, who ended up killing tens of millions of his own people in Indo-China. And the list goes on...

With the Jewish Holocaust of World War 2 (which the Rothschild Jew funded and directed), they think has bought themselves immunity from world scrutiny and blame for the atrocities they are committing today (as they have diabolically planned all along). Wrong. They have only reinforced the diabolical nature of who and what they really are: supreme agents of the Devil. It is none other than LUCIFER himself who the Jewish Rothschild Empire serves. In all truth, they are become the SYNAGOGUE of SATAN.

Let us pray for the DAY that comes quickly when the Kingdom of Heaven returns in FIRE, VENGEANCE and in GREAT GLORY to completely overthrow this wicked world and forcibly cast into HELL all the servants of the Devil who now abound on this planet. May our Heavenly Father completely RID the world of both evil man and fallen angel and give them ALL a fate "worse than death" for their crimes on the Great Day of Heavenly Judgement.

*Selah
Amen
Inshallah*

Evans, Derek

From: Joanne at Sunset Vapors [joanne@sunsetvaporsnc.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 12:09 PM
To: Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Chiu, David; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Tang, Katy; Wiener, Scott; Campos, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Evans, Derek; Board of Supervisors
Subject: Please do not ban e-cigarettes

So many of our customers have thanked us for providing these products. They have helped hundreds of people quit smoking cigarettes and many more quit every day.

Please don't ban them. Why not let businesses decide if they're "vape friendly" or not?

Thank you,
Joanne VanderWeide
Owner
Sunset Vapors
Asheboro, North Carolina

Evans, Derek

From: ubuntu**is**better@gmail.com on behalf of Caz Abbott [quiklives@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 12:11 PM
To: Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Chiu, David; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Tang, Katy; Wiener, Scott; Campos, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Evans, Derek; Board of Supervisors
Subject: Proposed ban of electronic cigarettes

Mayor and Board of Directors,

I am a current California resident, in the process of moving to San Francisco in a month. I am also an electronic cigarette user.

I fully support banning sales of electronic cigarettes to minors, and if you look into it, you will find that all of the respectable vendors of the products already take measures to ensure that they do not sell to minors.

I do not, however, support banning usage of these products throughout an entire city.

I smoked a pack of cigarettes a day for 17 years, beginning when I was a 13 year old kid. I tried to quit many times, while watching my health decline - my lung function declined, I gained weight, and I knew I needed to quit, but I couldn't.

I did quit, finally, when I bought my first electronic cigarette, December 10, 2012. Since then, I have reduced the nicotine content of the liquid I use from 18 mg/ml to 3 mg/ml. I feel better, I am able to walk up a flight of stairs without being out of breath when I reach the top. I have taken up hiking. I've lost over 50 pounds in the last year. I would have continued smoking until it killed me, if it hadn't been for these products.

There is a wealth of studies available demonstrating the relative safety of these products as compared to smoking. I understand that we do not yet have long term studies, but there can be little doubt that they are significantly safer than cigarettes.

This is a link with a list of various studies that have been done thus far, and their results, consistently confirming that electronic cigarettes present little danger if any at all: <http://onvaping.com/the-ultimate-list-of-studies-on-e-cigarettes-and-their-safety/>

I hope you will consider NOT passing this ban.

Thank you,
Caz Abbott

Evans, Derek

From: Pat Meyer [plmeyer@mail.sdsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 12:40 PM
To: Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Chiu, David; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Tang, Katy; Wiener, Scott; Campos, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Evans, Derek; Board of Supervisors
Subject: Health Code - Restrictions on Sale and Use of Electronic Cigarettes

Mr. Mayor and Honorable Board Members,

As a former San Franciscan, I cannot sit idly by without commenting on what I have learned is an upcoming agenda item for the Neighborhood Services and Safety Committee.

I have read the proposed modifications to San Francisco's Health Code. I understand amending the existing smoking ordinance to include the ban of electronic cigarettes is multifaceted and complicated and appreciate the Board's concerns. That said, here is my perspective.

