



CENTER FOR EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

TOBACCO CONTROL EVALUATION CENTER

Combating Outdoor Smoking in Public Places:

**A summary and analysis of 22 Final Evaluation Reports addressing
Communities of Excellence Indicator 2.2.16**

Report prepared by

C. S. Lemp Consulting

P. O. Box 445

Columbia, CA 95310

May 2009

Commissioned on behalf of the

Tobacco Control Evaluation Center/UC Davis

Funded by

The California Department of Health Services,

Tobacco Control Program

PREDICTORS OF SUCCESS IN MEETING INDICATOR 2.2.16 OBJECTIVES:

Location

- To succeed with parks and beaches: An environmentally-conscious city or county with a flourishing economy, ample public services, and a comparatively affluent, well-educated population
- To succeed with events: A less affluent milieu in which event organizers are grateful for sponsorship
- A history of public/private support for tobacco control policies
- Nearby cities and counties with smoke-free policies in place
- Youth-specific events and areas

Operation

- A “champion” positioned in the community and/or decision-making body to help carry the LLA’s agenda forward
- Active, well-connected coalition members
- A pool of potential volunteers, particularly young people
- A large and diverse roster of local CBOs with which to contract or partner
- LLA staff that is stable, knowledgeable, creative, and highly motivated
- An evaluator who is closely connected with the project from start to finish

CONTENTS

Predictors of Success	2
Introduction	4
Methods	4
Overview	5
Elements of a Successful Strategy	8
Working with Decision Makers	23
Challenges and Barriers	28
Evaluation Activities	32
Conclusions	33

INTRODUCTION

Between the beginning of July 2004 and the end of June 2007, 20 Local Lead Agencies (LLAs), representing 18 county health departments in California and two city health departments, were funded by the California Department of Health Services, Tobacco Control Program, to address Communities of Excellence Indicator 2.2.16:

Proportion of outdoor recreational facilities, areas, and venues with a voluntary policy that regulates smoking in places such as amusement parks, beaches, fairgrounds, parks, parades, piers, playgrounds, sports stadiums, tot lots, and zoos

OR

Proportion of communities with a policy that regulates smoking at outdoor recreation facilities, areas, and venues in places such as amusement parks, beaches, fairgrounds, parks, parades, piers, playgrounds, sports stadiums, tot lots, and zoos

Upon completing their work, the LLAs wrote and presented a total of 22 Final Evaluation Reports, or FERs (two counties produced two FERs each). The purpose of this report is to examine the efforts of all 20 LLAs, to describe outcomes as presented in their FERs, and to discuss some of the factors that appear to underlie successful and less successful attempts to achieve their stated goals. The report is primarily descriptive rather than analytical for reasons given in the Methods section below.

METHODS

Since contacting the LLAs directly in order to resolve ambiguities or to expand upon the information offered in the FERs was not an option in preparing this report, the data used here are drawn almost exclusively from the 22 FERs as they were submitted at the end of the project period.

This information has been augmented to a limited degree by reference to the original work plans and to the budgets that the LLAs wrote prior to project approval, but both of these sources have several drawbacks. First, the budget section of the work plans addresses each county's 2004-2007 Scope of Work as a whole rather than as individual objectives. Since the LLAs chose to focus on multiple objectives and worked on them more or less concurrently, it is difficult to determine how much of the budget was used for these outdoor policy objectives. Second, whatever their original intentions, most LLAs had to juggle priorities and change direction as their projects evolved in response to unanticipated local issues, so work plans and budgets became less reliable road maps as time went on. And finally, the activities in the work plans are typically described only briefly, providing little direction.

On occasion, we have consulted LLA websites and other sources for a better understanding of an item mentioned in the FERs.

Definitive conclusions cannot be drawn from the limited information that many FERs provided nor extrapolated from the intentions they expressed in their original work plans. Instead, this report limits itself to compiling information about activities and outcomes presented by the FERs themselves and making tentative observations based upon their assertions and upon apparent confluences among common efforts. The guiding rule of thumb in considering what to include in each section below was this: for the purposes of this report, if the LLAs didn't report it in their FER, they didn't do it.

OVERVIEW

In studying the 22 FERs, it quickly becomes apparent that no set of shared variables presents itself to be used for convenient point-by-point comparisons. As is often the case when California cities and counties undertake projects that have a single point in common—in this instance, Community of Excellence Indicator 2.2.16—the resulting final reports demonstrate a wide variation in content and in presentation.

Briefly examining some of these differences provides a useful platform from which to make some preliminary observations about the contents of these FERs (Table 1 summarizes this discussion).

- Differences among the cities/counties. The cities/counties included in this report vary geographically, economically, politically, and demographically. Five of the counties represented are rural; four, plus the two cities, are urban; eight are suburban, and one—Stanislaus County—is unclassified, but either rural or suburban. The array of advantages and challenges that each faces in limiting outdoor tobacco use varies also. Santa Cruz County, for example, counts its popular parks and beaches and its environmentally-conscious, relatively well-educated and affluent population among its strategic advantages. One of the unique challenges the county faces, however, is a large number of homeless people, many of whom are smokers who tend to occupy its parks and beaches.
- Differences in Local Lead Agencies and in local community coalitions. Reflecting the characteristics of their communities as well as their own individual capabilities, staffing varied in number, stability, and competence from one LLA to another and local coalitions varied in their number of members, the organizations and agencies they represented, and their degree of involvement. Some LLAs took on most of the tasks themselves and others contracted with local community-based organizations (CBOs), usually coalition members, to perform some or all of the project activities. While some LLAs were able to make extensive use of adult and youth volunteers in carrying their projects forward, others were less successful in recruiting volunteer helpers.
- Differences in approach. The various LLAs and coalitions chose to pursue vastly different interventions and to pursue them in ways unique to their individual settings and goals. For example, of the 22 FERs examined here, 12 focused upon interventions aimed at particular physical targets, such as parks, beaches, or even whole cities; eight described efforts to control tobacco use at recurring events such as fairs, parades, or festivals; and three described a combination of both.
- Differences in evaluation. Sixteen LLAs elected to hire outside evaluators while the other four conducted the evaluation internally. Tradeoffs implicit in these choices include an objective, professional approach versus intimacy with the day-to-day evolution of the project, although in many cases the external evaluator did seem familiar with the details and nuances of the project. However, there are other issues that could impact the quality and accuracy of the evaluation, such as how professional the evaluator is, how well-versed s/he is in the strictures of tobacco control evaluation, and whether the evaluator or project director changed during the project.
- Differences in FERs. As documents, the FERs are a study in dissimilarity. They range in length from five to fifty pages. Some are models of coherence and clarity, touching as closely as possible on the points addressed in the original plan and providing well-chosen details. Others err in the direction of providing too much or too little information, or are very difficult to follow. None follow a single pattern of reporting activities and outcomes.
- Differences in scopes of work. Reflective of the size of their county's population and related allocation of tobacco control funding, LLAs and their coalitions determined the number of objectives they would take on in their scope of work for the 2004-2007 grant period. Fifteen LLAs worked on between three to five objectives while the remaining five LLAs took on from seven to ten objectives.

- Differences in funding. Thirteen of the LLAs received the same amount of money—as Tier 3 agencies—from the California Tobacco Control Program. Of the remaining seven LLAs that were funded at higher levels, two were considered Tier 2 agencies and the other five were Tier 1 organizations, all located in either urban centers or densely populated suburban areas.

Table 1 illustrates some of these differences.

Table 1. Some of the variations among jurisdictions selecting Indicator 2.2.16.
(Those city/county LLAs which were successful in their efforts are shaded.)

County/City	Jurisdiction Characteristic	Evaluator	Length of FER*	Total # Objectives	Funding Level
Del Norte	Rural North Coast Region	External	12	5	Tier 3
El Dorado	Rural Gold Country Region	Internal	14	4	Tier 3
Humboldt	Rural North Coast Region	External	9	4	Tier 3
Lake	Rural North Coast Region	External	21	5	Tier 3
Long Beach (city)	Urban Los Angeles Region	External	N/A**	3	Tier 2
Los Angeles	Urban Los Angeles Region	Internal	21	9	Tier 1
Marin	Suburban Bay Area Region	External	12	4	Tier 3
Monterey	Suburban Central Coast Region	Internal	11	5	Tier 3
Nevada	Rural Gold Country Region	External	5	4	Tier 3
Orange	Urban Southern Coast Region	Primarily Internal	16	8	Tier 1
Pasadena (city)	Urban Los Angeles Region	External	11	4	Tier 3
Riverside	Suburban Tri-County South Region	External	14	4	Tier 1
Sacramento	Urban Gold Country Region	External	8	7	Tier 1
San Diego*** (2 FERs)	Suburban Southern Coast Region	External	11/13	10	Tier 1
San Luis Obispo	Suburban Tri-County Region	External	11	3	Tier 3
San Mateo	Urban Bay Area Region	External	50	3	Tier 3
Santa Cruz (2 FERs)	Suburban Central Coast Region	External	20/11	7	Tier 3
Solano	Suburban Bay Area Region	External	50	4	Tier 2
Stanislaus	-- not provided --	External	15	4	Tier 3
Yuba	Suburban Gold Country Region	External	18	3	Tier 3

*Page count includes cover page and text only, excluding attachments. **No FER submitted. ***1 of 2 projects was successful.

Table 2 provides a very brief summary of the approaches and outcomes of LLAs during their 2004-2007 scope of work for this objective.

Table 2. Projects described in the FERs addressing Indicator 2.2.16.
(Again, successful efforts have been shaded.)

County/City	Intervention focused on:	Degree of success	Remarks
Del Norte	1 event	Successful	Progressed from 1 smoke-free day at the County Fair to all 4 days smoke-free except for designated areas during program periods.
El Dorado	1 event, 1 ski resort	Successful: exceeded goals	The County Fair and ski resort became smoke-free with designated smoking areas; additional parks and pools also went smoke-free.
Humboldt	1 event, 1 city	Successful	Work with fair and city decision makers led to policies of no smoking except in designated areas.
Lake¹	6 of 20 targeted concerts, festivals, fairs, etc.	Successful: may have exceeded goals	Reported that 19 outdoor community events had adopted and enacted smoke-free policies at the end of program period.
Long Beach (city)	City beaches	Unknown	Final evaluation submission consisted of 4 survey/observation descriptions only; no accompanying narrative.
Los Angeles²	8 cities	Mostly successful: 7 cities, plus other venues	Smoke-free outdoor policies passed in 7 cities (also reported: smoke-free parks in 4 cities, smoke-free beaches in 5, other smoke-free policies in 5 more).
Marin³	6 of 8 jurisdictions	Partly successful: county plus 3 other jurisdictions	The county Board of Supervisors adopted a comprehensive smoking policy that has been a model for several other communities.
Monterey⁴	10 events	Partially successful: 6 no-smoking policies, 3 for entire event	By spring of 2005, the LLA had nearly met their original objective—5 events to prohibit all tobacco use—so they doubled the objective to 10.
Nevada	5 city parks and 2 skate parks	Partly successful: 2 city parks, 1 skate park	The LLA anticipated that 3 more city parks, already in the works, would be tobacco free by the end of July 2007.
Orange	10 outdoor recreational facilities	Successful: exceeded goals x 10	7 cities passed smoke-free park/beach ordinances covering over 100 separate venues.
Pasadena (city)	3 outdoor recreational events	Successful: exceeded goals	4 agencies adopted a voluntary smoke-free policy at 7 events.
Riverside	3 cities	Partly successful: 2 cities	A total of 32 parks are covered by the voluntary no-smoking ordinances adopted by the two cities.
Sacramento⁵	6 policies	Successful: exceeded goals	9 policies were adopted by 7 organizations (6 smoke-free events and 3 sponsorship policies).
San Diego (2 FERs)	7 locales/events	Successful: exceeded goals	8+ cities/community events signed smoke-free policies.
	7 community colleges in 4 districts	Partly successful: 3 colleges	1 college adopted a smoke-free policy, 2 created designated smoking areas (as will 1 more college).
San Luis Obispo	1 beach and/or pier	Successful: exceeded goals	2 cities (1 with 1 beach, the other with several beaches and a pier) passed no-smoking policies.
San Mateo⁶ (2 projects)	1 event	Successful	A new youth coalition (an associated goal) worked with festival leaders to introduce and secure the no-smoking policy.
	1 event	Successful	Again, a youth group conducted most of the activities and won passage of the festival's policy.
Santa Cruz (2 FERs)	1 outdoor tourist destination	Successful: exceeded goals	3 policies were adopted comprising 3 beaches and 2 city parks, plus all county parks.
	1 event	Successful	Smoke-free Pride parades and festivals were held in 2006-07.
Solano	All county parks	Partly successful: regulations amended	Park-specific regulations still TBD. A succession of personnel changes in county depts. stalled the project repeatedly.
Stanislaus	1 baseball park	Successful	Swift passage with complete community support.
Yuba	6 events	Partly successful: 3 signed policies; some events smoke-free	13 events have gone smoke-free to some extent, though only 3 policies were officially signed and 2 of those need to be resubmitted annually.

