

de la Guerra, Sheila

Public Comment - Group 2

#3



**From:** SB Coalition for Responsible Cannabis <coalition4responsiblecannabis@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 3:35 PM  
**To:** Williams, Das; Hart, Gregg; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve  
**Cc:** sbcob; Miyasato, Mona  
**Subject:** D3 Prohibit sale of flavored tobacco products

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

BOS MTG: D3 Prohibit sale of flavored tobacco products

Dear Board

Just a quick note to thank you for your effort to control/lessen the sale of vaping products, via amendment of the Tobacco Retail Ordinance at tomorrow's Board meeting.

We are, however, concerned at and confused by the statement on Pg 4:

*“The proposed ordinance amendment would add an updated definition of “electronic smoking devices” to the definition of “tobacco product”, which includes any substances that may be aerosolized or vaporized by such device, whether or not the substance contains nicotine. This definition does not include cannabis products.”*

We are unclear about why this ordinance would not apply to *any* vaping substance, and why you would proactively exclude cannabis. In fact, Attachment 2, the “Strikethrough ordinance” the definition of Electronic Smoking Device refers to *“any substance that may be aerosolized or vaporized..”*.

That statement does not exclude cannabis.

If you are for some reason unable to amend this ordinance to include cannabis, we suggest that when the Cannabis Business (Retail) Ordinance returns to you, next week, it be amended to prohibit sales of vaping products.

To underscore the fact that vaping of any substance is of concern, we draw your attention to the weekly **“Vaping Product Use Associated Lung Injury”** update on the California Department of Public Health website: <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/Pages/EVALI-Weekly-Public-Report.aspx>

Among other data for this informative weekly report updated 12/4/19, and linked above, 82% of patients reported "vaped product containing THC":

**Table 2: Patient Interview Data [above link]**

Total Surveys Completed	
Reported vaping practices**	
Vaped product containing THC	80 (82%)
Vaped product containing CBD	37 (38%)
Vaped product containing nicotine	45 (46%)
Vaped nicotine products only	10 (10%)

In a related action, we note that your Public Health Department recently rescinded a prior provider directive which previously asked providers to report "cannabis related illnesses". This new directive includes the statement that: *"Public Health is exploring options to create a mechanism for physicians to report suspected cases of allergic reactions to cannabis odors as part of our partnership with the local medical community and potential data collection efforts. There is insufficient evidence in the medical literature at this time to determine if odor alone (even exclusive of pollen) can cause adverse physical reactions. Therefore, in an effort to minimize confusion with reporting of VAPI/EVALI associated with cannabis use and until we receive guidance and clarification from the California Department of Public Health, reporting of "Cannabis Related Illness" has been removed from the list of reportable diseases and it is no longer required to be reported"*. [https://countyofsb.org/uploadedFiles/phd/PROGRAMS/Disease\\_Control/2019-25-19%20Provider%20Alert-List%20of%20Reportable%20Diseases.pdf](https://countyofsb.org/uploadedFiles/phd/PROGRAMS/Disease_Control/2019-25-19%20Provider%20Alert-List%20of%20Reportable%20Diseases.pdf)

That statement is confusing on many levels, and we would appreciate more of an explanation of how this reversal took place, and under whose direction. We would also like some assurance that cannabis-related VAPING injuries are still reportable.

In closing, we thank you for beginning the process of protecting the public's health by restricting sale of certain vaping products. We encourage you to extend this prohibition to vaping products containing THC/Cannabis, via the Cannabis Business Ordinance.

Sincerely,

Coalition for Responsible Cannabis

## de la Guerra, Sheila

---

**From:** Jacqueline Kurta <jkurta@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 4:32 PM  
**To:** sbcob; Hartmann, Joan  
**Subject:** RE: Supervisors meeting-December 10, 2019

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors:

I wholeheartedly support the proposed policy initiative to strengthen the existing local laws that regulate the sale and distribution of tobacco products by making them less accessible to children.

Adopting strong flavored tobacco restrictions is an important way to protect our youth from tobacco industry targeting and lifelong addiction. Manufacturers have created 15,500 unique youth-friendly flavored tobacco products in recent years, including e-cigarettes and cigars with flavors such as gummy bear, cotton candy and peanut butter cup. Federal laws ban flavors in cigarettes, excluding menthol, but not in any other tobacco products. Menthol products are disproportionately used by smokers who are young, female, part of a sexual minority, or part of a racial or ethnic minority. Menthol flavors facilitates addiction and disease, and it is imperative for menthol to also be included in a complete flavored tobacco ban.

The tobacco and vape industry spends \$900,000 an hour on marketing and price discounts to lure new and existing users into addiction. Restricting pricing strategies and establishing requirements based on minimum pack and price is another way to prevent predatory pricing and discounting of tobacco products. This would eliminate discounting schemes that encourage consumption, and increase the number of units per package to raise the price of cheap tobacco products, making them less accessible.

The Unincorporated County of Santa Barbara currently has 64 stores that sell tobacco, 6 of which are tobacco only stores. Of these retailers, 13 are within 1,000 feet of a school, which only increases youth exposure to tobacco marketing. In 2019, 49 of these stores were shopped in undercover operations, and 10% of these stores illegally sold tobacco to a minor. Youth who purchase tobacco products from local stores almost always choose flavored tobacco due to their sweet tastes and appealing names.

It is of the utmost importance that something be done to address this public health issue within our community.

1. Flavors, including menthol, play a significant role in drawing youth and young adults to tobacco products.
2. Over 80% of adult tobacco users started before the age of 18.
3. Over 80% of kids who use tobacco started with a flavored tobacco product.
4. This will show community that our County believes firmly in preventing youth from beginning to smoke and vape.

We fully support the Santa Barbara County legislation restricting the sale of flavored tobacco, restricting pricing strategies and establishing requirements based on minimum pack and price. This is paramount to the health and safety of Santa Barbara County residents.

Sincerely,  
Jacqueline Kurta  
Santa Barbara city resident

---

---

Jacqueline Kurta, PsyD, LMFT  
jkurta@mac.com  
Lic #43222

**de la Guerra, Sheila**

---

**Subject:**

FW: Vaping

**From:** Bella Lewis <[bellalewis378@gmail.com](mailto:bellalewis378@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 11:00 PM  
**To:** Alexander, Jacquelyne <[jralexander@countyofsb.org](mailto:jralexander@countyofsb.org)>  
**Subject:** Vaping

**Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.**

My name is Bella and I am a student at a local high school here in Santa Barbra. I am unable to be at the public hearing since I am in school at this time. However, when I heard that Santa Barbara was considering banning flavored tobacco products; I wanted to let you know how I feel.

For the last several years, vaping has become really popular. I see it everywhere, especially at school. I am a good student and I do not drink or do drugs and neither do most of my friends. However, even some of my friends have tried vaping and some are doing it regularly. It's a large problem. I think that flavors make vaping more attractive to people my age and even younger. There are so many flavors and they are fruity and unique and are obviously aimed at young people, like me. Therefore, kids don't see it as being as harmful as it is. They treat it like a toy and don't understand the damage it is causing to their bodies.

I think the harder it is to buy these products, fewer teens will be vaping and there is less of a chance of addiction and health problems in the long run. But first, we need your help. Please do everything you can to ban these harmful products.

Thank you,  
Bella