I used e-cigs cigarettes to replace smoking more than a pack a day for almost 40 years almost 3 years ago. I'm a responsible adult that continues to "vape" a significantly reduced amount of nicotine instead. Needs formerly satisfied by smoking are fulfilled. I'm much healthier as a result - no daily hacking, coughing, chronic bronchitis, etc. Vaping eliminates almost every negative aspect of smoking, while restoring my perceived benefits. I am such an advocate that I volunteer with a local e-cig/e-liquid vendor (we do NOT sell to minors), educating smokers on vaping advantages. Over the last year I've assisted hundreds of adults to successfully replace smoking with vaping. After transitioning, vapers can choose to lower their nicotine level & often even quit altogether.

I wish to address misconceptions regarding potential risks. I donate time with a vendor who makes e-liquid from scratch using three basic food-grade ingredients: propylene glycol, vegetable glycerin, & flavor extracts (usually organic). Nicotine can also be added, mimicking levels in cigarettes. I believe many opponents cherry-pick electronic cigarette study results, then exaggerate reports of "harmful particles of metal components" in an attempt to force excessive regulation by omitting the fact that these measurements were "trace amounts". I'm convinced that most attempts to restrict electronic cigarette use are motivated less by sincere concerns for consumer health & safety than by a flailing tobacco industry hemorrhaging customers and municipalities desperate to increase tax revenues and/or avoid loss of anti-tobacco funding. I'm supportive of quality specifications for e-liquids but equating them with tobacco products is overkill. I include a link to the Consumer Advocates for Smoke-free Alternatives Association (CASAA), an organization dedicated to supporting tobacco harm reduction policies. CASAA's research library will assist you to better understand the issues and help sort out the many misconceptions about the health risks <http://casaa.org/Documents.html>.

Nicotine sales are already regulated and I believe these laws should not only be more effectively enforced but also expanded to include vaping hardware and nicotine-free e-liquids to keep them out of the hands of minors. The argument that "child-friendly" flavors are targeted toward children makes little sense. E-liquids are created by and for adults who enjoy the taste and aroma of fruits, baked goods, candies, etc. While I applaud efforts to de-glamorize smoking (and vaping), I also know realistically, persistent minors will find avenues. I started smoking as a young teenager and recall many devious ways I obtained cigarettes. No matter the age of the user, no one argues vaping isn't significantly healthier than inhaling burning tobacco. I've personally witnessed parents buying vaporizers for their children, in hopes their kids will quit (or never start) smoking cigarettes or hookahs.

While I'm convinced there is virtually no health risk to adjacent parties, I only vape indoors with the explicit permission of the people around me. A simple explanation that the exhaled vapor contains only a trace amount of nicotine usually relieves their concerns (plus the vapor smells nice).

For myself – I ENJOY VAPING! I started smoking in an era when it was a social activity & endured the evolutions that turned smokers into pariahs. Utilizing a new technology that works, I'm now healthier. I (& my clothes, house, car, etc.) don't stink. I'm active in a communally spirited sub-culture proud that we no longer endanger anyone else's well-being. Why would anyone want to deny these enhancements and take such punitive action against hundreds of thousands of ex-smokers? Please don't make us personae non gratae yet again!

I hope for an educated decision based on facts & ultimately the best outcome for all.

Respectfully,

Pat Meyer


4430 Cherokee Avenue

San Diego, CA 92116

Pat Meyer

Library Services Specialist plmeyer@mail.sdsu.edu 619.594.6798

San Diego State University, Library & Information Access, Serials Unit



Evans, Derek

From: Carranza, Richard [RichardCarranza@sfusd.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 11:23 AM
To: Evans, Derek
Subject: City Ordinance Support Request

February 25, 2014

Dear Clerk Evans,

School Health Programs Office of San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) would like to strongly encourage you to support the proposed city ordinance regarding e-cigarettes. We know how tempting these devices can be to our young people, and by supporting this ordinance you can take a strong stand against future addiction and in support of the health of all the citizens of San Francisco, especially our youth. This ordinance would prohibit the use of e-cigarettes in all areas where cigarettes are prohibited by state law. This includes day care facilities, public buildings, retail food facilities and health facilities. *Since the proposal would limit e-cigs where state and local law prohibits, that also includes school buildings and applies to all students, staff, visitors, and civic use permit holders.* It would extend the prohibitions on the advertising of tobacco products to include the advertising of e-cigarettes.

Many people are not aware of the dangers of e-cigarettes but we must emphasize the products can be addictive, just as with tobacco cigarettes, and they are being marketed to youth. Philip Morris, R.J. Reynolds and Lorillard have invested heavily and the use of ENDS (electronic nicotine delivery systems) has doubled from 2011-2012.