¹The Lake County LLA doesn't provide baseline information on how many events already had smoke-free policies in place or which events were targeted for program activities, making it difficult to assess the connection between their intervention and the outcome.

²The Los Angeles County LLA targeted 8 cities—"one city in each Service Planning Area"—which may explain why they reported partial success even though 14 cities in the county enacted some kind of outdoor tobacco use prohibition.

³It is not clear whether the county was one of the 8 targeted jurisdictions or whether enacting a comprehensive outdoor no-smoking policy at the county level transcends the 6-jurisdiction goal; therefore it is difficult to ascertain the LLA's degree of success.

⁴In addition to the 6 events that adopted no-smoking policies, a seventh event was adopting a policy as the FER was being written and the local Girl Scout chapter was motivated by LLA staff to sign a tobacco-free policy.

⁵"Sponsorship" in this context refers to organizations adopting policies prohibiting tobacco sponsorship of their events.

⁶In addition to these successes and the success of another objective covered in this FER, the San Mateo County LLA went on to offer technical assistance to the directors of 13 other outdoor events in the county. In May of 2007, the Pacific Coast Farmers' Market Association—encompassing 38 markets—decided to adopt a voluntary smoke-free policy.

Fourteen of the 22 projects were successful, and in nine of those, the LLAs were able to accomplish more than the minimum goals they set for themselves. An examination of Tables 1 and 2 for common characteristics or combinations of characteristics that might shed some light on why some projects were more successful than others (e.g., were LLAs more successful in addressing events rather than physical locales? Did the total number of objectives undertaken diminish their ability to attain successful outcomes? Did the amount of funding or the geographic setting somehow influence their success?) provided no clear patterns, either positive or negative.

To gain a better understanding of the many accomplishments logged by the LLAs who made outdoor smoking their target, the remainder of this report will examine their campaigns in detail. We will pay particular attention to:

- elements of a successful strategy
- tactics for working with decision makers
- challenges and barriers encountered along the way
- evaluation activities and their uses
- conclusions and recommendations

Rather than attempt an exhaustive summary and analysis of every point as addressed by every FER, we will illustrate significant areas with examples provided by LLAs which actively addressed those areas.

ELEMENTS OF A SUCCESSFUL STRATEGY

All of the FERs described a number of activities that together comprised the foundation of the LLAs' efforts to effect changes in the tobacco policies of their targeted communities and events. In general, these included:

- designing the campaign
- determining how to deploy and extend LLA staff
- choosing among financial and other incentives
- conducting research and compiling educational material
- gathering local data through observations, polls, and interviews
- deciding how to handle community education
- designing the media interface

The specific activities and the order in which they were performed depended upon the unique circumstances of each case. Many functions overlapped; for example, the decision to seek out champions might be made during the design phase, investigated during the research phase, and the champions themselves would be deployed while the LLA was working with decision makers.

Designing the campaign

Most of the FERs which discussed the planning stage of their project in detail noted that the LLAs and their coalitions used the *Midwest Academy Strategy Chart* to work out specific strategies, contacts, and activities. Some made use of it in every project area and others combined it with additional planning methods.

- In San Diego County two contractors sat down with sympathetic personnel at each of the five community colleges to focus specifically on that campus, taking into account each administration, student body demographics, and special conditions. Another contractor worked with the LLA's tobacco control coalition secondhand smoke subcommittee to tailor activities and approaches to each of their three targeted community events and three targeted communities.
- The Los Angeles County LLA described the phase model they used as “a linear advocacy model [consisting of] five phases: Community Assessment, Campaign Strategy, Coalition Building/Broadening, Campaign Implementation, and Campaign Evaluation,” and incorporated the Midwest Academy Strategy Chart into a half-day policy planning session for specific local objectives.

The Solano County LLA, after sad experience with their county's complexities, added this caveat to the recommendations at the end of their FER: “When planning for intervention and evaluation, consider that the project objective and the evaluation plan may not unfold as a single, easily measured event, but rather adoption may involve multiple steps.”

Determining how to organize and extend LLA staff

The work plans LLAs mapped out reflected the scope and complexity of their objectives. The more complex and ambitious campaigns naturally required more people to carry them out. Some LLA staff—particularly in the smaller, more rural counties—perform the majority of the tasks associated with getting a no-smoking policy implemented in their chosen venue themselves, with some assistance from coalition-based volunteers. Others contracted some or all of their intervention activities to local CBOs and the cadres of volunteers available to them. A few LLAs mentioned benefiting from an infusion of support from local chapters of national organizations. Finding a champion with solid connections to the targeted policy makers—a trusted individual who can plant the message within the lines—was another way to extend the reach of the LLA staff.

Training plays an important role in melding together an effective team. Some FERs describe intensive trainings that include LLA staff, community members, CBO staff, and youth volunteers. Training at this level seems to infuse confidence and a powerful sense of purpose into the group, creating strong linkages and bonds among the individuals gathered to perform an important mission. This seems to be particularly true for the youth involved with the project.

Examples of staffing approaches and combinations follow:

Using staff primarily. When FERs didn't specifically credit contractors, coalition members, or volunteers for performing the activities described—conducting polls and observations, meeting with decision makers, staffing booths and tables at events—we inferred that the LLA staff was doing the work. This was the case in a few counties, large and small, several of which were successful in many of their undertakings.

Using contractors. Some LLAs maintained an exclusively administrative role, establishing the parameters of the project or projects and working closely with their contractors—usually CBOs already in the LLAs' coalitions—to map out the activities, then relying on the contractors to implement them.

- The San Diego County LLA contracted with several community agencies to perform two projects that addressed Indicator 2.2.16: one which encouraged selected events in a low-income Hispanic/Latino

community to go smoke-free and resist tobacco industry sponsorship and another that sought to implement tobacco control policies at several community colleges.

- The San Mateo County LLA selected two contractors that combined a trained adult with youth coalitions.

Using coalition members. Coalitions, as described in this set of FERs, ranged from almost invisible—the Del Norte County FER never mentioned their coalition—to being major contributors to the success of the project as was the case in Los Angeles County. The Los Angeles County LLA acknowledged the importance of their partners: “Critical to achieving the successful adoption of local policy is the presence of a strong and active local coalition.” In addition to sponsoring a county-wide coalition, the Los Angeles County LLA ensured that their contractors convened coalition meetings in each of the targeted cities to focus more closely on local issues, leading to successful outcomes in most areas.

In general, urban LLAs enjoy the advantage of a broader array of potential partners than do rural and suburban LLAs, where there are fewer organizations engaged in similar or complementary work within the county and where CBOs tend to be stretched beyond capacity in attempting to meet their own goals. Urban coalitions frequently include partners with similar goals who can bring funds from their own grants to the table and can use the same successful outcomes to meet their own objectives, forging mutually advantageous relationships that endure beyond grant periods. As the Los Angeles County LLA reported, working through a coalition “...can greatly improve the success of advocacy efforts by providing members with both a support group and valuable resources.”

Few FERs described the constituents of their coalitions, although it was sometimes possible to deduce from context that many members represented health-related organizations and agencies.

- For instance, in its discussion about the difficulty of getting coalition members to attend meetings regularly, the Marin County FER noted “Regular attendance is dominated by individuals working in fields directly or closely related to tobacco control.”
- The Riverside County LLA administered a comprehensive survey to their coalition members and one of the things they learned was that “[t]he majority (55.6%) of Coalition members earns their income from tobacco control activities...44% [work for] non-profit organizations, 33% work in the area of public health, 11% for a college/university, and 11% for the government.”
- At least two LLAs brought local high schools into their coalitions. The San Mateo County LLA contracted with two youth coalitions drawn from three local high schools which were long-time coalition members.

In some cases, membership appeared to limit the extent to which a coalition could effectively assist the LLA. For example, Humboldt County’s LLA learned from key informants that coalition members “had a hard time taking action due to the fact that they could only advise because of the lobbying regulations of their employers.”

As Table 3 shows, coalition members are most frequently involved during the planning stages of the project, particularly as participants in the Communities of Excellence needs assessment and the subsequent selection of objectives to pursue; 70% of the 20 LLAs in this set reported this activity. FERs noted that 30% of the coalitions also volunteered to observe smoking behavior, clean up litter, and conduct public opinion surveys, and the same number used their time and influence to help promote the proposed policy to decision makers, either through direct contact with individuals or by attending and speaking at meetings. Twenty percent of the coalitions were also mentioned in FERs as acting as key informants and another 20% took part in some kind of coalition development activity.

Table 3. Involvement of local tobacco control coalitions in 2.2.16 objective projects.
(Shaded areas depict successful projects.)

County/City	Coalition Activities				
	Planning	Polls/Litter/ Observations	Presentations/ Lobbying	Key Informants	Development *
Del Norte ¹					
El Dorado ²	x				
Humboldt	x		x	x	
Lake	x	Observations of smoking/litter	x		
Long Beach (city) ¹					
Los Angeles ³	x		x	x	x
Marin				x	x
Monterey		Observations of smoking			
Nevada ¹					
Orange	x	Beach and park cleanups/polls	x		
Pasadena (city)	x	Intercept surveys			
Riverside ⁴					x
Sacramento	x				
San Diego ⁵ (2 FERs)	x				x
San Luis Obispo	x				
San Mateo	x				
Santa Cruz (2 FERs)	x	Observations of smoking/litter	x	x	
Solano	x	Park cleanups			
Stanislaus	x		x		
Yuba	x				
TOTALS: 20 LLAs	14	6	6	4	4

*Coalition development includes such endeavors as intensive training of coalition members, efforts to understand how to engage more coalition members in community activism, and attempts to understand and resolve issues that concern coalition members.

¹Coalition not mentioned.

²The El Dorado FER commended their coalition for forming a secondhand smoke subcommittee which provided education and technical assistance in this area.

³The Los Angeles County LLA used both countywide and city-specific coalitions to pursue and track local objectives.

⁴The Riverside County LLA asked its coalition to complete a satisfaction survey and indicate how the coalition could be improved. The results, while interesting, aren't immediately applicable in the context of this report.

⁵The San Diego County FER on community events noted the coalition activities indicated; the FER on community colleges mentioned some of the same organizations without actually dubbing it coalition activity, making it difficult to be certain whether either or both projects did in fact involve coalition members per se.

Using volunteers, especially young people. Engaging young volunteers was a feature of 12 LLAs' agendas and was actively employed by 10 of them (for a total of 12 projects), as detailed in Table 4. Several FERs identified young volunteers and youth coalitions as essential to their work with policy makers, which was a feature in at least nine interventions.

- For example, it was the youth component of El Dorado’s YAK-SO (Youth and Adults Kicking Smoking Out) which was credited with sustaining momentum in working with their targeted ski resort, particularly after weather curtailed their efforts twice in succession.
- The Nevada County FER declared, “Project staff showed great political acumen in collecting data and having youth present the data to the City Councils. They operated on the assumption that it would be difficult for public officials and role models to refuse to act in what was demonstrated to be clearly in the best interest of both youth and the public at large.”
- In one of San Diego’s projects, “[y]outh volunteers created media excitement around the project and were instrumental in garnering the support of the Youth Commission and the Community Services Commission in favor of the policy.”
- By contrast, the Humboldt County FER mentioned “the involvement of the youth in making presentations to the board” among the three *barriers* to the policy adoption without explaining why this should be the case.

Table 4. Youth roles described in the FERs reporting on Objective 2.2.16 activities.
 Those interventions which organized *youth coalitions* as opposed to enlisting youth volunteers on a more short-term basis are noted. (Shaded areas depict successful projects.)

County/City	YOUTH ROLES					
	Planning	Developing material	Collecting litter/Making observations	Conducting surveys	Making presentations	More
Del Norte (Youth coalition)		Youth made video of kids requesting smoke-free fair			Youth coalition went before Fair Board	
El Dorado (Youth/adult coalition)				Youth staffed booths, did surveys	Coalition made numerous presentations	Helped provide technical assistance in policy enactment
Humboldt					Future Farmers of America made 2 presentations	Wrote letters to local papers re: smoke-free venues
Lake*						
Long Beach (city)**						
Los Angeles**						
Marin**						
Monterey**						
Nevada				“Youth advocates” helped survey	Youth presented to at least 1 city council	
Orange						Trained in how to write to elected officials
Pasadena (city)**						
Riverside**						
Sacramento**						
San Diego #1: Community events/parks			High school students did cleanups/polls		Youth volunteers “created media excitement”	Students conducted a letter-writing campaign

County/City	YOUTH ROLES					
	Planning	Developing material	Collecting litter/Making observations	Conducting surveys	Making presentations	More
San Diego #2: Community colleges	Students involved in Midwest Strategy Chart and CYAN activities	Students assisted with 2 PowerPoint presentations	Students collected litter	Students did surveys	Student leaders met with officials	Students gave media interviews, wrote letters of support, collected petitions for ballot
San Luis Obispo (project adopted by 2 city youth coalitions)					2 groups of youth worked with 2 city councils	
San Mateo PYC (2 youth coalitions) JUHSD	Planned project	Created educational packet & policy	Collected litter	Conducted surveys	Presented to event board & community	Collected letters of endorsement
	Created timeline	Created presentation & educ. packet			Presented to event board & community	
Santa Cruz #1** Tourist destinations						
Santa Cruz #2** LGBT festival/parade						
Solano			4-H youth clubs collected litter		Youth volunteers trained to talk to county board	
Stanislaus (Youth coalition)			Youth did observations	Youth surveyed attendees		
Yuba* (Youth coalition)						
Totals: 22 FERs	3	4	5	5	9	6

*FER mentions plans for the youth coalition to undertake "various activities" but doesn't describe any activity associated with this objective.

