



The Consumer Advocates for Smoke-free Alternatives Association (CASAA)

Oppose Indoor Vaping Prohibition

CASAA is a 501(c)(4) consumer advocacy association with a national membership focused on promoting tobacco harm reduction strategies to reduce the disease and early death attributed to smoking.

The verified low risk of vapor products does not warrant government action prohibiting public use.

- While some may find exposure to vapor from e-cigarettes unpleasant, discomfort is not an appropriate justification for heavy regulation. In most places, private business owners are free to set and enforce their own indoor vaping policies. In fact, many businesses may see a benefit to allowing employees and patrons to vape indoors as opposed to forcing them to go outside.
- Allowing private businesses to set their own indoor vaping policy is consistent with recommendations from both Public Health England (PHE) and The Royal College of Physicians (RCP) in the UK. “Given the lack of evidence on the harmfulness of e-cigarette vapour to others, it would be inappropriate for national legislation to prohibit their use in public places and workplaces.”¹

Including vapor products in smoking bans misinforms consumers about the risks of smoking vs vaping.

- Ostensibly, smoking place bans are enacted to protect bystanders from the harms of secondhand smoke. But vapor products do not involve combustion and do not pose a risk to bystanders.² Including vapor products in smoking place bans sends the inaccurate message to the public these two distinctly different products pose similar risks to public health.

Applying traditional tobacco control regulations to low-risk vapor products will discourage quit attempts and may undo recent public health gains.

- There is no evidence that public use of vapor products may “renormalize” smoking. If anything, it “normalizes” an incredibly low-risk alternative to smoking and encourages quit attempts. Many former smokers report learning about low-risk smoking alternatives by seeing others use the products in public. Public use of vapor products will likely inspire smokers to make quit attempts they might have otherwise dismissed as impossible or undesirable. Prohibiting vaping in public spaces and workplaces creates an unnecessary barrier to consumer awareness of safer alternatives to smoking.
- Moreover, requiring former smokers who have transitioned to vapor products to use designated smoking areas exposes them to an unnecessary risk of relapse. Social situations where smoking occurs are one of the strongest cues for reinitiating substance use. Whereas former smokers might employ vapor products as a strategy to prevent reinitiation when exposed to relapse triggers, forcing them into such a situation is inviting harm. It would be similar to requiring recovering alcoholics to purchase non-alcoholic beverages only from bars.

¹ Royal College of Physicians. Nicotine without smoke: Tobacco harm reduction. London: RCP, 2016.

² Burstyn I: Peering through the mist: systematic review of what the chemistry of contaminants in electronic cigarettes tells us about health risks. BMC Public Health 2014, 14:18..