In fact, according to Stanton Glantz, director of the Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education at UC San Francisco, the actual evidence is that e-cigarettes are associated with less quitting cigarettes among both adults and adolescents. Second hand 'vaping,' like second-hand smoke, is also harmful. According to Glantz, this new study means that in heavy density 'vaping' areas such as bars or casinos e-cigarette use would create pollution levels 5-10 times what is considered acceptable.

There are also other toxic chemicals in the vapor as well as ultrafine particles that likely have cardiovascular effects. At least 10 compounds that are on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to cause cancer have already been identified in mainstream or secondhand (side-stream) e-cigarette vapor.


Many districts are including prohibiting the devices in tobacco-free campus policies, including the following Bay Area Boards of Education: Contra Costa, Alameda, Berkeley, Antioch, Castro Valley, New Haven, and San Ramon. It is my intent as the Superintendent of the SFUSD to amend the present tobacco-free policy to address the impact of the e-cigarettes by the end of this school year.

As tobacco-control advocates, we are working hard to stem the increasing popularity of e-cigarettes for multiple reasons:

1. *The simple truth is that 'vaping' doesn't just produce harmless water vapor.*
2. *Nicotine isn't a harmless high even if the smoke from burning plant matter is eliminated.*
3. *Nicotine by itself contributes to vapors' higher risk of developing atherosclerosis, the primary cause of heart attacks.*

With all of this in mind and for the safety of our citizens and youth, I strongly urge you to endorse this city ordinance to prohibit the use of e-cigarettes in all areas where cigarettes are prohibited by state law.

Sincerely,



Richard A. Carranza
Superintendent

Richard A. Carranza

Superintendent of Schools

San Francisco Unified School District

Tel: (415) 241-6121

Fax: (415) 241-6012

Email: RichardCarranza@sfusd.edu

Evans, Derek

From: Michael González [gzalez.ma@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 9:42 AM
To: Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Chiu, David; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Tang, Katy; Wiener, Scott; Campos, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Evans, Derek; Board of Supervisors
Subject: E-Cigarette Usage Ban - Ordinance No. 131208

I am a California citizen, I have friends who live in San Francisco and so I spend a lot of time visiting there. W_____

E-cigarettes have changed my life. I know that without them, my physical wellness would be much worse. My lung capacity has increased and I get much more out of my workouts now. I can also tell that my sense of taste and smell have gotten much better.

The nicotine liquid in used in e-cigarettes only contains 4 ingredients: nicotine, flavoring, propylene glycol, and vegetable glycerin, as opposed to 600 found in traditional cigarettes and 4,000 in the smoke produced by them.

- Smoking bans are enacted to protect the public from the harm of secondhand smoke, but e-cigarettes have not been shown to cause harm to bystanders. In fact, all evidence to date shows that the low health risks associated with e-cigarettes are comparable to other smokeless nicotine products.
- The low risks of e-cigarettes is supported by research done by Dr. Siegel of Boston University, Dr. Eissenberg of Virginia Commonwealth, Dr Maciej L Goniewicz of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Dr. Laugesen of Health New Zealand, Dr. Igor Burstyn of Drexel University, and by the fact that the FDA testing, in spite of its press statement, failed to find harmful levels of carcinogens or toxic levels of any chemical in the vapor.
- comprehensive review_____
- Electronic cigarette use is easy to distinguish from actual smoking. Although some e-cigarettes resemble real cigarettes, many do not. It is easy to tell when someone lights a cigarette from the smell of smoke. E-cigarette vapor is practically odorless, and generally any detectable odor is not unpleasant and smells nothing like smoke. Additionally, e-cigarette users can decide whether to release any vapor ("discreet vaping"). With so little evidence of use, enforcing use bans on electronic cigarettes would be nearly impossible.
- The ability to use electronic cigarettes in public spaces will actually improve public health by inspiring other smokers to switch. Surveys of thousands of users indicate that the majority of those who switch completely replace tobacco cigarettes with the electronic cigarettes, reducing their health risks by an estimated 99%.

_____ CASAA Research Library.

Please do not ban e-cigarettes in San Francisco. They have helped thousands of adults quit smoking and better their lives.