**No mention of youth involvement.

Training volunteers. LLAs invested varying amounts of time and effort into training their volunteers, depending upon the kinds of tasks they had in mind for them. Youth and adults volunteering to collect tobacco litter and observe smoking behavior needed only a short training period (half an hour sufficed for an effective San Diego clean-up with student volunteers) to learn the purpose of the exercise and how to use the forms and collection material. Volunteers who were conducting public opinion polls seemed to get a similar kind of practical training.

To prepare volunteers, particularly youth volunteers, to play a larger role in changing community smoking policies, several FERs described a much more intensive process.

- The El Dorado County LLA held several trainings to give their youth coalition members a good grounding in public speaking, policy writing and enactment, and local and state laws. "The trainings,"

the FER said, “were very helpful in helping the youth feel comfortable and confident when presenting to administrators and board members.”

- San Diego County contractors worked with the California Youth Advocacy Network (CYAN) to train student volunteers at all seven targeted college campuses: “Access to materials, teleconferences, and student advocate training resources available from CYAN was essential to our efforts.”
- The San Mateo County LLA and coalition set the gold standard for community trainings that produced dedicated cadres of youth. Using an adaptation of the Midwest Academy Strategy Chart, the Youth Leadership Institute worked with local CBOs and other coalition members to map out overall strategies for each of the designated projects. Then they conducted several in-depth trainings after the Pilipino Youth Coalition had coalesced to address one event and the Tobacco Peer Educators had convened to work on another event. Subsequently, the youth groups took on every activity in the plan, collecting litter and conducting polls, developing educational packets and PowerPoint presentations, working with the media, obtaining letters of support, helping develop a model policy, meeting with event boards, making presentations to community groups, even meeting with police. Ultimately both groups were successful in convincing their respective targets, the Fil-Am Friendship Festival and the Pacifica Fog Festival, to enact strong non-smoking policies.

Finding a well-placed champion and/or allies. For the purposes of this report, a *champion* is an individual who is a member of, or is respected by, the targeted body of decision makers and is dedicated to securing the passage of the proposed policy. *Allies* are individuals or groups which agree with and support the LLA’s efforts with their presence, advice, information, and/or financial aid.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of a local champion to the LLA’s effort, and this set of FERs was filled with examples. Champions can be prominent community members, one of the decision makers, or any locally known and respected individual with whom the LLA can forge a connection. Locating a champion can be serendipitous but is typically the result of careful cultivation.

- “The most critical elements of the intervention that contributed to its success were the people involved and their relationships,” the Solano County FER declared. It went on to describe how vital the influence these individuals brought to bear was to the success of the campaign—and, subsequently, how ruinous the loss of their primary champion was to getting the policy passed and enacted before the project timed out.
- San Diego County contractors working to convince seven local colleges to go smoke-free enlisted student activists on every campus. In at least two cases, students with impaired respiratory health contacted the administration to protest the prevalence of secondhand smoke on campus, and the FER summarized the experience by saying: “Developing, training, and maintaining relationships with District or campus community ‘champions’ was key to the success of our campus policy change campaigns.”
- The Humboldt County FER said, “All the [key informant] respondents cited the involvement of the concerned citizen from Blue Lake as the most successful and important element of the intervention.”
- San Luis Obispo County’s FER declared, “The most crucial component of a successful smoke-free beach/pier policy effort has proven to be a strong champion.”
- In Marin County, “[t]he key to the success of the Implementation Plan was two Board of Supervisors members who co-facilitated Inter-Departmental Implementation Committee meetings,” without which “department heads would never attend,” let alone undergo the planning entailed in working out the details of enforcement and other implementation particulars.

As used here, *allies* can be local individuals and groups, such as park rangers, people in local Parks and Recreation or Maintenance Departments, and CBOs with similar anti-tobacco agendas; or representatives of national organizations dedicated to curtailing tobacco use, such as the American Lung Association, the American Cancer Society, and the state’s Tobacco Control Program. Allies may or may not take an active part in assisting with the passage of a non-smoking policy. Quietly supportive allies might be described as follows:

- The Santa Cruz Parks and Recreation Department staff took on the challenge of convincing the Parks and Recreation Commission to support the effort to prohibit tobacco use on Santa Cruz city beaches. They met with and soothed anxious business representatives and produced a comprehensive report (with LLA help) that resulted in a strongly positive recommendation from the Commission to the city council, which led to policy adoption.
- The new CEO of the El Dorado County Fair was "...supportive of protecting families from secondhand smoke..." and could be considered an ally.
- So could the Del Norte Fair Executive Director, described as "someone who supported the concept of a smoke-free fair" and who was thus "...key to developing the good working relationships with the Fair..." This was a courageous stance to take in a county where the prevailing attitude was summed up by a sarcastic comment made by another fair board member: "Why don't we just make the whole Fair smoke-free and if anyone is smoking we'll just take 'em out in the parking lot and shoot 'em?"

More active allies will stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the LLAs on occasion.

- The Estero Bay Youth Task Force and the South County Youth Coalition described in the San Luis Obispo County FER stepped up and adopted no-smoking policies as their own projects. Both of the policies that those youth groups helped promote were passed by their respective city councils.
- The project coordinator for the youth group from the Jefferson Union High School District (JUHS), one of the San Mateo County LLA's contractors, said that the police chief became an ally in the effort to make the Pacifica Fog Festival smoke-free because his daughter was involved in a related project: "That helped the chief get on board with the policy."
- The San Diego County contractor working with community colleges found a similar opportunity at one campus: "Allies included members of the Associated Students leadership team, including the Vice President. With a daughter in campus daycare, he was particularly concerned with secondhand smoke around the Child Care Center."

Making financial contributions

The boards and organizers of county and community events often struggle to finance their productions and will give special consideration to potential sponsors. Offering significant support to an event gives an LLA considerable influence over the policies adopted by the event's organizers.

- The Del Norte County FER described the LLA's delicate negotiations with the Del Norte County Fair board, a group of businessmen with conservative views on personal freedoms and legitimate concerns about turning away some of their patrons who routinely used tobacco products. Gradually, over the three-year period, the LLA was able to gain ground in increasing the number of days and areas that were designated as smoke-free. The LLA invested about \$7,000 annually in sponsoring the fair, plus an additional \$5,000-\$7,000 over the four day event for games, prizes and educational incentive items. The FER reported, "While not inexpensive, the sponsorship provided by TUPP to the Fair has been the critical element in moving this intervention forward."
- In Santa Cruz County, an event that appeals to a group demographically likely to include smokers—the LBGT community—looked more favorably upon adopting a non-smoking policy when the LLA became a "Gold Sponsor" of the parade and festival.
- As hard as the Yuba County LLA worked to convince the organizers of 13 outdoor events to ban or restrict tobacco for health and safety reasons, they had to admit that money was the most persuasive argument they offered. The FER declares, "Event sponsorship remains the most important method of accomplishing this goal...either through direct contracts or through paying for table space for tobacco education."

Sponsorship also affords a practical approach toward combating the invasive efforts of the tobacco industry, ever poised to fund an event for the opportunity to recruit new customers and retain old ones. In an effort to combat this constant threat, the San Diego County LLA made sponsorship part of its effort to convince organizers of community events to make the health of their patrons a top priority. The FER noted, "As an incentive to community event organizers to reject tobacco company sponsorship, the

project sponsored the event and paid sponsorship fees of \$1,000 at the Bi-national HIV/AIDS Conference, BonitaFest, and the U.S. Open Sandcastle Competition.”

Several FERs made it clear that the LLAs shared the cost (or bore the whole cost) of signs and banners for the various venues, a contribution gratefully received by local officials and event coordinators alike. The Monterey LLA not only bought but actually placed signs in the areas designated as tobacco-free. One of the San Diego County CBO contractors worked with the LLA to provide “Smoke-free Event” banners at no cost to the two events that were curtailing tobacco use for the first time in their history.

Most LLAs built incentives into their campaign plans as rewards to be offered to participants, volunteers, and agencies. These ranged from attractive trinkets and gadgets to t-shirts and caps emblazoned with the campaign’s slogan to movie tickets and gift cards. Volunteers typically received apparel, gift cards in varying denominations, and movie vouchers. Small items were distributed to event attendees who dropped by information booths and offered to respondents who agreed to answer survey questions at beaches, parks, malls, and other venues.

- The practice of distributing these items prompted one parade-goer in Santa Cruz to observe, “It occurred to me that those visible giveaway items may have helped non-smokers feel less isolated and more willing to confront smokers than they otherwise would have been.”
- The Sacramento LLA went a step beyond mass-produced items to design certificates and present them to “organizations that adopted either sponsorship or smoke-free event policies.”

Conducting research and compiling educational material

Research efforts. Some LLAs limited their preliminary research to tapping into information offered through such sources as the Tobacco Education Clearinghouse of California (TECC) and the California Smoke-free Bars, Workplaces and Communities Program (BREATH). Others conducted their own research, combing through local, state, and national media for data they could use, contacting other jurisdictions to learn about their experiences in establishing no-smoking policies, gathering information about applicable state laws and local ordinances, and collecting anti-tobacco literature and statistics from agencies such as California’s Clean Air Program, the American Cancer Society, and the American Lung Association. As an example of this work, the San Diego County FER on making community events smoke-free went to “...TECC, BREATH, TALC, and ethnic networks for effective materials that could be used with smoke-free community event and sponsorship issue.”

In addition, most LLAs made an effort to learn about the decision makers that they would be working to convince, studying especially their points of view and voting records on similar policies.

- The Riverside County LLA used city council records “...to identify council member concerns or the voting record. Concerns were addressed by adjusting the intervention activities and try[ing] to improve communication with the council members who oppose the policy.”
- Some LLAs went even farther to gain an understanding of their targeted city council members, county supervisors, and event coordinators. The Los Angeles County contractors ...constructed biographical sketches of elected officials and other key decision makers including family information, past/current jobs, hobbies, affiliations, allies, term information, etc. The collected information was summarized in a “decision maker matrix” for each target community, categorizing elected officials as a smoke-free outdoor areas campaign “supporter,” “opposition,” or “undecided.”

LLAs targeting local events have an extra issue to research. The tobacco industry has historically contributed money and products to local events such as county fairs, and some fair boards were reluctant to abandon this reliable source of support. Several LLAs found themselves competing with the industry’s deep pockets when they tried to convince event organizers to introduce no-smoking restrictions. After spending considerable time trying to convince one event’s board to go smoke-free only to find them

committed to the industry sponsors, Pasadena's FER said that the LLA should have researched event sponsorship and spoken frankly with event decision makers at the outset.

Educational materials. Information packets were a standard adjunct to presentations and also served as handouts at information booths and other venues. The contents varied but most FERs referred to the fact sheets the LLAs had developed and some included them as appendices. Typically printed on both sides of a single page, all provided health statistics about secondhand smoke; some also included a summary of local responses to surveys, a history of local tobacco control work, facts about other jurisdictions that had adopted no-smoking policies, and/or a suggested tobacco control policy for the targeted venue.

- The Los Angeles County LLA and its contractors developed a "Decision Maker" kit that presented information specifically tailored to the city councils being addressed, featuring the results of local polls, summaries of the negative effects of outdoor tobacco use, and statistical information provided by TCP and other statewide partners.
- The El Dorado County LLA prepared one handout each for attendees of the El Dorado County Fair and for employees and patrons of the Sierra-at-Tahoe ski resort, announcing the "Outdoor Smoke-Free Policy," explaining which areas were designated as smoke-free, and outlining compliance measures in a very respectful but definite tone.
- San Mateo County's active youth coalitions devised their own sales pieces, identifying themselves and asking recipients to join them: "Our vision is to unite with all anti-smokers in creating a smoke-free environment. Support and join us in our battle against tobacco."
- The Stanislaus County LLA developed an informational flier that youth volunteers distributed while they conducted an observational survey at the newly smoke-free Costa Fields Baseball Park.

Gathering local data

Most of the FERs made it clear that the direct information the LLAs, their contractors, coalitions, and volunteers gathered about the targeted area or event was among the most valuable strategic tools in demonstrating the need for outdoor no-smoking policies. The results of litter collection, observations of smokers, and public opinion surveys seemed to have an immediacy and striking relevance to decision makers that no other tactic could equal.

Tobacco litter collection. Cleaning up beaches and parks and gathering cigarette butts at events was typically an LLA- or contractor-guided volunteer activity. (An extreme example: One of the San Diego County contractors offered a cash prize of \$200 to the student at the Palomar Community College who collected the most cigarette butts. This was so effective that 30 volunteers collected over 22,000 butts in two hours.) In addition to giving an objective measure by which to assess pre- and post-policy conditions, the collected litter itself could be turned into a very effective display to underscore the need for tobacco control, especially on beaches.

- The San Mateo County Pilipino Youth Coalition used sparkling glass jars filled with grubby cigarette butts for dramatic effect when making their presentations to the Fil-Am Friendship Festival board of directors and coordinating committee.
- The Los Angeles County LLA elevated litter collection to the status of one of their four most important campaign strategies: "...the strength of tobacco litter clean-up results as a tactic to garner support for the issue..."

Public opinion surveys. Prior to launching their work with decision makers, most LLAs set out to capture information about the public's opinions at the events and in the locations they targeted for intervention. They had several purposes for these activities:

- to establish baselines for later comparison
- to determine how much tobacco litter and smoking there actually was
- to gauge the public's will to enact no-smoking policies
- to collect evidence for strategic use in making presentations to policy makers, reminding them that these are the people who are adding to their gate receipts and keeping them in office

Surveys were conducted in person at events, in parks and on beaches, and also by telephone, sometimes—as in the case of the City of Long Beach and Los Angeles County LLAs—through random digital population-based computerized sampling. (The latter effort covered the largest samples: 502 from the City of Long Beach and 1020 from Los Angeles County.) In most cases, convenience samples were used for in-person surveys: beach-goers, fair attendees, and so on. A departure from this norm was the Nevada County LLA and their youth advocates, who selected three groups of people in Nevada City to talk to about making Calanan Park smoke-free: city retailers, the business owners immediately adjacent to the park, and the high school students who frequented the park.

However they were collected, the impact of the opinions from fairgoers, beach walkers, park users, and students upon decision makers was considerable. It is a useful fact, as demonstrated in Table 5, that “the public” is invariably in favor of tobacco control, even in the most politically conservative areas—and tends to be overwhelmingly so when asked to consider the health of children and establishing proper role models for them. To take further control of the process with intent to enhance the outcome, the Orange County FER articulated the strategy of placing survey questions in the order most likely to elicit strongly positive responses:

If people were asked if cigarette litter was a problem prior to the question “Would you support a smoke-free park/beach law?”, the percentage of support was much higher because the respondent had a reason to support the smoke-free venue. Without that anchor of litter, people were more apt to think of government infringement (banning smoking) rather than the problems of tobacco usage in recreational areas and their impact on the environment and health.

Table 5. Results of public opinion surveys conducted *prior to* scheduled interventions.

PLEASE NOTE that the percentages in the final row are for comparison purposes only and are NOT being presented as scientifically accurate. (Shaded areas depict successful projects.)

County/City	General Concerns			Project-specific Responses		
	Tobacco litter	Secondhand smoke	Impact of smoking on youth	Should event/area be smoke-free?	Should event/area have smoke-free zones?	At least as likely to go to smoke-free event/area?
Del Norte ¹			87% of 203	79% of 203		
El Dorado (two projects)		93% of 228		46% of 868 62% of 228	74% of 868 75% of 228	
Humboldt				76% of 351	62% of 351	
Lake ²						
Long Beach (city)		78% of 491		69% of 694		
Los Angeles ³ (parks/beaches)	70% of 3,124 88% of 1,345	95% of 3,124 93% of 1,345	97% ⁴	84% of 3,124 77% of 1,345	96% of 1,345	
Marin		87% of 252		72% of 252		
Monterey ⁵						
Nevada (retailers/students)	97% of 136	74% of 136		59% of 94 85% of 136		63% of 136
Orange	91% of 223			85% of 223		
Pasadena (city) ⁶		88% of 105		59% of 105	26% of 105	51% of 105
Riverside ⁷				67% of 31 88% of 8		
Sacramento ⁸						
San Diego #1: Community events/parks	75% of 246	66% of 246		98% of 246		

County/City	General Concerns			Project-specific Responses		
	Tobacco litter	Secondhand smoke	Impact of smoking on youth	Should event/area be smoke-free?	Should event/area have smoke-free zones?	At least as likely to go to smoke-free event/area?
San Diego #2: Community colleges	64% of 676			60% of 676	59% of 676	
San Luis Obispo				62% of 240	61% of 240	97% or 240
San Mateo (two projects)		91% of 179		52% of 179 91% of 181	69% of 179 87% of 173	94% of 187
Santa Cruz #1⁸ Tourist destinations						
Santa Cruz #2⁸ LGBT festival/parade						
Solano⁸						
Stanislaus⁹				99% of 74		
Yuba				84% of 324		53% of 324
Totals: 22 FERs*	81%	85%	92%	74%	68%/73%	72%

*Because the projects, the populations, the number of individuals polled, the way surveys were administered and by whom, and the content and wording and order and number of the questions themselves all differed radically from one LLA to another, these totals are provided just to demonstrate the general positive outcome of public opinion polls. (The "smoke-free areas" column shows results with and without Pasadena's anomalous figure.)

¹A question about cigarette litter was on the survey form attached to the FER but the public response was not provided.

²Although the FER reported the results of public intercept surveys (n=100), the questions asked were not applicable to Objective 2.2.16.

³The number of public intercept surveys completed during the 2004-2007 period in Los Angeles County was 3,124 at parks and 1,345 at beaches for a total of 4,469. The FER doesn't break these down into pre- and post-intervention polls.

⁴This figure came from responses to the 2005 Los Angeles County Health Survey about the impact of secondhand smoke on children and babies. The FER didn't provide the number of respondents to that survey.

⁵The Monterey County LLA, coalition members, and community volunteers did "observational surveys" only.

⁶The Pasadena survey asked respondents to choose among five concerns, the top two of which were "Breathing secondhand smoke" and "Smoking near children."

⁷The Riverside County FER mentioned several opinion polls but provided no results. Instead, results of interviews with 31 "opinion leaders" and eight key informants were tabulated and are presented here.

⁸The Sacramento County FER, both Santa Cruz County FERs, and the Solano County FER made no mention of public opinion polls.

⁹The Stanislaus County project went through so fast that schedule pre-policy surveys never took place; the figure shown is the only post-policy percentage in the table.

Smoking observations. A few LLAs and their contractors observed smoking behavior at parks, beaches and events, and on college campuses prior to interventions to gauge the extent of the problem and to accumulate ammunition before going before decision makers. For instance, the Riverside LLA, at the beginning of their intervention, observed and logged smoking behavior in 37 parks, and noted smokers in 29 of them.

More often, observations were conducted after policy adoption to determine compliance with new regulations.

Key informant interviews. Many LLAs interviewed key informants early in their projects to:

- find out where officials stood on tobacco control issues
- learn about the local costs associated with cleaning up tobacco litter and enforcing existing ordinances
- make initial educational and trust-building contacts with individuals of importance in the community
- learn what well-informed members of their own coalition advise

The number of key informants described in FERs varied widely, from three individuals in Marin County to 90 in one of the San Diego County's projects (plus 18 focus groups). The local definition of who qualified as a key informant varied also, depending upon the reason for the choice. Some LLAs included their coalition members in these interviews.

The Lake and Monterey County LLAs administered their key informant survey to event board members and event coordinators so that they could tailor their intervention around the common themes of barriers/challenges that emerged, a strategy that was mostly successful. Lake County key informants included community leaders and law enforcement professionals in addition to event personnel. The Riverside County FER divided the initial interviews into Opinion Leader and Key Informant surveys, asking the same questions of each group. The 31 Opinion Leaders—not described—were slightly less supportive of a smoke-free parks policy than the Key Informants, who were drawn from local Parks and Recreation departments (66.7% and 75%, respectively, said they “strongly” supported the policy). The policy was adopted in two of the three targeted cities.

Educating the community

The Los Angeles County FER said, “Media coverage and public education played a large role in the passage of smoke-free outdoor area policies in six of the eight cities targeted.” Information packets and the fact sheets described above [*Educational Materials*] were widely used in a variety of ways. For example, the Santa Cruz County LLA made sure that the new no-smoking policy “...was highly visible in all promotional materials, interviews, and signs.”

The effectiveness of persistent community education was expressed nicely in the Del Norte County FER. Reporting that years of effort were gradually winning community acceptance of more smoke-free days and areas at the annual county fair, the LLA said: “As an example, one smoker who completed a community opinion poll said, when asked if they would support more smoke-free days at the Fair, ‘Isn’t it already smoke-free?’”

Media. This vital component of community education is discussed in a separate section below.

Information booths. Those LLAs which targeted fairs and festivals often set up booths and tables in prominent locations where they offered interested members of the public small incentives to stop and listen to the no-smoking message and, frequently, to take part in public opinion polls and surveys. Del Norte and Monterey Counties captured event-goers’ attention by distributing inexpensive but eye-catching promotional items.

Signage often serves as the main interface with the public over time, and those LLAs who followed up after signs were erected noted that the design, number, and placement of signs is critical to public compliance with no-smoking regulations. Some of the patrons of the Sierra-at-Tahoe ski resort told El Dorado County surveyors that they would actually like to see more signs to instruct them where smoking was allowed and prohibited. Contrast this with the remark made by a Parks and Recreation commissioner in Solano County that he did not “...want the parks littered with signs stating where people could and could not smoke.”

LLAs and their contractors frequently designed the signs and determined what they said. The signs that the Monterey County LLA provided to events which signed voluntary policies read: “THIS IS A FAMILY FRIENDLY SMOKE-FREE EVENT.” Other LLAs purchased banners and signs through TECC, the Tobacco Education Clearinghouse of California. At least one LLA used billboards in addition to regulatory signs to publicize their new policy. The Stanislaus County FER reported that LLA staff “produced and maintained a billboard promoting the tobacco free status of the baseball complex which was placed on location at Costa Field.”

Presentations. Several FERs described efforts to inform local groups and community organizations about the need for stronger restrictions on outdoor tobacco use. A further motivation—in addition to the educational aspects of the presentation—was often to look for volunteers and to request support in helping to convince local decision makers that the community was in favor of the proposed policy change through such activities as writing letters, attending meetings, and adopting the project as part of their own agenda.

- The Solano County LLA recruited and trained youth and adult volunteers to make a series of presentations at such organizations as the local 4-H Leadership Council, the Solano Asthma Coalition, and the local chapter of the American Cancer Society. This effort won them a new set of youth volunteers from the 4-H and an active member of their working committee from the Asthma Coalition, plus their first letters of support.
- Both of the San Mateo County youth coalitions developed presentation materials and reached out to a variety of community groups, requesting letters of endorsement in some cases. One of the coalitions conducted two presentations to the Pacifica police department to ask for their support and the other coalition made presentations to at least eight community and health care groups.
- At least one LLA contrived to liven up their presentations with some entertainment. In addition to the presentations they made to four local agencies, the City of Pasadena arranged to have the Pasadena Cigarette Stompers—a youth coalition dedicated to keeping Pasadena youth “from growing up and becoming cigarette smokers”—perform at five events on their behalf.

Public events. Some LLAs made a point of joining environmentally-oriented or anti-smoking events already observed within their intervention areas in order to raise public awareness of the need for tobacco control and to share in media coverage.

- The San Diego County contractors working with community colleges were conspicuously present with handouts and incentives during such campus events as Earth Day and the Great American Smoke-Out. When Mesa College adopted its no-smoking policy, the campus advocacy group startlingly named the Smoking Investigation Committee “...created a campus Smoke-free Awareness Day...to kick off the new policy on the first day of the spring semester.”
- The San Mateo County LLA co-sponsored a Coastal Clean-up Day on several San Mateo beaches, in part to assess from public response whether the projects they were considering were likely to meet with widespread support.

Community celebrations. Several LLAs held general celebrations after tobacco control measures were adopted to thank the decision makers for their concern for the public welfare, to acknowledge the hard work of their volunteers, and to publicize the new policy. Typically, the public and the media were invited to join in.

- The Stanislaus County LLA held a communitywide event at the Costa Fields Baseball Park in May of 2005. Although the professional athletes they invited were unable to attend, the team mascots of the San Francisco Giants and the Modesto Nuts joined the celebration. The FER reports that “[p]romotional items imprinted with the slogan ‘Tobacco Strikes Out’ were distributed to the public during this event.”
- The Solano County LLA transformed a county meeting room with pine cuttings and picnic blankets to celebrate the adoption of an amendment to add smoking regulations to the parks section of the County Code. Calling the theme party “A Day in the Park,” they held games and served refreshments to a small friendly crowd. The event was noted by the local press.

Websites. This method of interfacing with the community is either under-used or under-reported. The Marin County FER noted that the website LLA staff created (www.smokefreemarin.com) “turned out to be a very effective public information tool to create awareness and widespread compliance,” and also gave the public a simplified way to file complaints when they encountered infractions of the new smoking law. Over the four months after Marin County’s no-smoking ordinance was adopted, the site received almost 33,000 hits.

Interfacing with Media

Nearly all of the FERs described their efforts to work with local media to help inform the community of the need for tobacco control, to build local support for their project and its goals, and to place some positive pressure on decision makers at the same time. The FER describing San Diego County's effort to make community colleges smoke-free said, "Media coverage of public opinion polls helped to gain the attention and support of administration officials." The San Diego County contractors went all out, placing some 27 print ads in college and local papers, holding five "media events" covered by local TV stations, issuing a total of seven press releases, getting two health columns published in non-college papers, and holding a radio interview in Spanish.

At least one LLA engaged a consultant to provide various media support services, although the experience was not a complete success. The San Mateo County FER candidly described a situation in which the coalition's media advisory committee hampered the efforts of their consultant by being unable to decide where those efforts should be focused. After 18 months of discussion, the media campaign which emerged included three items: thank you ads in newspapers, targeted letters to key decision makers, and banners.

Several LLAs cited media reports about tobacco control work being done elsewhere in their county and in the state as being of significant value to their local effort by helping to create an atmosphere that may have worked in their favor.

- The Marin County LLA tracked the growing coverage of tobacco-related issues in local media throughout the program funding cycle and speculated that it reflected increased public awareness, leading to support and compliance.
- The San Diego County LLA also found that "Ongoing media coverage in support of smoke-free parks and beaches kept secondhand smoke issues on the public agenda during the last half of the project. We believe that this media coverage...supported our efforts."
- The Orange and Los Angeles County FERs suggested that their cause might have been helped along by publicity attending the rash of fires that swept through southern California, prompting at least two cities to pass emergency ordinances prohibiting smoking in open areas and canyons.

Some LLAs worked primarily with their local newspapers and others sought public attention through radio and television as well, often depending in part on location—urban settings offer many more media opportunities—and budget.

Newspapers. Every county, however rural, had access to newspapers. FERs that discussed their media efforts in any detail invariably noted that they communicated with local newspapers as a means of publicizing their goals and successes. Typically, the positive results of public opinion polls formed an important part of the conversation, article, press release, op-ed column, or letters to the editor, together with statistics on the impact of tobacco use on public health and the environment. For example, the Lake County LLA provided "...press releases about the results of the public opinion survey and the risks of secondhand smoke." The Humboldt County LLA contributed two op-ed pieces to the local paper and felt that those attracted considerable public attention.

Successful interventions provided natural material for enthusiastic press releases. Like many other LLAs and contractors, the Los Angeles County contractors made sure that local newspapers were informed every time one of the cities in their work area adopted a smoke-free outdoor area policy. The Sacramento County LLA used the same opportunity to publicize each event that went smoke-free. In addition to its other media work, the San Diego County contractors working with community colleges arranged a flamboyant media event through the American Lung Association to recognize the Mesa College President for adopting a new smoke-free policy at his college.

Another approach that FERs reported was taking out an ad in the local paper to announce that an event or locale would be smoke-free and to thank the public-spirited decision makers for passing such an excellent policy. The San Diego County contractors involved with community colleges led the field with their 26 print ads in five college newspapers to educate students, faculty, staff, and administrators about secondhand smoke.

Not every print media experience was positive. The Solano County FER reported an incident where press coverage of the project to make the county's parks smoke-free had a decidedly negative effect on the campaign. After conducting a low-key media effort with a couple of press releases describing the project and getting some letters of support published, the LLA representative was sharply criticized by one supervisor in a 2006 meeting of the county board: "He characterized this press release and letters of support from community groups as 'a move to get support' and 'prejudging what the Board would do.'" Ascertaining from subsequent remarks this individual made (calling the request for park-wide smoking restrictions "unnecessary, unprecedented, overreaching, and unenforceable," among other things), he was seriously offended. The LLA representative was supported by other supervisors and county staff but remained gun-shy about seeking publicity for the duration of the project.

Broadcast media. Only a few LLAs mentioned obtaining radio and television coverage of their outdoor smoking control efforts, whether by buying time for public service ads or by doing something interesting enough to capture the attention of a TV crew. Some of the San Diego County contractors' college-related press releases and media events generated attention from at least three local television stations, and contractor staff participated in a Spanish-language radio interview.

WORKING WITH DECISION MAKERS

In this set of FERs, decision makers were typically local government officials—the city council, the county board of supervisors, the heads of city or county departments—or the boards and coordinators of the targeted events. In addition, contractors for the San Diego County LLA worked with local college officials at several levels and the El Dorado County LLA worked with the Director of Human Resources at the Sierra-at-Tahoe Ski Resort. Prohibited by county policy from contacting public officials directly, the Orange County LLA worked through its coalition members to interface with decision makers and to coordinate the technical assistance component.

Understanding the political climate

Several FERs noted the importance of recognizing and respecting the political climate which shaped the thinking of the group of decision makers they were addressing. LLAs in the rural counties needed to work with local officials who tended to be conservative in nature, concerned about individual rights and touchy about the possibility that tobacco control might interfere with business interests.

- The Nevada County LLA encountered these attitudes when attempting to make one park smoke-free ("It sounds great...but it's taking away freedom.") but was able to show sufficient public support—even from nearby business owners—to allay the concerns of the city council involved.
- The Del Norte FER expressed sympathy for the somewhat skittish county fair board and their reservations about how a no-smoking policy would affect their business. The LLA elected to proceed "in baby steps" over the course of the three year project, expanding the smoke-free days from one to four and gradually increasing the number of areas where smoking was prohibited. They also contributed significantly to the support of the fair over this period through financial sponsorship, which gave them an edge in negotiating a favorable position. "Also important," according to the Del Norte FER, "is the strongly held community belief that the Fair should support a kid-friendly environment and that youth access to tobacco is a serious problem."
- The Yuba County LLA discovered that older teenagers and younger adults who responded to their public opinion survey would be less likely to attend smoke-free outdoor events. Based on these findings, the FER said, "Fair and festival organizers might have financial objections to creating

entirely smoke-free events. The young, childless adults who are the most strongly opposed to such policies are a valuable demographic to those who sell impulse items, such as festival vendors.”

- In Lake County, despite their conviction that they had considerable public support for their work, the LLA acknowledged that “...there is a small subset that includes what the community refers to as “die-hard” smokers, who believe that there should be a laissez faire attitude toward tobacco control.” That subset includes a large number of consumers who are likely to attend the targeted events, making them an important factor in Lake County’s economic equation.
- The contractors in San Diego County that worked with four community college districts correctly interpreted the academic mindset when they designed their campaign. Coalition members had already set the stage by assessing tobacco control policies at the county’s two- and four-year colleges and releasing the dismal results to the media. The FER described the psychology involved here: “Educators are inherently competitive ‘grade-grubbers’ and were extremely motivated to seek good grades for their campus in competition with other campuses. This was an effective motivational tool for working with educators.” A year later, college administrators were asked to rate their own colleges. The FER reported, “...asking campus leadership to gauge their own progress against a desirable standard paralleled the self-study approach commonly used by academic accrediting bodies. Such a process was one with which campus leaders were familiar and, thus, they were more willing to participate.”

This set of FERs made it clear that decision makers in the more affluent, more populous counties with longer histories of proactive tobacco control tended to be more receptive to well-mounted campaigns than did those in rural counties where tobacco use was more prevalent and still relatively acceptable. For example, the Santa Cruz County FER reporting upon efforts to impose non-smoking restrictions on all local beaches described a favorable political climate within the Santa Cruz City Council and the Parks and Recreation Department that resulted in unanimous approval of the ordinance. By contrast, the Del Norte LLA—although they have worked closely with their county fair board since the 1990s and have made significant incremental progress (in “baby steps,” as the FER put it)—must still negotiate the fair’s smoke-free status every year.

Another dichotomy developed around place-based and event-based interventions. With regard to beaches and parks, public officials and administrators proved to be accessible to approaches based upon tobacco use primarily as an environmental issue, especially in the form of tobacco litter. On the other hand when working with event organizers, it was more effective to frame the need for a policy in terms of the health issues associated with exposure to secondhand smoke where large numbers of people were in close proximity with one another.

- The Santa Cruz County LLA working on outdoor tourist destinations made the point very well: “While there are any number of good reasons to enact tobacco control policies, *the most important arguments will depend on the situation and the priorities of the decision makers.*” (Italics added.) Proving the truth of this statement, they went on to say that even proponents of making beaches smoke-free dismissed the health impacts of secondhand smoke as an issue and that “[o]nly the issue of beach litter was persuasive, with its environmental damage and cleanup cost.”
- Just as earnestly, the Humboldt County FER declared, “Emphasize the public health component of the issue when presenting the policy to decision makers.” Their primary focus was the county fair but they found that this advice worked for the city council they targeted also.
- In El Dorado County, where the LLA worked with both a physical location and an event, they noted that the environmental perspective prevailed at the Sierra-at-Tahoe Ski Resort while the health issue of secondhand smoke was more persuasive to the CEO of the El Dorado County Fair.

Concern for the welfare of children vis à vis tobacco use—their health and the effect on them of role model behavior—is a constant across the FERs in this set, transcending county characteristics. LLAs have used this fact to their advantage. Their very presence is an asset to most campaigns: In almost every case where FERs reported that young people were involved in making presentations directly to decision makers, the results were positive.

Approaching decision makers

The Humboldt County LLA offered a thoughtful set of suggestions for dealing with local decision makers for both event- and place-based interventions:

- Make an effort to understand the decision makers, to establish relationships with them, and to get to know their ways of operation before approaching them about the policy activities. Ask permission to be involved.
- Become educated on what it takes to draft an ordinance or create an event policy so that you can be flexible in giving them what they want. Offer resources in a non-threatening manner.
- Be available to respond to their concerns and offer solutions to problems without being overbearing. Use real examples. Be consistent, persistent, and patient.
- Remember that costs related to policy development, education, and implementation could be a major concern for decision makers. Offering free technical assistance, sample policies, signage, and education presentations are key components in gaining policy support.

The Monterey County FER added:

- "It is important to be flexible with the Boards of the local events as many of the members are volunteers."

Building on precedents and past successes

Decision makers are sometimes hesitant to be the first to take a stance that may have an adverse effect on some constituents, as tobacco control policies inevitably do. LLAs have found it helpful to comfort them with evidence of public acceptance for such policies, both from the jurisdiction's own history and from the actions of nearby communities. The Santa Cruz County FER focusing on outdoor tourist destinations found that "...local precedence has clearly been of great importance" and advises that "[l]ocal advocates will be more effective if they continue to link new tobacco control strategies to earlier successes."

Some counties have embraced tobacco control since the early 1990s, establishing a norm of acceptable public behavior. This is particularly true in the case of the coastal counties with their state, county, and city beaches. Several of the counties have been successful in extending local acceptance to parks, events taking place on private property, and even countywide.

- The Marin County FER described a history of tobacco prevention advocacy and public support that provided an excellent springboard for their appeal to the county board of supervisors to adopt a comprehensive tobacco control policy that filled in gaps left by previous outdoor smoking ordinances.
- Similarly, the Santa Cruz County LLA made good use of the example of the popular Santa Cruz Boardwalk's facility-wide ban on smoking, saying in the FER that "...the Boardwalk's overwhelmingly positive experience with the smoking ban was influential in winning over other representatives to support the ordinance in principle." They were able to exceed their goal to extend the ban to all county parks.

Local precedents can also be supported and further legitimized by examples from other jurisdictions. Again, the Santa Cruz County FER promoted this approach as effective in their intervention:

In every case, mention was made of other communities that had implemented similar ordinances and measures. This effect cannot be overstated: no local action would have been likely without the evidence of reasonableness afforded by precedent. The presence of pending state-level legislation provided a similar legitimacy to local control efforts.

Demonstrating support for the proposed policy

Presentations. All of the FERs mentioned conducting presentations to the decision makers who would determine whether or not a tobacco control policy would be adopted. These presentations could be made

at regularly scheduled city council or county board meetings with public access or by private appointment with event boards. Presentations were generally led by the LLA (in cities and counties where public employees were permitted to engage in political activity) or by contractor staff, and frequently involved the active support of coalitions members and adult and young community volunteers.

Some LLAs devised the most appealing presentations they could, sometimes relying strategically on earnest, well-prepared young people to carry the message before the decision making body. FERs often referred to PowerPoint presentations to which youth groups contributed and which they conducted, with such adjuncts as collections of cigarette butts as visual aids.

- The Del Norte County's Youth Coalition developed and presented "a video of kids talking at the local park about how they'd like the Fair to be tobacco-free. This initial pitch to create one smoke-free day...opened the door to the productive relations between [the LLA] and the Fair Board."
- One of San Mateo County's youth coalitions, serving as a contractor in the effort to make the Fil-Am Friendship Festival smoke-free, arrived at the event's board meeting with their PowerPoint presentation and an impressive collection of filthy tobacco trash in sparkling glass jars.

The Pasadena LLA found that obtaining introductions to event boards from other local event coordinators was helpful in gaining the confidence of those decision makers and getting them to look favorably on their proposals. The FER commented that "...it was easier to have voluntary policies adopted when they were referred to event organizers through other trusted sources such as collaborating partners."

Results of local polls/petitions/votes. The ability to show decision makers that their constituencies supported prohibiting or restricting outdoor tobacco use was pivotal in getting their attention and initiating the process of serious consideration. Every LLA and contractor which conducted public opinion polls prior to their presentation featured the results—and, as noted above, those results were always strongly in favor of smoking restrictions. Similarly effective were the results of the focus groups held by San Diego County contractors and the Del Norte County LLA's petition signed by over 1000 fairgoers. Petitions signed by students on San Diego County community college campuses were helpful in putting the tobacco policy on the ballot for their regular election and the ensuing vote showed strong support for a smoke-free campus.

Drafting experts in the field. In addition to providing local testimony, the Humboldt and Los Angeles County FERs mentioned that offering input from local chapters of respected national organizations—e.g., the American Cancer Society, the American Lung Association—helped to lend weight and credibility to their presentations.

Organizing letter-writing campaigns. Several FERs mentioned letters written in support of the effort to curb outdoor tobacco use as one of the tools used to good effect—again, to demonstrate local support. Whether the letters are written directly to individuals among the decision makers or to the local newspaper, they represent a significant effort on the part of the signatory that commands attention and respect.

- For this reason, the Orange and San Diego County interventions included training youth to write compelling letters to local officials. San Mateo County's Pilipino Youth Coalition also worked to obtain Letters of Endorsement from several respected organizations and managed to get at least five.
- The Humboldt County FER reported that letters to the local paper from community members were among the three aspects of their campaign that led to their success. Similarly, Solano County LLA staff's conviction that the letters of support received by the county board of supervisors were "...critical to the policy's adoption" was underscored by comments from two of the supervisors.
- Students, staff, and faculty at several campuses in San Diego County all wrote letters to college administrators supporting the LLA contractors' campaign to make those campuses smoke-free, which the FER found was essential in capturing those officials' attention.

Providing technical assistance

Most of the FERs which described technical assistance provided to decision makers concentrated on the issue of policy development. Many of the FERs acknowledged the assistance of the Technical Assistance Legal Center (TALC) in providing guidance for LLAs in creating and adapting policies to suit the specific circumstances of each intervention. Most FERs described levels of technical assistance for policy development ranging from offering decision makers sample policies for their consideration to taking on the entire job of preparing the policy for the decision-making body's acceptance. The efforts of most LLAs fell somewhere in between, and one FER—from San Luis Obispo County—included city council minutes in which city staff were directed to prepare the ordinance banning smoking themselves, with no reference to LLA assistance or involvement.

Technical assistance was sometimes requested in other areas as well, as the FER for the San Diego County project involved with smoke-free policies at community events reported. In their case, organization leaders and decision makers requested technical assistance in the following areas: "...legal, in order to craft sound and indisputable policies; educational, to design appropriate signage, organize community support, and media advocacy; and enforcement, to develop strategies to monitor compliance." The contractors provided about 300 hours of technical assistance to them in total.

Technical assistance was not always applied directly. Some LLAs, prohibited by their bureaucracies from working directly with public officials, provided technical assistance to their contractors to enable them to assist decision makers in policy development and adaptation. The Los Angeles County FER, in summarizing factors leading to its successes, commented on the importance of training the trainers: "Providing ongoing technical assistance and training to building capacity of tobacco control advocates to effectively organize and facilitate local policy campaigns is essential to ensure success of the local campaign."

Most decision makers seemed to accept assistance in policy development gratefully; in fact, the Humboldt County LLA found that the local city council considered "the free assistance from TALC in drafting the policy language a key factor in adopting the policy." It was sometimes an enormous and time-consuming endeavor for LLAs or their contractors. The San Diego County contractors working with community colleges provided 228 hours of technical assistance to seven college campus leadership groups, helping draft several smoking policies of varying levels of tobacco prohibition.

At the other end of the technical assistance spectrum was the Stanislaus County LLA's experience, where the Ceres City Council received a sample tobacco control policy for the Costa Fields Baseball Park on January 24, 2005, and adopted it verbatim on February 15, 2005.

"Walking the board"

Many LLAs made personal visits to members of decision-making boards, crediting this activity with winning over individuals who were undecided or against enacting no-smoking policies by being able to answer questions and quell concerns.

- The Solano County LLA relied heavily upon one-on-one discussions with members of the county board of supervisors, not only to gain their support but also to benefit from their advice on how best to approach—or not approach—certain other members of the board.
- As the Humboldt County FER said, "...it was important to get to know the decision makers and their ways of operation before approaching them about the policy activities. Offering resources in a non-threatening manner helped gain support for the issue."
- Sometimes the fact that an extra effort was required in this area is apparent only in hindsight. When the Orange County coalition exceeded its goal of converting ten outdoor recreational facilities to a smoke-free status, they decided to tackle the county board of supervisors to make county parks and beaches smoke-free as well. "It was the only proposal advanced by the Tobacco Use Prevention

Coalition (TUPC) that was not passed into law," the FER reported. TUPC did all its groundwork impeccably, preparing and distributing detailed information on all the beaches and assembling supporters among county departments to make a compelling show at the pivotal meeting. In the end, the vote was two for and two against, with one supervisor abstaining. The FER lamented, "...the Coalition should have addressed each of the Supervisors to educate them prior to the vote by 'walking the board.'"

CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS

Even the most successful campaigns and best-planned interventions encountered difficulties along the way. A selection of these is collected below.

Changes in management

A single election or the offer of a better job can sever relationships built over years of careful work by skillful LLAs, forcing them to start all over to develop new sympathetic partners in the tobacco control effort. Several FERs told stories about working hard to develop relationships with key people in local government, departments, and administrations, only to have the individuals move on before tobacco control policies could be adopted or augmented.

- The Marin County LLA found the change in political leadership during policy development in their county a disadvantage since "New decision makers were not as active...in promoting smoking policy updates."
- During the 2001-2004 contract period, the Director of Human Resources at the Sierra-at-Tahoe ski resort had agreed to partner with El Dorado County's YAK-SO coalition to begin implementing outdoor no-smoking in the 2004-2007 period. But when YAK-SO contacted the resort to map out the new strategy, this individual had departed, forcing them back into the time-consuming business of initiating a new contact at the resort.
- No LLA was hit harder by this phenomenon than the Solano County team members, who found themselves awash in a sea of administrative indecision as acting heads of at least two departments deflected vital decisions until a new chief was found and hired. At the celebration of their successful effort to make all of the City of Vacaville's parks smoke-free, the jubilant LLA was encouraged by three county supervisors to make Solano County parks their next target. Secure in their belief that they had a strong mandate and happy in finding a champion in the head of the Parks Division, the Solano County LLA watched their project founder when the composition of the board of supervisors changed radically and their champion moved on to another position. Although a general ordinance was eventually passed by the board of supervisors, determining the precise regulations for each of the three county parks was delegated to the Parks Division. Acting heads cycled through Parks, each deferring to the not-yet-chosen permanent chief. When at last a new Parks Services Manager was brought on board more than a year later, the LLA's issues were fairly low among the priorities he set, and the grant period ended before the regulations were addressed.

Changes in management can be beneficial on occasion, of course, when an opponent or disinterested individual leaves the decision-making group and is replaced by more positively-disposed newcomers. This sometimes occurs with elected officials, administrative departments, and event boards and offers new opportunities to the LLA or contractor hoping to promote a particular proposal. The San Diego County contractors encountered such a case at Miramar College, where they had encountered crippling resistance from the Associated Student Council President ("a smoker," they noted parenthetically). As the student body changed, the incoming AS President, already trained by the California Youth Advocacy Network (CYAN), arrived fully committed to leading the effort to make the Miramar campus smoke-free.

Enforcement

It's one thing to adopt a no-smoking policy and another thing entirely to enforce it, a distinction not lost upon decision makers. Many FERs reported that the issue of enforcement was raised as a key concern during conversations with city councils, county boards of supervisors, event boards and coordinators, and key informants, but few FERs explained how LLAs and contractors responded. The Marin County FER did report that the LLA's fact sheet offered the following response: "Minimal education takes the place of police enforcing these self-enforcing regulations. People generally comply when informed of the laws." One of the Santa Cruz FERs noted that the answer was contained in the policy itself: "Enforcement is described in detail, including signage and appropriate responses to policy violations."

According to the Nevada County FER, one of the most pervasive public concerns—as identified by key informants in Truckee and by survey respondents in Nevada City—centered upon the problem of "...enforcement and policing of a tobacco-free policy in the park." One respondent wrote, "Is this what we want our police spending their time on?" In general, FERs describing projects centered on parks and beaches found police to be reluctant to give enforcing non-smoking regulations much of a priority. There were exceptions: the San Diego County FER addressing community events noted that compliance with no-smoking regulations was "extraordinarily high" once the public was educated via signage and media coverage and added, "Law enforcement officials also aided in conducting community education by informing violators of the new law and potential fines, after which smokers were quick to comply."

At some locales, enforcing the restrictions were the responsibility of park or beach rangers. One of the Santa Cruz FERs found that staffing cutbacks on their targeted beaches seemed to have hampered enforcement there (and noted that increasing the number of park rangers had the opposite effect at the parks they had targeted):

Smoking is still easily observed among beachgoers. The absence of active enforcement may play a role. This may be supported by a comparison of the situation at the beach, where staff cutbacks reduced the ability to enforce the ordinance, with the parks, where additional staff were assigned with a mandate to enforce. In the latter case there appears to be very little smoking...

Enforcement at events is a tricky business; often these are held on private property and public servants, the police in particular, don't have jurisdiction there. The San Mateo County Pacifica Fog Festival project consulted the Technical Assistance Legal Center (TALC) on this point and were told that

...if Fog Fest has even the theoretical ability to exclude individuals from the event (e.g., patrons pay, or otherwise get permission to enter) then someone violating the Fog Fest policy can be considered a trespasser and the police can remove or arrest the trespasser....Hopefully, the reality of the situation will be that the police can simply inform any smoker that the event is smoke-free, and the person will comply, and enforcement won't be a real issue.

If private security personnel are already engaged, reminding smokers that smoking is either prohibited or restricted to designated areas can be one of their responsibilities, but parades and festivals operating on tight budgets rarely provide their own security. (An exception to this was the Santa Cruz LGBT parade and festival, about which the FER reported that "[t]he Diversity Center provided enforcement of the policy, including training for security personnel and volunteers to intervene effectively where individuals are smoking.") But, as a number of FERs pointed out, smokers were sometimes asked by fellow celebrants to put out their cigarettes, and often did so in good graces.

Some locales and events chose to regard the policy as self-enforcing once signs were in place. One organization working with the Sacramento County LLA expressed concern about enforcement, according to the FER, "...but understood that signage was critical for self-enforcement by community attendees." The El Dorado County FER agreed: "Posting of no-smoking signage is crucial to the success of self-compliance and enforcement."

In some cases, this worked well. Once the policy was in place, public-spirited citizens sometimes took on the role of enforcers. During one of the Santa Cruz County LLA's two projects—the annual Santa Cruz LGBT Pride March and Rally—“...volunteers assisted paid security staff in thoughtfully enforcing the smoking restrictions.” The experience in Orange County was that “locals,” aware of the no-smoking status of all the municipal beaches despite inadequate signage on at least two of them, were observed approaching smokers and warning them that smoking is illegal there. According to the FER, “Even with few postings, the fact that the ordinance is ‘on the books’ emboldens people to point out signs when needed.”

This public action was not apparent in Long Beach. Observers at Long Beach city beaches in 2007 found considerable evidence of ongoing smoking after the Smoke-free Beach ordinance was adopted in 2005 and attributed that in part to inadequate signage: too few signs, the print was too small, there were too many other messages on the signs. The Santa Cruz County FER concerning parks and beaches made the same observation:

Even though the beach signs are duly posted at each entrance, and even though the pictograph is clearly understood by the majority of people, it is likely that visitors do not take in the message. These signs are large, but they include so many pictographs that the impact of any one may be lost.

The rules were underscored by fines in at least two locations. Among the questions the Stanislaus County LLA asked their key informants were “Why do you think the Ceres City Council chose to impose a fine for violations of the policy? Do you support the fines?” The FER reported that the three respondents felt that “...the introduction of the smoking fine will not adversely affect the economic situation of the ballpark.”

“Bad for business”

Concern surfaced in a number of jurisdictions that the proposed policies regulating smoking would drive customers away. Anxiety about this potential problem appeared most often in counties where the local culture supported smoking, although even some cities and counties where smoking restrictions were somewhat commonplace had pockets of resistance based on the impact of outdoor non-smoking policies on tourists as well as on local patrons.

Both the Monterey County and San Mateo County LLAs found that some of the farmers’ market administrators in their counties worried about smoking restrictions being bad for business. Two of the three farmers’ markets that the Monterey County LLA approached chose not to restrict smoking while the third (at the Monterey Peninsula College) took a year to decide to adopt the policy. The San Mateo County LLA, with help from coalition partners, did eventually succeed in convincing the Pacific Coast Farmers’ Market Association—comprising 38 markets—to go smoke-free.

Business people dependent upon pedestrian flow at events and beaches seemed to be more sensitive to the possibility of offending visitors than those near local parks. At least two of the LLAs working with county fairs and other community events—Del Norte and Lake Counties—could not fully allay the fears of coordinating boards and were unable to obtain firm promises of ongoing tobacco prohibition. Their FERs noted the need for repeated sessions of negotiation annually to ensure that the gains they had made the previous year stayed in place.

However, when it could be demonstrated that smoke-free policies did not negatively affect business in one area, decision makers were more amenable to adopting a provision elsewhere. Following on the heels of the successful conversion of the Santa Cruz Boardwalk to a smoke-free status without significant impact on the businesses located there, the Santa Cruz County LLA—assisted by the work of the Parks and Recreation Department staff—was able to quell the fears of the Beach Areas Business Association, though the latter did request that the city establish one or more smoking areas on the beach.

“It’s a free country”

Some local officials, event boards, and polled individuals objected to the effort to curtail smoking outdoors as serious infringements of personal freedoms. It was a frequently-noted objection in a number of FERs and, while it could be—and was—countered by suggesting that smokers were infringing upon the rights of other, equally deserving individuals whose health was threatened by secondhand smoke, not to mention the environmental effects of cigarette litter, it was generally treated as a valid objection.

- The beleaguered Solano County LLA struggled with a hostile member of the county board of supervisors and an editorial in the local paper entitled “Banning Smoking at Parks Takes the Law Too Far,” both of which ridiculed the health impact of secondhand smoke outdoors, cast enforcement as both costly and impossible, and spoke of government using “extreme regulations.”
- The Nevada County LLA found survey respondents reluctant to interfere “...with a perceived right of individuals to smoke while outdoors. One wrote, ‘It sounds great...but it’s taking away freedom.’” Another respondent said, “People need to be able to smoke somewhere.”
- The San Diego County contractors working to supplant tobacco company support of local events with smoke-free policies held 18 one-hour focus groups (comprised primarily of CBOs, coalition members, and health advocates, it must be noted) and discovered that most attendees were in favor of their campaign. The FER added, “Those few policy makers and community members that openly did not support smoke-free policies were generally perceived as supportive of tobacco companies and champions of ‘personal rights.’”—as though those two conditions were synonymous. Which perhaps they are.

Other issues:

Staffing problems. Del Norte, Humboldt, and Lake Counties all reported that shortages of LLA staff impeded their work, causing them to have to rework timelines and adjust their range of activities. Several FERs lamented the fact that community organizations, local agencies, and well-meaning individuals may join the community coalition but don’t always attend meetings or take part in intervention activities.

Opponents. Just as single individuals can be the champions vital to carrying the policy forward, so can single opponents put the brakes on the best organized effort. The LLAs and contractors in at least three counties ran into opponent resistance that at least delayed and in two cases halted projects in certain venues.

- The San Luis Obispo LLA encountered resistance from a key staff member in one of their target cities whose power and determination exceeded that of the champion they had identified in the same city; as a result of that city deciding not to enact a no-smoking policy, they failed to meet their overall objective.
- In San Diego County, the contractors working on smoke-free community colleges ran into opposition from key individuals who were smokers, delaying policy acceptance at one college and blocking it at two others.
- Although the Solano County LLA finally achieved approval of smoking regulations in county parks, the same member of the board of supervisors who belligerently attacked the policy during the proposal phase was also in a position to keep the regulations from being fully implemented, thus causing the LLA to reach the end of the grant period without completing their objective.

Weather kept El Dorado from pursuing their original project design at the Sierra-at-Tahoe Ski Resort two winters in a row, once when there was not enough snow and once when there was too much.

The homeless population. The Santa Cruz County FER working to control tobacco use on beaches and in parks found that one of their greatest challenges was the large homeless population, many of whom smoke and have nowhere but the outdoors to do it in. There was a thorny political issue to confront in placing no-smoking ordinances on public parks and beaches: they could be used “...as a tool for ridding the parks of homeless people,” which some public officials saw as an advantage and others in this highly

liberal community viewed as despicable. The FER concluded, "The issue of homelessness is an area of deep community polarization in Santa Cruz, one that the TEP objective and activities were inadvertently drawn into."

Success in one venue is no guarantee of success in another. The Solano County LLA discovered that their relatively straightforward route to success in making the City of Vacaville's parks smoke-free during one grant period didn't provide as simple a road map to achieving the same success with the county parks as they expected it would. Though they were urged by county supervisors to expand their efforts countywide, they quickly discovered that county agencies and requirements were far more complex than city departments and decision-making bodies. They also encountered a run of bad luck by losing first one, then another key champion that might have smoothed the way through official channels for them. They emerged at the end of the grant period with the new smoking regulations approved but not implemented and, given the bureaucratic hurdles still to be leaped, no clear sense of when implementation might take place.

Coping with colleges. The San Diego County contractors who worked with seven community colleges found themselves forced to work with the "shared governance" process of policy development adopted by the state legislature in 1988. As the FER described it,

Shared governance is a social system of self government wherein decision-making responsibility is shared among those affected by the decisions. At the community college level, shared governance means that responsibility for institutional decisions is shared among governing boards, district administrators, and faculty, with joint recognition and respect for the participation of staff and students.

In other words, the extremely complicated requirements for obtaining approval at multiple levels for any policy change required continual interface with different groups, with new sets of questions and concerns at each level. Further complicating their efforts was a lack of continuity year to year due to the natural turnover of student advocates as they completed their academic careers, forcing the contractors to recruit and retrain student representatives annually.

EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Evaluation activities, sometimes regarded as a necessary evil by busy people struggling to accomplish challenging goals, tended to be presented positively in the FERs. This report has already discussed measurements and interviews conducted prior to policy enactment; here we will look briefly at post-policy activities.

The role of the evaluators

In many cases, fully involved external and/or internal evaluation teams were credited with helping move the project forward in an organized way. They frequently determined outcome measures, designed the survey and observation instruments or adapted existing instruments to the project's needs, and trained and supervised volunteers and LLA staff in their use. In addition, it was their job to analyze the results, develop tables and charts, and write and submit reports, including the FERs. Several FERs demonstrated the evaluator's ability to sift through detail, summarizing much of the routine work but capturing small and large points of significance to the success or failure of the project, and presenting interesting and helpful observations along the way.

Post-policy measurement

Many of the FERs described their efforts to gauge how effective newly enacted tobacco control ordinances and regulations were and how the public responded to them. In a number of cases, policies were adopted so close to the end of the grant period that it would have been premature to conduct the

planned post-intervention polls and observations. Those LLAs which had not been successful in seeing a anti-tobacco policy accepted or implemented were naturally unable to do post-policy work.

Outcome measures varied according to the venue. The primary tools tended to be observations of smoking behavior and the accumulation of tobacco litter, typically conducted by the same staff, coalition members, and volunteers who were tapped for pre-policy work.

- The Sacramento County FER reported that the LLA staff performed 38 observations at the six events that had agreed to adopt smoke-free policies and expressed some disappointment in the level of compliance among event attendees, finding smokers in 16 of their 38 observations.
- The Stanislaus County team never saw a smoker within the protected baseball park—although they noticed several people conscientiously making their way out of the restricted area to have a cigarette—and found only a small amount of litter near some of the entrances.

Some LLAs, particularly those working with events, asked attendees to compare their experience during the present event with its smoking restrictions in place to earlier, unregulated events and often asked if they would support more stringent restrictions.

- The Del Norte County LLA, capturing public input at their prominently located table at the county fair, turned these opportunities into petitions which they used in the next annual round of negotiations with the fair board.
- Some decision makers requested that the LLA conduct polls after the new ordinance was in place, as was the case in El Dorado County's work with the Sierra-at-Tahoe administration. The results were gratifyingly positive.

Post-policy key informant interviews were particularly useful for gaining a candid impression of what tactics had been most persuasive according to the people who were the target of the LLAs' hard work.

- The Marin County LLA learned that "it was the persistence of TRDCP that made model policy move from being a model to an actual proposed ordinance."
- The Monterey County FER reported that their second round of key informant interviews found respondents pleased with the implemented policies overall (with some event board concern about discouraging long-time volunteers who were pro-tobacco) and had received little negative public feedback.

The presence of signage also served as an indicator of policy implementation.

- The Los Angeles County LLA decided that the number and percentage of "no smoking" signs would be their principle outcome measure, coupled with evidence of media notification (press releases and advertisements).
- The City of Long Beach also conducted a special tour of city beaches to assess the number, placement, and effectiveness of signage. Their findings were disappointing.

CONCLUSIONS

Top ten best practices reported in 2.2.16 FERs

The key points listed below have been discussed elsewhere in this report because various LLAs and contractors—large and small, rural and urban—have found them to be instrumental to the success of their land-based and event-based campaigns. We present them here in no particular order, since their applicability is local and situational.

- Locate and recruit **champions** who are known and respected by decision makers and keep them active throughout the campaign.

- Invest in **sponsorships, signage, and incentives** of all kinds. All jurisdictions and events have financial constraints and are grateful for help, and all volunteers deserve to be rewarded.
- Involve **young people** as deeply as possible in all aspects of the intervention: they are irresistible. It's good for the intervention and good for the youth.
- Demonstrate **public support** for the policy via opinion polls, letters of support, presence at meetings. All decision makers know that the good will of their constituents is important.
- Make use of **precedents** from local history, neighboring venues, similar areas throughout the state to show how mainstream and desirable tobacco control is in California.
- Understand **local politics** and get to know as much as possible about **individual decision makers**, their public records, their social and political convictions, their alliances and concerns *before* designing a campaign.
- Provide unstinting **technical assistance** to decision makers—to include sample policies, assistance with community education, signage development, and legal consultations—to make their job of adopting and implementing appropriate tobacco control measures as easy as possible.
- Assemble, train, deploy, and reward a comprehensive **community coalition**. Align goals and support for mutual benefit wherever possible.
- Make the most of local **media** in all its available forms via press releases, articles, media events, one-on-one interviews, op-ed pieces, letters to the editor. Try to develop partnerships: they need news to report, you need coverage.

Of course there were many other worthy elements mentioned by successful campaigns, but the abovementioned strategies seemed to be the most salient and prevalently used.

Unanticipated benefits

Spreading the word by example.

The Marin County LLA reports receiving requests about their website from several other counties so that they could publicize their own new outdoor smoking laws. Also in Marin County, three other jurisdictions began spontaneously to revamp their own local tobacco control policies to match the more comprehensive county ordinance.

The San Diego County FER working for smoke-free community events and parks reported that their effort benefited from anti-tobacco advocacy that had gone before and in turn was having a positive impact on similar work being done elsewhere:

The smoke-free policy campaigns continued to play a large role in educating the public about the health hazards of outdoor secondhand smoke and the impact of cigarette litter on the environment. According to municipal law enforcement agencies, the campaigns generated support of other smoke-free policies and observed compliance with other municipal smoke-free ordinances.

The San Mateo County FER noted that a serendipitous consequence of their successful interventions was a "...domino effect'...in which other outdoor or community events not originally targeted in the objective also adopted tobacco control policies after learning about the first three ground-breaking venues."

Long-term community benefits. Several FERs made the point that their efforts built or enhanced community alliances. One of Santa Cruz County's projects brought LLA staff together with HIV program staff, Diversity Center representatives, and members of local law enforcement and the American Lung Association to assess the problems and devise solutions. This collaboration helped the LLA and coalition develop a campaign which resulted in two consecutive smoke-free festivals. In reviewing their outcomes, the FER said,

The success of this objective, coupled with the new Tobacco Free LGBT, Santa Cruz County project, has forged strong ties between tobacco control advocates and the local LGBT community. Given the higher prevalence of smoking, especially among LGBT youth and young adults, this is a very positive development."

The San Mateo County LLA also found that one of the most important outcomes of the projects they tackled with the help of their coalition members was the new set of community connections that developed over the course of their work. Their FER underscored this discovery:

...one ancillary consequence of the collaborative work on this objective was an enormous increase in community participation, cooperation, and unity among key CBO advocacy groups—which had previously only operated in isolation. The community collaboration—among the TPP staff, CBOs, youth, volunteers, and various government entities—greatly enhanced the ability of the county to work on pressing social and public health issues.

The work isn't over...

Several FERs made the point that, despite heartening successes in their chosen fields of endeavor, constant vigilance must be maintained and public attention needs to be periodically reinforced.

The Marin County FER sounded a cautionary note, based on their experience in a county where the public assumption is that the issue of secondhand smoke has already been resolved:

Without continuing leadership from local policymakers, tobacco control runs the risk of becoming less of a priority in a county where smoking is less publicly visible due to the social norm change that occurred in the past 15 years.

For precisely opposite reasons, Del Norte County's LLA is unable to consider the conservative Del Norte Fair Board fully committed to curtailing tobacco use at the annual event. Even though they went along with expanding the smoke-free policy from part of a single day to the whole four days and increased the number of tobacco-free areas, board members remain part of the prevailing culture that supports tobacco use in the county. The LLA recognized that their continued success depended directly on their ability to help "...bring the Fair out of the red." The fair board has maintained its autonomy by requiring annual Memorandums of Understanding each program year.

The Lake County LLA encountered a similar unwillingness on the part of the event boards and coordinators to make a firm commitment to tobacco control at their events by adopting permanent, written policies. The Lake County LLA's response to this, together with other LLAs whose targeted decision makers have not yet recognized the importance of curtailing outdoor tobacco use, is to say that they will keep working with them as long as necessary.

... but we can see a clearer, cleaner future

Even after acknowledging that there are still areas of resistance, many FERs concluded their narrative with very positive outlooks on tobacco control for their own locales, for their regions, and for the state itself.

- The El Dorado County LLA said, "Overall, the outcomes produced reflect that the majority of youth/young adults and their families, local residents and tourists prefer attending outdoor recreational facilities that are smoke-free."

- The Stanislaus County FER closed with, “The very fast manner in which a tobacco-free ballpark policy was adopted in Ceres...is an indicator of community norm change in Stanislaus County....Although there are many challenges ahead, clearly, Stanislaus County is on a clear path to creating healthy outdoor environments.”
- The Orange County FER made one of the strongest statements about positive change building upon itself:

As more public places limit smoking, the de-normalization of smoking increases...socially and environmentally....As people have become accustomed and like smoke-free areas, there has been less resistance to additional areas becoming smoke-free. There are also fewer people who smoke. People who do smoke are becoming more aware of the effect of their usage on other people. Although smoke-free outdoor areas have typically less supervision [than indoor ones], clearly posted signs and typically excellent cooperation should prevail and will increase through peer and public pressure.

In the final observation of this report, it is valid to say that none of the projects undertaken by the twenty LLAs who chose Objective 2.2.16 failed in making an impact on the targeted community with regard to the need for control of outdoor tobacco use. Whether they achieved all of their specific goals or not, every LLA in this set was successful in raising the awareness of their community in general and of their local decision makers in particular.

Appendix A. List of Local Lead Agency Objectives

Del Norte County: *During the annual Del Norte County Fair, the Del Norte County Fair Board will adopt a policy designating the fairgrounds as tobacco-free between the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., with tobacco use allowed within up to three (3) designated areas only located away from the carnival, livestock, and children-oriented activities, with a compliance rate no lower than 95%.*

El Dorado County: *By June 1, 2007, at least 2 recreational facilities in El Dorado County (e.g., ski resorts, skate parks, county fair, etc.) will adopt written politics which designate a portion of or all of outdoor areas as smoke-free.*

Humboldt County: *By June 30, 2007, in Humboldt County, at least one major venue for community events and one city council will adopt written policies creating smoke-free zones in areas such as: grandstand bleachers, eating areas, and children's amusement areas during special events and in city parks and/or recreational facilities.*

Lake County: *By June 30, 2007, at least six out of twenty targeted outdoor venues in Lake county such as concerts, festivals, and fairs will adopt and enact smoke-free policies that designate all or a portion of outdoor areas as smoke-free.*

City of Long Beach: *By June 30, 2007, The City of Long Beach will adopt and implement a smoke-free beaches policy at all City Beaches. [found in OTIS under work plan]*

Los Angeles County: *By June 30, 2007, a minimum of eight cities in Los Angeles County (one city in each Service Planning Area) will adopt and implement policies to prohibit smoking in outdoor areas (e.g., beaches, piers, parks, outdoor dining areas, civic outdoor areas, theater lines, and bus stops).*

Marin County. *At least 6 out of 11 jurisdictions in Marin County will amend existing secondhand smoke regulations to include options developed by the Smoke-Free Marin Coalition to cover areas not currently covered under state and local laws, such as outdoor dining areas, 20-foot zones around entrances to public buildings, and outdoor public events, beaches, and other public parks.*

Monterey County. *By June 30, 2007, at least 10 events in Monterey County (such as Blues in the Park, Feast of Lanterns, Big Sur Marathon, Artichoke Festival, and First Night) will adopt a policy prohibiting all tobacco use during the events. This is a spring 2005 revision of the LLA's original objective—getting 5 events to adopt such a policy—which had almost been met by that time.*

Nevada County. *By June 30, 2007, a minimum of 5 of the 10 city parks and 2 skate parks in Nevada County will adopt a curb-to-curb smoke-free policy.*

Orange County. *By June 30, 2007, at least 10 outdoor recreational facilities (e.g., beaches, amusement parks, parks, sports stadiums) in Orange County will enact a policy designating at least one of the following as smoke-free and cigarette litter-free: play areas, eating areas, waiting lines, seating areas, children's areas.*

City of Pasadena. *By December 31, 2006, three local outdoor recreational events in Pasadena (e.g., local jazz festivals, cultural events, parades, etc.) will adopt a tobacco control policy designating a portion or 100% of the outdoor area or event as smoke-free.*

Riverside. *By June 30, 2007, at least 3 cities in Riverside County will adopt a policy which restricts smoking at public recreation areas beyond what is already covered by the state tot law. This may include parks as well as other types of recreation areas such as camping, lakes, etc., that may be under public control by cities.*

Sacramento. *By June 30, 2007, a minimum of six policies prohibiting tobacco sponsorship and/or creating smoke-free events will be adopted and implemented by priority population organizations or community/sporting events in Sacramento County.*

San Diego. *By May 31, 2007, at least seven community locales/events will adopt policies restricting tobacco use and be designated as smoke-free public spaces in San Diego County.*

San Diego. Unable to interest cities in smoke-free patio policies under the above objective, two LLA contractors agreed to work instead with community colleges to establish smoke-free campus policies. They worked with a total of 4 college districts and targeted 7 campuses (together with their satellite campuses). No new objective was written to cover this redeployment.

San Suis Obispo. *By June 30, 2007, a minimum of 1 beach and/or pier in San Luis Obispo County will adopt and implement a smoke-free outdoor area policy.*

San Mateo. (1) LLA overall goals: *By June 1, 2007, at least three outdoor and/or community venues (e.g., beaches, county fairs, community parades, farmers markets) in San Mateo County will adopt tobacco control policies designating a portion or all of the outdoor area or event as smoke-free.*

(2) One contractor had two goals: (a) *By January 31, 2006, the Pilipino Bayanihan Resource Center (PBRC) will develop and train a Pilipino Youth Coalition (PYC) with 8-10 Tobacco Peer Educators (TPEs) from Jefferson and Westmoor High Schools in Daly City to prepare them to work in policy development.* (b) *By June 30, 2006, PBRC's Pilipino Youth Coalition (PYC) will work with the Coordinating Committee of the Fil-Am Friendship Celebration to adopt and implement a tobacco control policy designating a portion or all of the outdoor event as smoke-free.*

(3) The goal of another contractor: *By October 15, 2005, Jefferson Union High School District's (JUHS) Tobacco Peer Educators (TPEs) will work with the Pacifica Fog Festival (Fog Fest) Committee to adopt and implement a tobacco control policy designating a portion or all of the outdoor event as smoke-free.*

Santa Cruz. *By June 30, 2007, at least 1 outdoor tourist destination (such as Capitola Village, Santa Cruz Warf, Pacific Avenue) in Santa Cruz County will adopt and enforce a policy to prohibit smoking on public beaches.*

Santa Cruz. *By June 30, 2007, one (1) outdoor LGBT event or parade in Santa Cruz County will adopt a policy designating a portion or all of the outdoor area or event as smoke-free.*

Solano. A 2-part objective: (1) *By January 31, 2006, the Solano County Board of Supervisors will adopt a policy prohibiting smoking in all parts of County parks and assign an agency to enforce this policy, and* (2) *by April 30, 2006, this agency will be actively enforcing this policy.*

Stanislaus. *By June 30, 2007, The City of Ceres Parks and Recreation Department will adopt a policy that prohibits the use of tobacco products of any kind at Cost Fields Baseball Park. As a result, use of tobacco products of any kind at the ballpark will decrease by 80% over baseline via annual compliance checks once policy is adopted.*

Yuba. *By June 30, 2007, a minimum of 6 outdoor community events in Yuba County (i.e., Peach Festival, Strawberry Jubilee, Fishing Derby, etc.) who do not have an existing written policy prohibiting smoking in outdoor areas, will adopt and implement such policies.*

References

- Barbic, S., Smith, J., and Eby-Carl, R. 2007. *Lake County Outdoor Venue Smoke-free Policy Adoption*. California: Lake County Tobacco Control, Education, and Prevention Program, Lakeport, California.
- Davis, A. 2007. *Outdoor Tourist Destination Final Report*. California: Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Tobacco Education Program.
- . 2007. *Smoke-free LGBT Outdoor Event Final Report*. California: Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Tobacco Education Program.
- D'Onofrio, C.N., and Flores-Workman, F.A. 2007. *Smoke-free County Parks: Case Study of a Policy Initiative, Final Evaluation Report*. California: Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program.
- Forst, M. 2007. *Final Evaluation Report: Special Events Objective*. California: San Mateo County Tobacco Prevention Program.
- Higley, L., Knutson, G., Brown, M., Bloomfield, K. 2007. *Establishing Smoke-free Policies on Community College Campuses in San Diego County*. California: San Diego County Tobacco Control Resource Program.
- House, M. and Lidtke, H. 2007. *Final Evaluation Report, Objective 2: Smoke-free Outdoor Events, Monterey County 2004-2007*. California: Monterey County Tobacco Prevention Program.
- Huddleston, J. 2007. *Final Evaluation Report: Adoption and Implementation of Sponsorship and Smoke-free Event Policies in Sacramento County*. California: Sacramento County Tobacco Education Program.
- Hughes, S.K. and Keifer, T. 2007. *Smoke-free Beaches, Final Evaluation Report*. California: San Luis Obispo County Tobacco Control Program.
- Kessler, C. 2007. *Smoke-free Outdoor Recreation Final Evaluation Report*. California: El Dorado County Tobacco Use Prevention Program.
- Lodestar Management/Research, Inc. 2007. *Smoke-free Outdoor Events Final Evaluation Report, City of Pasadena, 2004-2007*. California: Pasadena Tobacco Control Program.
- Manzano, F., Brown, M., Higley, L., Knutson, G. 2007. *Establishing Policies Restricting Smoking and Tobacco Company Sponsorship at Community Events in San Diego County*. California: San Diego County Tobacco Control Resource Program.
- Marshak, H.H. 2007. *Riverside County Department of Public Health Tobacco Control Project, Evaluation Report*. California: Riverside County Tobacco Control Project.
- McCubbrey, J.P. 2007. *Reducing Exposure to Secondhand Smoke with Outdoor Smoking Policy; Final Evaluation Report*. California: Marin County Tobacco Related Disease Control Program.
- . 2007. *Tobacco-free Del Norte County Fair Final Evaluation Report*. California: Del Norte County Tobacco Use Prevention Program.
- McDonald, A. M. 2007. *Smoke-free Outdoor Events in Yuba County*. California: Yuba County Tobacco Education Program.
- Midwest Academy Strategy Chart. <http://www.partnersinpolycymaking.com/curriculumchangechart.html>.

Pasadena Cigarette Stompers: Stomping Out Tobacco Use among Pasadena Youth.
http://ci.pasadena.ca.us/publichealth/health_advoc_improvement/tobacco%20control/PCSYP%20brochure.pdf

Perales, D. P. and Perales, D. C. 2007. *Creating a Smoke-free Baseball Park Policy in Stanislaus County.* California: Stanislaus County Tobacco Education Program.

Puckett, K. and Levy, M. 2007. *Smoke-free Policies for Redwood Acres Fairgrounds and the City of Blue Lake.* California: Tobacco-Free Humboldt.

Robinson, G. 2007. *[No written report: no title].* California: Long Beach Department of Health and Human Services (City of), Tobacco Education Program.

Schafer, C. 2007. *Smoke-free Outdoor Venues Case Study.* California: Orange County Tobacco Use Prevention Program.

Sterner, L. 2007. *Nevada County 2007 Evaluation Report: Smoke-free Parks Policy Adoption.* California: Nevada County Tobacco Control.

Weber, M.D., Anderson, N., Namba, L., Wang, R., Messex, M. 2007. *Smoke-free Outdoor Areas Final Evaluation Report.* California: Los Angeles County Tobacco Control and Prevention Program.