--
Michael A González

Evans, Derek

From: Colleen McClintock [colleenmcclintock@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 11:27 PM
To: Lee, Mayor; Avalos, John; Breed, London; Chiu, David; Cohen, Malia; Farrell, Mark; Kim, Jane; Tang, Katy; Wiener, Scott; Campos, David; Mar, Eric (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Evans, Derek; Board of Supervisors
Subject: Ordinance No. 131208

To all concerned:

I am a previous resident of San Francisco and as a frequent traveller to the area on business, I wish to express my concern over the proposed restrictions on e-cigarettes. I smoked for over 30 years and have successfully quit smoking using e-cigarettes. In fact, it is exactly one year ago today that I smoked my last cigarette! This would not have been possible without the use of an e-cigarette. I had previously tried all other options including cold turkey, nicotine replacement substitutes, and online support forums. Nothing worked until I discovered e-cigarettes.

Please consider that banning the use of e-cigarettes is sending a message that e-cigarettes are as dangerous as smoking both to the smoker and to those exposed to second-hand smoke. No studies to date have not supported this position and it is giving the wrong message to the public. Why wouldn't my success at quitting be rewarded with acceptance? My doctor, family, friends, and co-workers are all very supportive and impressed that I was able to quit after so many years of addiction.

I have never had a single person complain that the vapor from a e-cigarette is bothering them so I am very confused as to why a ban would be seriously considered.

Please consider the following when making a decision on this issue:

- Smoking has been shown to cause cancer, heart disease, and other serious health problems. E-cigarettes have not been shown to cause these same health problems. In fact, e-cigarettes have been shown to be a safer alternative to smoking.
- The use of e-cigarettes has been shown to help people quit smoking. This is a significant public health benefit. Banning e-cigarettes would remove this benefit from the public.
- E-cigarettes have been shown to be a safer alternative to smoking. They do not contain tar or carbon monoxide, which are the two most harmful chemicals in cigarette smoke.
- E-cigarettes have been shown to be a safer alternative to smoking. They do not contain tar or carbon monoxide, which are the two most harmful chemicals in cigarette smoke.
- E-cigarettes have been shown to be a safer alternative to smoking. They do not contain tar or carbon monoxide, which are the two most harmful chemicals in cigarette smoke.
- E-cigarettes have been shown to be a safer alternative to smoking. They do not contain tar or carbon monoxide, which are the two most harmful chemicals in cigarette smoke.

Thank you for your consideration!

Colleen McClintock



RICHARD H. CARMONA, M.D., M.P.H., FACS
17th Surgeon General of the United States (2002-2006)

* Duplicate letters
addressed to each
member of the New
York City Council is
in file.

December 11, 2013

New York City Council

Dear Councilmember:

My name is Richard Carmona, and I served as the 17th Surgeon General of the United States. I write to ask for your personal support in *declining* to include electronic cigarettes in the Smoke Free Air Act. I am extremely concerned, as set forth below, that such an effort, if successful, could do tremendous harm to what is emerging as the most promising weapon yet in the fight against tobacco-related illness and death.

As we approach the 50th anniversary of the first Surgeon General's Report linking smoking and cancer, the plague of tobacco-caused death and disability still persists, killing over 430,000 Americans per year, while disabling millions more with preventable chronic diseases at a cost of hundreds of billions of dollars annually.

During my tenure as Surgeon General, my colleagues and I published reports detailing the preventable harm done by tobacco, spoke frequently to the public and to Congress about the catastrophic health damage caused by tobacco, and even participated as an expert witness in the federal government's case against the tobacco industry. I am particularly proud of my authorship of the 2006 Surgeon General's report on secondhand smoke, in which I wrote: "The debate is over. The science is clear: secondhand smoke is not a mere annoyance, but a serious health hazard that causes premature death and disease in children and non smoking adults."

Yet despite my actions and those of my predecessors like Surgeon General C. Everett Koop, high cigarette taxes, Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved smoking cessation therapies, and the best educational efforts by public health professionals, nearly 20% of the adult population and one-third of our military service members continue to smoke. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) reports that adult smokers usually know they are engaged in harmful behavior and 69% would like to reduce or quit smoking. However, each year only 6% of smokers succeed in quitting, and new smokers replace those who successfully quit. The history and data suggest that we need more viable alternatives in this fight against tobacco.

I believe that one such alternative is the electronic cigarette. Despite their unfortunate name, electronic cigarettes are not actually cigarettes. They contain no tobacco but rather deliver nicotine without all of the toxic, carcinogenic, and other disease-causing products of tobacco combustion. (For example, they produce no carbon monoxide (a particularly

lethal constituent of secondhand tobacco smoke) and produce no sidestream emissions (a source of 85% of secondhand tobacco smoke)). The published research suggests there


may be a significant role for electronic cigarettes in tobacco harm reduction strategies, since they provide smokers both with the nicotine they crave and the smoking rituals that they have grown accustomed too. Respected Wall Street analysts have opined that, within a decade, electronic cigarette sales could overtake tobacco sales. I recently joined the board of NJOY, the leading independent electronic cigarette company, because its ambitions are even higher – to obsolete the tobacco cigarette entirely.

I recognize the good intentions behind the present effort to include electronic cigarettes in the Smoke Free Air Act. However, I am extremely concerned that a well-intentioned but scientifically un-supported effort like the current proposal could constitute a giant step backward in the effort to defeat tobacco smoking. This regulation, if passed, would disincentivize smokers from switching to electronic cigarettes, since NJOY's research indicates that many initially switch for reasons of convenience. It would also send the unintended message to smokers that electronic cigarettes are as dangerous as tobacco smoking, with the result that many will simply continue to smoke their current toxic products. Legislative action that would keep smokers smoking would obviously have serious health consequences – and could cost lives. Worse still, it could lead to the adoption of similar ordinances in other cities, creating a domino effect that would further magnify the potential public health danger in this scientifically unsupported approach.

I will also observe that the concerns expressed about the possibilities that electronic cigarettes could addict non-smokers, condemning them to a lifetime struggle with nicotine addiction, echo concerns expressed about nicotine gums and patches when these first were introduced to the market. We have seen clearly, however, that such products did not have that affect. At the same time, while gums and patches have helped a small minority of smokers successfully quit smoking, it is clear to those of us have been engaged in this battle that we need more impactful solutions to the continuing problem of tobacco smoking, and that is where we see electronic cigarettes playing a central role.

I know that we all share the same vision of a world without tobacco related illness and disease. I fervently believe that to achieve that goal, we need to distinguish between the problem (tobacco smoking and tobacco secondhand smoke) and one extremely promising solution (electronic cigarettes). I strongly encourage you to resist calls to include electronic cigarettes in the City's smoking ban, which I believe would be a major step backward in the effort to achieve this aim. A decision rejecting this proposal would preserve the great legacy of this Council in the fight against tobacco.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Richard Carmona".

Richard Carmona, M.D., M.P.H. FACS
17th Surgeon General of the United States

President, District 3
BOARD of SUPERVISORS



Electronically:

*(j. Rules Clerk
C: BOS-11, COB, Leg Dep.
BOS-Aides, NSS Clerk
City Hall*

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-7450
Fax No. 554-7454
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

DAVID CHIU

邱信福
市參事會主席

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

Date: 2/28/2014

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Madam Clerk,

Pursuant to Board Rules, I am hereby:

☐ Waiving 30-Day Rule (Board Rule No. 3.23)

File No. _____
(Primary Sponsor)

Title. _____

☒ Transferring (Board Rule No. 3.3)

File No. 131208 Mar
(Primary Sponsor)

Title. Health Code - Electronic Cigarettes

From: Neighborhood Services & Safety Committee

To: Rules Committee

☐ Assigning Temporary Committee Appointment (Board Rule No. 3.1)

Supervisor _____

Replacing Supervisor _____

For: _____ Meeting
(Date) (Committee)

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "David Chiu".

David Chiu, President
Board of Supervisors

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- ☒ 1. For reference to Committee:
An ordinance, resolution, motion, or charter amendment.
- ☐ 2. Request for next printed agenda without reference to Committee.
- ☐ 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee:
- ☐ 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor inquires"
- ☐ 5. City Attorney request.
- ☐ 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- ☐ 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- ☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- ☐ 9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).
- ☐ 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.
- ☐ 11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- ☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission
☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a different form.

Sponsor(s):


Mar, Avalos, Chiu

Subject:

Health Code - Restrictions on Sale and Use of Electronic Cigarettes

The text is listed below or attached:

Please see attached.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: 

For Clerk's Use Only: