



CENTER FOR EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

TOBACCO CONTROL EVALUATION CENTER

## **Combating Secondhand Smoke in Multi-Unit Housing:**

**A summary and analysis of 21 Final Evaluation Reports  
addressing Communities of Excellence Indicators  
2.2.11, 2.2.12, and 2.2.13**

**Report prepared by C. S. Lemp**  
Tobacco Control Evaluation Center/UC Davis

**August 2010**

Funded by  
The California Department of Health Services,  
Tobacco Control Section

# Contents

## Introduction

FER quick facts

## Overview

CX Indicators 2.2.11, 2.2.12, 2.2.13

Table 1. List of funded LLAs/Competes, indicators chosen, and project outcomes

Table 2. Target populations and project outcomes

## Analysis of Primary Areas of Investigation

Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations

Table 3. Involvement of coalition members and other organizations in project activities

Significance of this factor

Educating decision makers and tenants

Table 4. Campaign targets and educational efforts

Determining point of access: strategies in selecting targets

Making contact with decision makers

Reaching decision makers in local government

Reaching decision makers in the housing industry

Reaching the residents of MUH complexes

Educating decision makers and tenants

Assembling educational materials

Establishing personal relationships

Table 5. Training and technical assistance

Educating local government officials

Educating owners/managers

Dealing with landlords ready to discuss developing policies

Dealing with landlords new to the concept

Dealing with landlords with misgivings

Dealing with hostile landlords

Educating tenants

Significance of this factor

Working with volunteers

Table 6. Volunteer activity

Significance of this factor

Using media for education and advocacy

Table 7. Media used and amount budgeted for primary objectives

Significance of this factor

The Impact of project staffing

Table 8. Project staffing: staff titles, FTEs, and the number of primary objectives that constitute their workload

Significance of this factor

A test of the primary areas of investigation as links to successful outcomes

## Conclusions

Regarding the primary areas of investigation

Regarding the objective of protecting MUH residents from secondhand smoke

## Appendix A. Additional Insights into Work with MUH Complexes

### Findings and recommendations for successful outcomes

- Avoid surprises: research the target MUH/community/city council thoroughly

- Cultivate champions

- Build personal relationships

- Allay fears

- Be flexible, be patient

### Challenges and barriers: a set of teachable moments

- Common misunderstandings and misconceptions

- What about smokers' rights?

- Imagined conflicts with housing subsidy programs

- Policy enforcement

- Misinformation

- No information

- Manager sabotage

- Owner-manager disconnect

- Manager-tenant discord

- There is reason behind blind, unreasoning resistance

- Misapprehensions

- Management staff turnover

### Reasons for developing/adopting smoke-free policies

- Feedback after policy adoption

- Property managers

- Tenants

- From one owner/manager to another

### In closing

- Measurement of success

- Unintended consequences

- The value of celebration

## Appendix B. List of Local Lead Agency/Competitive Grantee objectives

## Introduction

The purpose of this report was to scan across 21 Final Evaluation Reports (FERs) that describe addressing tobacco control for multi-unit housing (MUH) complexes during the 2004-2008 funding period to examine certain elements or factors, common to all projects, that were selected by the Tobacco Control Evaluation Center as **primary areas of investigation** due to their apparent link to successful outcomes in past analyses of FERs. These elements or factors include:

- Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations
- Educating decision makers and tenants
- Working with volunteers
- Using media for education and advocacy
- The impact of project staffing

In attempting to make a determination about how these elements affected the outcomes of the projects described in this set of FERs, we examined each element separately, using the projects' own descriptions of their work and its outcomes in their FERs to see how their management of the five factors appeared to contribute to their success or lack of success and concluded our investigation with the following observations:

1. All of these elements have a role to play in the success of funded projects, but the relative importance of that role will change (and may even vanish) according to the nature of the objectives pursued—with one exception. The impact of project staffing will always be the invariable factor in a successful outcome. If all the other elements were in place and the project staff were not well trained and competent, the project would be likely to fail. On the other hand, many projects that succeeded did so despite limitations among the other elements, leading to the conclusion that the staff made it happen, whatever it took.
2. In the present case, where the objective is to obtain protection for residents of MUH complexes by convincing decision makers to adopt smoke-free policies, the most prominent elements of a successful outcome appear to be collaboration with state and local—especially local—agencies and organizations, including representatives of the housing industry; the education of decision makers and tenants; and project staffing. The use of volunteers and of media can—and in some cases, did—play a complementary role but these elements are not essential to the projects' success. When other objectives are pursued, the roles of the four variable elements will change. For example, an effort to promote litter-free parks and beaches requires strong media activity and troops of volunteers to play a prominent part in bringing the project to life and to fruition, while collaboration and educating decision makers will be less vital to a positive outcome.
3. Determining how well collaboration, subject education, and the use of volunteers and media are managed during the course of a project is relatively straightforward: a well-written FER generally provides that information in terms of numbers, activities, and accomplishments. However, the impact of project staffing—the most important factor of the five—cannot be assessed objectively. Lists of job titles and numbers of FTEs may be as misleading as they are helpful in attempting to measure the essential qualities of a project team and cannot capture the essence of their interaction or tell whether they are led by a strong and imaginative director. Perhaps the only way to assess the excellence of a project staff is to get to know them, work with them, reinforce their strengths and help them overcome their weaknesses—just what the Tobacco Control Evaluation Center is already doing.

This report is presented in several parts. The Overview recaps the CX Indicators and introduces the projects as described in their FERs with two tables. This is followed by an analysis of the primary areas of investigation, one by one, which together comprise the body of the report. A brief experimental section then attempts to evaluate the importance of the five factors across the five

projects which exceeded their objectives, taking that fact as a strong indication of overall success, by assigning a grade (A-C) to each element. The conclusion of this portion of the report follows. Appendix A presents a sort of sub-report, compiled from the rich assortment of ideas and information offered by this set of FERs that are not directly relevant to the main thrust of this report. Contained in Appendix A are insights into the amoebic qualities of success, some issues underlying the need for educating landlords and tenants (“challenges and barriers”), together with five findings and recommendations for successful project outcomes and some nuggets of information about owner/manager reflections.

Before we continue, here is a brief summary of some of the characteristics of the projects as they are described in their FERs.

### FER quick facts

- **9** were produced by LLAs and **12** by Compets;
- **5** reported **exceeding** the planned objectives (3 Compets, 2 LLAs), **9 met** the objectives (6 Compets, 3 LLAs), **7 did not meet** the objectives (3 Compets, 4 LLAs);
- **2** Compets focused on **training** LLAs, other Compets, city and county officials, and rental association staff;
- **5** FERs reported activities conducted in **rural** areas and the rest were urban projects;
- **14** projects worked primarily with **owners/managers** of individual MUH complexes, **6** targeted property development/management **companies** and housing authorities, **4** worked at the **city/county** level, and **2** each focused on **rental housing associations** and on MUH **contractors/builders** (5 FERs reported more than one target).
- a total of **91 MUH complexes** and **7 cities** were targeted for some form of non-smoking policy adoption; FER conclusions indicate that **79** MUH complexes and **3** cities did adopt/change their policies (plus another 10 MUHs and 5 “cities/counties,” also described as accomplishments, but in vague language);
- **8** projects explicitly included **seniors**, while **2** others (by comprising all of San Diego County and all of San Francisco) probably included seniors and 5 others didn’t specify;
- **13** projects specifically targeted **low-SES** tenants and **3** focused on **Latino/Hispanic** residents, while other FERs probably encompassed both populations;
- **7** FERs provided precise figures for the **number of units** affected by their interventions (a total of **8,276**) but other FERs used more general terms (e.g., “all ground-level units in one MUH” and “a total of 17 MUH complexes adopted a comprehensive smoke-free policy.”).

## Overview of the 21 Projects

Between the beginning of July 2004 and the end of June 2007, a combination of nine Local Lead Agencies (LLAs) and twelve Competitive Grantees (Compets) were funded by the California Department of Health Services, Tobacco Control Section, to address the Communities of Excellence Indicators that deal with the control of secondhand smoke in multi-unit housing complexes: **2.2.11, 2.2.12, and 2.2.13.**

**2.2.11:** Proportion of multi-unit housing complexes with a voluntary policy that designates **common outdoor areas** as smoke-free, such as playground, pool area, and entrances.

-or-

Proportion of communities with a policy that designates outdoor common areas of multi-unit housing complexes as smoke-free, such as playground, swimming pool area, and entrances, and/or resolutions encouraging owners, managers, or developers of multi-unit housing to adopt policies creating smoke-free outdoor common areas.

**2.2.12:** Proportion of multi-unit housing complexes with a voluntary policy designating **indoor common areas** as smoke-free, such as laundry room, hallways, stairways, and lobby area.

-or-

Proportion of communities with a multi-unit housing policy that prohibits smoking in indoor common areas such as laundry room, hallways, stairways, and lobby areas, and/or resolutions encouraging owners, managers, or developers of multi-unit housing to adopt policies creating smoke-free indoor common areas.

**2.2.13:** Proportion of multi-unit housing owners and/or operators with a voluntary policy that restricts smoking in **individual units** (including balconies and patios.)

-or-

Proportion of communities with a policy that restricts smoking in the individual units of multi-unit housing (including balconies and patios), and/or resolutions encouraging owners, managers, or developers of multi-unit housing to adopt policies creating smoke-free individual units.

Upon completing their work, these groups produced 21 Final Evaluation Reports (FERs), describing their experiences and revealing whether they were able to succeed in meeting their objectives. We found that two-thirds of the projects exceeded or met their objectives (five groups exceeded their objectives, nine met theirs) and seven did not meet their objectives. These outcomes are illustrated in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. List of funded LLAs/Compets, indicators chosen, and project outcomes**

(Shading: *blue* = objectives exceeded, *green* = objectives met, none = objectives not met)

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)                                | MULTI-UNIT HOUSING<br>INDICATOR CHOSEN: |        |        |        | OBJECTIVES MET?                                                               |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                       | #                                       | 2.2.11 | 2.2.12 | 2.2.13 |                                                                               |
| ALA of the East Bay<br>(EBSFH Project,<br>Emeryville) | 1                                       | x      | x      |        | <b>Exceeded objective:</b><br>4 instead of 2 MUHs adopted smoke-free policies |
| ALA of Sacramento<br>(RESPECT)                        | 2                                       | x      | x      | x      | <i>FER claims overwhelming success; it's hard to tell<sup>1</sup></i>         |
| BREATHE CA of<br>Sacramento (BCSET)                   | 3                                       | x      | x      |        | <b>Met objective:</b><br>5 MUHs adopted smoke-free policies                   |

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)                        | MULTI-UNIT HOUSING<br>INDICATOR CHOSEN: |        |        |        | OBJECTIVES MET?                                                                                                                  |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                               | #                                       | 2.2.11 | 2.2.12 | 2.2.13 |                                                                                                                                  |
| BREATHE CA of the Bay Area (San Jose)         | 4                                       |        | x      |        | <b>Met objective:</b><br>4 MUHs adopted smoke-free policies                                                                      |
| Catholic Charities (SFASD Project, San Diego) | 5                                       | x      | x      |        | <b>Did not meet objective:</b><br>12% instead of 20% of 111 owners/ managers receiving presentations adopted smoke-free policies |
| CommuniCare (Davis)                           | 6                                       |        | x      |        | <b>Exceeded objective:</b><br>18 instead of 3 MUHs adopted smoke-free policies                                                   |
| ETR CCAP (Sacramento)                         | 7                                       | x      | x      |        | <b>Probably Met objective (5 city/counties); it's hard to tell.<sup>2</sup></b>                                                  |
| Fresno Co. EOC RTEP (Fresno)                  | 8                                       | x      | x      |        | <b>Exceeded objective:</b><br>17 instead of 15 MUHs adopted smoke-free policies                                                  |
| Imperial Co. (El Centro)                      | 9                                       |        | x      |        | <b>Did not meet objective (10 MUHs):</b><br>but allowed to post signs in 2 MUHs                                                  |
| NCCWB Respiro Libre (Santa Rosa)              | 10                                      | x      |        | x      | <b>Did not meet objective:</b><br>2 MUHs instead of 4 MUHs <sup>3</sup>                                                          |
| Pasadena PTPC (City of)                       | 11                                      |        |        | x      | <b>Exceeded objective:</b><br>4 MUHs instead of 3 MUHs                                                                           |
| PHFE In the Zone (Corona)                     | 12                                      | x      | x      |        | <b>Mixed:</b><br>4 of 6 MUHs but 2 cities instead of 1                                                                           |
| Plumas Co. TURP (Quincy)                      | 13                                      | x      | x      |        | <b>Met objective:</b><br>2 MUHs                                                                                                  |
| REACT <sup>4</sup> (Fresno/Dinuba)            | 14                                      | x      | x      |        | <b>Met objective:</b><br>6 MUHs                                                                                                  |
| Sacramento Co. TEP (Sacramento)               | 15                                      |        |        | x      | <b>Exceeded objective:</b><br>5 MUHs instead of 4 MUHs                                                                           |
| San Francisco TFP (City)                      | 16                                      |        |        | x      | <b>Did not meet objective:</b><br>no new ordinance plugging loopholes                                                            |
| The Santa Cruz Tobacco Free LGBT              | 17                                      |        |        | x      | <b>Did not meet objective:</b><br>2 MUHs instead of 5 MUHs <sup>5</sup>                                                          |
| Santa Cruz Co. (Santa Cruz)                   | 18                                      |        | x      | x      | <b>Did not meet objective:</b><br>1 MUH/1 pending instead of 3 MUHs                                                              |
| Sutter Co. STEP (Yuba City)                   | 19                                      | x      | x      |        | <b>Met objective:</b><br>4 MUHs                                                                                                  |
| Ventura Co. LLA (Ventura)                     | 20                                      |        |        | x      | <b>Met objective:</b><br>technically, a city-wide SHS policy was adopted <sup>6</sup>                                            |
| Yolo Co. TPP (Woodland)                       | 21                                      |        |        | x      | <b>Did not meet objective:</b><br>no direct policy adoption at 3 MUHs <sup>7</sup>                                               |

<sup>1</sup>Pledged to get at least 8 MUH developers/contractors to construct/designate at least 1 MUH complex as "smoking restricted," RESPECT's FER proclaims, "...through staff and consultant contacts...it was found that *hundreds of multi-unit housing smoke-free/smoking prohibited policies have been passed*" (italics added) for which RESPECT is apparently taking credit. They did NOT specify MUH complexes in any particular cities/areas. **If we award them this honor, it means that there are 6, not 5, projects that exceeded their objectives and adjustments to language, colors, and experimental analyses will need to be made.**

<sup>2</sup>CCAP's FER notes that "...the proportion of funded projects receiving technical assistance related to smoke-free MUH has increased consistently from 33% in June 2006 to 45% in June 2007 to 64% in June 2008"; also, that 5 cities/counties have "...successfully adopted resolutions/policies related to prohibiting SHS in multi-unit housing," and all had received "some form of support" from CCAP. The far more specific wording of their objective in earlier pages is nowhere to be found in these statements, nor are the 5 cities/counties named.

<sup>3</sup>The 2 MUHs that adopted policies because they were persuaded by the project's intervention activities were outside the Respiro Libre's target area and were not occupied by the target population, but hey—smoke-free policies are smoke-free policies.

<sup>4</sup>Because 4 entire objectives are reported upon in a single 13-page FER without supplemental attachments, it's challenging to determine how the introduction common to all 4 pertains directly to the MUH portion.

<sup>5</sup>The 2 MUHs that decided to adopt some form of smoke-free policy probably didn't do so as a direct result of the project's intervention—to judge by the wording in the FER—although some parts of their efforts may have been influential in the owners/managers decision making.

<sup>6</sup>The Ventura County LLA tried to get Thousand Oaks to enhance its 2004 no-smoking policy for city-funded affordable housing and to get Oxnard to institute a similar policy for its city-funded MUHs. They did succeed in increasing the number of smoke-free units from one third to two thirds in Thousand Oaks but were not happy: "But these policies, to the health advocates' chagrin, did not require the nonsmoking units to be contiguous. No policy was achieved in Oxnard."

<sup>7</sup>The Yolo County, working with MUHs that typically serve UC Davis students, were unable to convince any of the managers whom they contacted to adopt a smoke-free policy. However, their FER points out, during the grant period while they were interacting with MUH managers to provide educational material, meetings and presentations, 5 MUHs did go 100% smoke free and 2 others designated some of their units as smoke free. The staff feels that they were responsible, at least in part, for these decisions since they had direct contact with 2 of the managers and the Davis Rental Managers Association, with whom they were collaborating, provided their material to another.

The populations targeted and the project outcomes for the 21 projects are presented in Table 2 for quick reference.

**Table 2 . Target populations and project outcomes**

(Shading: *blue* = objectives exceeded, *green* = objectives met, none = objectives not met)

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)                        | TARGET POPULATION                                     |                                                               | NON-SMOKING POLICIES ENACTED:                                                                                                                       |                                              |                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
|                                               | SENIORS*                                              | OTHER                                                         | WHOLE<br>COMPLEX                                                                                                                                    | NO. OF<br>UNITS                              | OTHER<br>AREAS                                |
| ALA of the East Bay/<br>EBSFH<br>(Emeryville) | 4 MUHs of 4                                           |                                                               | All 4, in time <sup>1</sup>                                                                                                                         | 419                                          | All common areas immediately.                 |
| ALA of Sacramento/RESPECT                     |                                                       | LLAs, county officials, rental association staff <sup>2</sup> |                                                                                                                                                     | Over 3,700 units since 2004 <sup>3</sup>     |                                               |
| BREATHE of Sacramento (BCSET)                 |                                                       | Young adults (18-29) in 5 MUHs                                | "Inside all units" (2 MUHs) <sup>4</sup>                                                                                                            | All ground-level units in 1 MUH <sup>4</sup> | Laundries(4 MUHs), pools (2 MUHs)             |
| BREATHE of Bay Area (San Jose)                | 1 MUH of 4                                            | 2 Farm worker MUHs, 1 low SES MUH                             | All 4 MUHs, w/exceptions <sup>5</sup>                                                                                                               | 446 units affected                           | All common areas                              |
| Catholic Charities (SFASD Project, San Diego) |                                                       | Lower SES apt. dwellers in San Diego County                   |                                                                                                                                                     | A potential 3,071 units affected.            | 4 MUHs: all common outdoor areas <sup>6</sup> |
| CommuniCare (Davis)                           | 2 MUHs of 18 <sup>7</sup>                             | 12 family MUHs, 4 transitional facility <sup>7</sup>          |                                                                                                                                                     | 538 units affected                           | 3 sets of defined common areas <sup>8</sup>   |
| ETR CCAP (Sacramento)                         |                                                       | LLAs, COMPETS, city/ countyofficials <sup>9</sup>             | 50% of MUHs in 1 county/4 cities <sup>9</sup>                                                                                                       |                                              |                                               |
| Fresno Co. EOC RTEP (Fresno)                  |                                                       | Women, families, Latinos, immigrants in 15 MUHs               | "A total of 17 MUH complexes adopted a comprehensive smoke-free policy." <sup>10</sup>                                                              |                                              |                                               |
| Imperial Co. TEP (El Centro)                  |                                                       | Low-income residents in 10 MUHs                               | Despite enthusiastic tenant support and apparent interest/agreement of management, the voluntary policies for smoke-free common areas did not pass. |                                              |                                               |
| NCCWB Respiro Libre (Santa Rosa)              |                                                       | Low-SES Latino residents in 4 MUHs <sup>11</sup>              | 2 MUHs                                                                                                                                              | 76 units                                     | All common areas included                     |
| Pasadena PTPC (City of)                       | 3 MUHs; FER gave no specific description of residents |                                                               | 4 MUHs                                                                                                                                              | ?                                            | Presumably all                                |
| PHFE In the Zone (Corona)                     |                                                       | Low-income residents in 6 MUHs <sup>12</sup>                  | Policies varied by city and by MUH, some affecting units in 25%/50% of MUH, some only common areas                                                  |                                              |                                               |
| Plumas Co. TURP (Quincy)                      | 2 MUHs of 2                                           |                                                               |                                                                                                                                                     | Units at 3 MUHs <sup>13</sup>                | All indoor common areas                       |
| REACT (Fresno/Dinuba)                         | 54%/tenants were over 45                              | Low-income tenants in 6 MUHs <sup>14</sup>                    | "...six apartment complexes...adopted a smoke-free policy..." [No further details were offered in the FER]                                          |                                              |                                               |



| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)              | TARGET POPULATION                                                                    |                                                | NON-SMOKING POLICIES ENACTED:                                                                                                                                          |                    |                                                  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
|                                     | SENIORS*                                                                             | OTHER                                          | WHOLE<br>COMPLEX                                                                                                                                                       | NO. OF<br>UNITS    | OTHER<br>AREAS                                   |
| Sacramento Co. TEP<br>(Sacramento)  | <i>[Resident demographics described only as "predominantly priority population"]</i> |                                                |                                                                                                                                                                        | Units at 5<br>MUHs |                                                  |
| San Francisco TFP<br>(City)         |                                                                                      | Residents of all MUH<br>complexes in SF        | The TFP and its Coalition/Task Force were aiming at closing loopholes in an existing ordinance and failed.                                                             |                    |                                                  |
| The Santa Cruz<br>Tobacco Free LGBT |                                                                                      | All LGBT tenants in<br>Santa Cruz MUHs         | At the end of the project, 1 owner/mgr added a non-smoking clause to his lease and 1 will rent only to non-smokers but doesn't want to change his lease. <sup>15</sup> |                    |                                                  |
| Santa Cruz Co.<br>(Santa Cruz)      | 1 MUH of 3 <sup>16</sup>                                                             | 1 MUH with low-SES<br>tenants <i>[pending]</i> | <i>[Per FER: "At least one new policy was adopted with another still in process." There was no information about how comprehensive these policies are.]</i>            |                    |                                                  |
| Sutter Co. STEP<br>(Yuba City)      |                                                                                      | Lower SES tenants in<br>4 MUHs                 | -                                                                                                                                                                      | 26 units           | 4: laundry room<br>2: grass area<br>1: pool area |
| Ventura Co. LLA<br>(Ventura)        | Seniors in<br>Oxnard                                                                 | Low SES families with<br>children              | 2/3 city-funded<br>affordable MUHs<br>-Thousand Oaks                                                                                                                   | ?                  |                                                  |
| Yolo Co. TPP<br>(Woodland)          |                                                                                      | UC Davis students                              | None as a direct result of the intervention, but as many as 5 100% smoke-free and 2 partially smoke-free MUHs as an indirect effect of educational work.               |                    |                                                  |

This separate column was chosen for the following reason, well expressed in the Santa Cruz County's FER: "The majority of these were in Senior housing settings, which confirmed the advice provided by RESPECT that senior housing is currently one of the most available venues for smoke-free housing advocacy."

<sup>1</sup>Of the 4 MUHs, one opened as smoke-free, one went smoke-free in 90 days, one in one year, and one as smoking tenants departed.

<sup>2</sup> RESPECT piloted a statewide effort to address low SES tobacco control by creating smoke-free housing educational material, advocacy, training of/collaboration with LLAs and state and local officials and agencies, and promoting policy activity in conjunction with MUH administrators.

<sup>3</sup> RESPECT claims that its work with apartment owners/managers and rental association leaders during this grant period is ultimately responsible for *new smoke-free policies in 49 MUHs, affecting over 3,700 units. Do you think that's true?*

<sup>4</sup> BCSET reported that "This work created 60 individual apartment units that are smoke-free from which renters can choose."

<sup>5</sup> The Forum and Plum Orchard complexes permitted smoking in parking lots only; the two migrant camp complexes restricted smoking within 20' of any "enclosed area," with no smoking allowed inside any of the apartments/cottages/villas.

<sup>6</sup> Five additional managers said they had instituted "word of mouth" policies to prohibit smoking in common areas, and a total of 37 MUH owner/managers expressed interest in adopting smoke-free policies at an unspecified "later time."

<sup>7</sup> The CommuniCare TPP's objective was at least 3 MUHs but they attempted to engage 9 and ended up with 18.

<sup>8</sup> New lease addenda defined outdoor, indoor, and "Exclusive Use Common Areas" (which included patios, balconies, doorsteps, parking spaces and more) *so comprehensively* that only the units themselves were not declared smoke-free.

<sup>9</sup> Agencies to which CCAP provided technical assistance successfully influenced Sacramento County officials and city leaders in Belmont, Calabasas, Novato, and Woodland to "...adopt resolutions/policies requiring a minimum of 50% of their units in multi-unit housing complexes to be designated as smoke free.

<sup>10</sup> Although the RTEP's objective specified indoor and outdoor common areas, the FER reports that 7 complexes had implemented this "comprehensive" policy (and there was No Smoking signage posted in some common areas) and 8 "...had demonstrated partial implementation." This adds up to 15, though the FER notes that 17 MUHs adopted smoke-free policies as a result of the project's implementation.

<sup>11</sup> Project staff was unsuccessful in convincing management of the target MUHs to implement a smoke-free policy but 2 other complexes were interested in adopting policies, so the staff worked with them. The FER doesn't describe the tenant population of those complexes.

<sup>12</sup> Six MUHs were targeted and 4 adopted smoke-free policies, 2 for the whole complex and 2 for common areas only. Two cities rather than the proposed 1 passed ordinances restricting exposure to SHS : Temecula for 25% of their MUHs and Loma Linda for 50%.

<sup>13</sup> Of the 12 MUHs complexes contacted by project staff, 3 "...implemented policies setting aside units for non-smokers in the first year of the project—in one case, as many as 15 of 45 units after receiving packets of information..." These were not tracked closely by the staff since they were not chosen targets. Also: the Community Development Commission, which apparently oversees half of the senior housing complexes in Plumas County, has expressed an interest in making 100% of their units smoke free.

<sup>14</sup> Although REACT's objective specified 6 MUHs and they were successful at 6 MUHs, project activities—as described by the FER—involved hundreds of apartment complexes and their low-income tenants." Breathtaking. Improbable.

<sup>15</sup> The actions of these 2 owner/managers are not claimed as results of the somewhat disorganized-sounding intervention mounted by the Santa Cruz Tobacco Free Community Planning Group (CPG), probably correctly; however, the CPG was in touch with them, and with 6 others, during the project and may have been influential in their decision making.

## Analysis of the Primary Areas of Investigation

In this report, we will begin by examining elements common to all projects that were selected by the Tobacco Control Evaluation Center as primary areas of investigation, due to their apparent link to successful outcomes in past analyses of FERs. These points include:

- Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations
- Educating decision makers and tenants
- Working with volunteers
- Using media for education and advocacy
- The impact of project staffing

Each of these points will be developed separately below, using tables constructed for the purpose, to explore the possibility of a correlation between a project's performance in these selected areas and its degree of success. The discussions of these elements reflect the amount of information available about them in the FERs. For example, the section on educating decision makers and tenants is by far the longest, in part because it received the greatest amount of description but—more importantly—because this is the area in which projects differ most, due to the variety of interventions undertaken.

### Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations

An efficient and practical way to extend the reach of any program is to mobilize members of local tobacco control coalitions and to join in partnership with other organizations that have similar goals. Table 3 provides an overview of the alliances and activities described in this set of FERs.

**Table 3. Involvement of coalition members and other organizations in project activities**

(Shading: *blue* = objectives exceeded, *green* = objectives met, none = objectives not met)

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)                        | COALITION MEMBERS                                                                                                                                                                                    | OTHER ORGANIZATIONS*                                                                                                        | ACTIVITIES                                                                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ALA of the East Bay/<br>EBSFH<br>(Emeryville) | LLAs of Alameda, Berkeley, Contra Costa & their coalitions; EBSFH Project Campaign Team (multi-grant collaborative including many long-standing relationships and substantial overlap among members) | Nonprofit Housing Assn of Northern CA; East Bay Asian Local Development Corp.; Citizen Housing Corp; Christian Church Homes | Regular communications, participation in LLA tobacco control coalitions, quarterly EBSFH Project Campaign meetings; other local meetings.                              |
| ALA of Sacramento/<br>RESPECT                 | Via the BREATH Smoke-free Housing Advisory Committee (AC), RESPECT worked LLAs of 9 counties & their coalitions                                                                                      | CCAP and other state and local non-smoking organizations                                                                    | Regular AC meetings, numerous conferences, creation of Action Kit ed. material, over 27 trainings, website, Apt. Owners Smoke-free Bill of Rights, media presentations |
| BREATHE of Sacramento (BCSET)                 | ?                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Rental Housing Association                                                                                                  | Ran ad in Association's magazine, used its logo on documentation, attended Association meetings                                                                        |
| BREATHE of Bay Area (San Jose)                | LLAs of Santa Clara & San Benito Counties                                                                                                                                                            | 5 apartment associations <sup>1</sup> plus the City of San Jose housing dept.                                               | Attended meetings and provided information on reducing 2 <sup>nd</sup> -hand smoke in common areas                                                                     |
| Catholic Charities (SFASD Project, San Diego) | ?                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 8 CBOs working with low-SES communities in San Diego County                                                                 | Formed a Community Planning Group to select indicators and help design implementation strategy                                                                         |
| CommuniCare TPP (Davis)                       | 1. Coalition members <i>[not named or described]</i>                                                                                                                                                 | 2. 11-member community planning group; 3. CHOC and SAMC <sup>2</sup>                                                        | 1. helped staff w/ strategic plan; 2. Yolo Co. needs assessment, choice of 2.2.12; 3. MOU to work for smoke-free policies in 9 MUHs <sup>2</sup>                       |

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)              | COALITION MEMBERS                                                                                          | OTHER ORGANIZATIONS*                                                                                         | ACTIVITIES                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ETR CCAP<br>(Sacramento)            | ?                                                                                                          | (a) Planning phase: CA Apt. Assoc., local businesses; (b) training: TCS & 38 LLAs/agencies                   | (b) CS monthly teleconferences & meetings, data-gathering, surveys, updating brochures, conducting trainings/technical assistance                 |
| Fresno Co. EOC RTEP<br>(Fresno)     | ?                                                                                                          | ?                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                   |
| Imperial Co. TEP<br>(El Centro)     | "Adult coalition members"                                                                                  | Planning phase: partner agencies & non-profits                                                               | Helped TPP staff choose their objective.                                                                                                          |
| NCCWB Respiro Libre<br>(Santa Rosa) | ?                                                                                                          | Local LLA, Sonoma Co. Asthma Coalition, & more <sup>3</sup>                                                  | Selected objective and collaborated on Secondhand Smoke Forum                                                                                     |
| Pasadena PTPC<br>(City of)          | ?                                                                                                          | <i>[collaboration mentioned but partners not noted]</i>                                                      | Learning from others, planning, working together— <i>[no specifics]</i>                                                                           |
| PHFE In the Zone<br>(Corona)        | 1. Riverside LLA Coalition                                                                                 | 2. RESPECT <i>[Also, per FER: "Collaborate with other projects within CA"]</i> <sup>4</sup>                  | 1. Strategic planning (MASC)<br>2. Co-presentation to Apt. Assoc. of Greater Inland Empire (200+ mbrs)                                            |
| Plumas Co. TURP<br>(Quincy)         | ?                                                                                                          | Community Development Commission                                                                             | Worked with TURP to promote smoke-free policy adoption.                                                                                           |
| REACT<br>(Fresno/Dinuba)            | ?                                                                                                          | "[O]ther tobacco control programs in the area"                                                               | Defined best practices & resources, shared database for planning                                                                                  |
| Sacramento Co. TEP<br>(Sacramento)  | ?                                                                                                          | 1. Rental Housing Assoc.<br>2. "other projects w/exp. in smoke-free housing"<br>3. Sac. Resident Advisory Bd | 1. Collaborative mailing to 12,000 MUH owners; 2. contacted/worked with other experienced groups; 3. surveyed tenants for Sac. RAB                |
| San Francisco TFP<br>(City)         | Tobacco Free Coalition's members <i>[not named but at least 8]</i> in the Secondhand Smoke Task Force      | ?                                                                                                            | Chose focus of campaign, developed policy options, sought endorsements & sponsors, conducted negotiations.                                        |
| The Santa Cruz Tobacco Free LGBT    | Tobacco Free Community Planning Group <sup>5</sup>                                                         | ?                                                                                                            | Chose an approach, designed activities, researched their position, redesigned approach/activities                                                 |
| Santa Cruz Co.<br>(Santa Cruz)      | ? <sup>6</sup>                                                                                             | 1. RESPECT; 2. Santa Cruz Co. Housing Authority                                                              | 1. Spoke at landlord seminar; 2. gave info. flyers to Section 8 housing mgrs                                                                      |
| Sutter Co. STEP<br>(Yuba City)      | ?                                                                                                          | ?                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                   |
| Ventura Co. LLA<br>(Ventura)        | 1. Ventura County Tobacco Education and Prevention Coalition, Smoke-Free Housing Subcommittee <sup>7</sup> | 2. Smokefree Air for Everyone; 3. UCLA School of Public Health, Cancer Div.                                  | 1. Chose objective, worked in both cities; 2. prepared/helped deliver survey of 95 in Oxnard; 3. surveyed 151 residents of CEDC MUHs <sup>8</sup> |
| Yolo Co. TPP<br>(Woodland)          | 1. Coalition members                                                                                       | 2. BREATH                                                                                                    | 1. Helped choose objective/target MUH; 2. provided info on smoke-free housing                                                                     |

\*So many FERs acknowledged the assistance of and materials provided by TALC, TCEC, TCS, TECC, and the Center for Tobacco Policy and Organizing that their vital contributions became almost a given.

<sup>1</sup>The apartment associations included the Santa Clara County Housing Authority, the Rancho San Antonio apartment complex (The Forum), the South County Collaborative, South County Property Management, and Project Access.

<sup>2</sup>CHOC is the Community Housing Opportunities Corp., a non-profit affordable housing development agency managing several low-income properties in Yolo County, whose subsidiary, Sterling Asset Mgmt Co (SAMC), worked directly with the CommuniCare TPP to assist with the intervention. More than "assist"; the management declared that the complexes would go smoke free.

<sup>3</sup>In addition to the local LLA and the Sonoma County Asthma Coalition, local organizations with similar goals that worked on the Respiro Libre Program included the Tobacco Coalition for a Smoke Free Sonoma County and California Rural Legal Assistance.

<sup>4</sup>The PHFE In the Zone FER had the annoying habit of using present and future tenses when listing activities and neither clarifying whether the activities had actually taken place nor discussing their implementation, so whether they did what they intended to do is a mystery to me. Also: the only one of the "other projects in CA" named was RESPECT.

<sup>5</sup>The Tobacco Free Community Planning Group (CPG) was comprised of LGBT community members and representatives of agencies and colleges; it appears to function like LLA-derived coalitions.

<sup>6</sup>A very popular intervention activity for tenants was a series of county-wide health fairs. "Partner agencies" were credited with providing bilingual staff to assist at South County housing complexes; these agencies were not identified either by name or as coalition members.

<sup>7</sup>The Ventura County coalition decided to take on smoke-free MUH complexes based in part on "...an appropriate use of scarce LLA and community resources (including the expressed willingness of coalition members to work on the issue)." Members of the Coalition included Smokefree Air for Everyone (SAFE), local American Lung Association, American Cancer Society, statewide Hispanic/Latino Tobacco Education Partnership, and "others."

<sup>8</sup>CEDC stands for Cabrillo Economic Development Corp. According to the FER, CEDC is "...the largest private affordable housing provider in Ventura Co. and its nonsmoking policy is a watershed event... [Its] strong policy action and subsequent resident survey provide powerful tools for advocacy with other affordable housing providers locally, statewide and nationally." Its support was a great help to the project.

~~~~~

Although ten of the FERs made no mention of putting their tobacco control coalitions to work, this may have been an oversight rather than an indication that there was no involvement. Of those organizations that did use the expertise and energy of their coalition members, seven requested their help in choosing objectives and shaping and reshaping strategic plans. Some coalition members took an active part in project activities. For example, the Ventura County LLA mobilized the Ventura County Tobacco Education and Prevention Coalition—particularly the Smoke-Free Housing subcommittee—and turned them into a cadre of trained advocates for tobacco-free housing. In fact, as the FER comments, the LLA designed its project—an ambitious one, given their scarce resources—around their coalition’s “expressed willingness” to work on the issue. And work they did: attending all seven meetings of the “highly contentious” City Manager’s Stakeholders Committee in Thousand Oaks, attending city council meetings in both Thousand Oaks and Oxnard, writing letters to the editor, and generally assisting in any way they could.

Like most of the other LLAs and Compets, the Ventura County LLA partnered with a variety of other organizations, such as local chapters of national organizations like the American Lung Association and the American Cancer Society in addition to local community-based organizations and “others.” FERs reported that project staff joined with a variety of state and local organizations to gain the benefits of working together toward mutual goals, many of them taking advantage of networks already established during earlier projects. County health departments were often numbered among the partners undertaking a joint effort in the area of tobacco control, sometimes with the implication that the LLA or Compet would assist them with their agenda in other areas as well. In addition, most projects were careful to acknowledge their debt to the California Department of Public Health, Tobacco Control Program, for the abundance of technical assistance that helped inform every aspect of their work.

A number of examples of successful collaboration were offered in the FERs reviewed for this study; several are included here to demonstrate some of the benefits—often unexpected—realized through collaboration.

The American Lung Association’s (ALA) East Bay Smoke-Free Housing (EBSFH) Project initially targeted two MUHs for seniors during this grant period, collaborating with LLAs from three counties and several other housing and nonprofit organizations. During the course of the EBSFH Project’s work and the publicity garnered by the multiplex effort, administrators of two other housing complexes in the region came to learn of the ongoing effort and requested similar assistance. As a result, the EBSFH Project was able to more than double the number of units they had targeted for Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12, from the original 173 units to a total of 418. Perhaps even more important in the long run, the newly-educated property management teams with which the EBSFH Project and their team were working are responsible for over 4,000 housing units in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The ALA of Sacramento RESPECT project launched an even more comprehensive effort that involved the LLAs of five counties and numerous owner/manager apartment associations and companies as members of the active *BREATH Smoke-free Housing Advisory Committee* involved in both exchanging information and teaching others. Members of this committee took part in conferences and educational material development in addition to working directly with local housing groups throughout California upon request. In addition, RESPECT staff partnered with state and county tobacco control agencies to develop and present educational materials on

smoke-free housing to interested organizations as well as to state and local government officials, and to conduct trainings for like-minded groups. The interconnections formed through these processes allowed information to be gathered from many sources and to flow at multiple levels into communities throughout California. The FER found the cross-pollination among the groups involved to be essential to the success of the project: “The major strength of this evaluation design is the varied population from whom data were collected. Information was solicited from developers/ builders/contractors, LLAs, permit authorities, and multi-unit housing owners/managers, representing the collaborative and far-reaching scope of this objective.”

The Central Valley Regional Advocates Countering Tobacco (REACT) Project counted among notable interventions in their FER the fact that they coordinated with “local, regional, and statewide tobacco control stakeholders to identify best practices, available resources, and to avoid duplication of services” and worked with “the California Smokers’ Helpline to identify possible strategies for increasing the use of the Helpline services by low income groups targeted by the program.” REACT further mentioned sharing their electronic database of contact information with “...other tobacco control programs in the area for consideration in planning interventions and/or trainings.” No doubt this was beneficial to REACT as well as to their partners.

Collaboration can work well in smaller venues as well. Although the Yolo County TPP was having a momentum-sustaining problem due to the perpetual turnover of student interns, the loose partnership they had formed with the Davis Rental Managers Association successfully passed educational materials along to interested MUH managers when the latter were curious and open to influence. At least one of these managers did adopt a smoke-free policy later on.

Significance of this factor. In assessing the importance of collaboration to a successful outcome as demonstrated in this set of FERs, it appears to be of considerable significance. Not all FERs covered this area with equal concentration—ten didn’t mention the involvement of their coalitions and four didn’t discuss partnerships formed with other agencies—and not all projects which did report working with their coalitions and/or other organizations succeeded in meeting their objectives. We can say, however, that of those projects that did meet and exceed their objectives, a robust demonstration of collaborative activity was certainly in evidence.

### **Educating decision makers and tenants**

The 21 projects differed widely on their choice of targets and on their approaches to reaching and educating decision makers (and, in most cases, tenants as well). This section addresses three phases in the work of getting smoke-free policies introduced, accepted, and implemented. First, there is target selection. Next, project staff need to gain access to the people who can make the decision to go forward with policy adoption, and also to those who will live with the decision. Finally, decision makers and tenants must be educated about the issues involved from the dangers of secondhand smoke to the arguments for smoke-free policies to the realities of policy implementation. Project staff have to be prepared to adapt general information to specific circumstances and to stand ready to allay fears and concerns that arise during the process.

Table 4 below provides a glimpse of target selection, tenant activity and the nature of educational efforts for both decision makers and tenants.

**Table 4. Campaign targets and educational efforts**  
 (Shading: *blue* = objectives exceeded, *green* = objectives met, none = objectives not met)

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)                        | DECISION MAKERS TARGETED                                                         |                                            | TENANTS<br>ENGAGED?*                                                                                                      | NATURE OF EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS                                                                                            |                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                               | INITIAL FOCUS                                                                    | FOCUS<br>CHANGED<br>TO:                    |                                                                                                                           | FOR DECISION MAKERS                                                                                                      | FOR TENANTS                                                                                                   |
| ALA of the East Bay<br>(EBSFH, Emeryville)    | Property dev. & mgmt administrators serving seniors at 4 MUHs                    | -                                          | 1. Resident surveys<br>2. Tenant meetings & presentations<br>3. Chinese translation                                       | Technical assistance information re: developing smoke-free policies                                                      | Fliers, handouts: (dangers of exposure to 2 <sup>nd</sup> -hand smoke); surveys                               |
| ALA of Sacramento<br>(RESPECT)                | Housing developers/contractors via local permitting agencies; state/local gov'ts | Rental housing associations, city councils | No.                                                                                                                       | Housing fact sheets and issue papers, sample policies, Action Kit, website                                               | -----                                                                                                         |
| BREATHE CA of Sacramento (BCSET)              | MUH owners/mgrs & property mgmt firms                                            | Private owners <sup>1</sup>                | No.                                                                                                                       | Information packet, <sup>2</sup> owner/mgr survey                                                                        | -----                                                                                                         |
| BREATHE CA of the Bay Area (San Jose)         | MUH owners/mgrs & Housing Authority of Santa Clara County                        | -                                          | 1. Tenant meetings & presentations <sup>3</sup><br>2. Tenants voted to have smoke-free policy <sup>3</sup>                | A model lease agreement for 1 MUH briefly noted. ( <i>No other comments.</i> )                                           | Staff helped with a brochure re: the new policy for 1 MUH.                                                    |
| Catholic Charities (SFASD Project, San Diego) | 111 owners/mgrs at low SES complexes                                             | -                                          | 881 tenants in 80 MUHs received educational material <sup>4</sup>                                                         | Model policies, fact sheets, a DVD & <i>Smoke-free Living</i> packets <sup>5</sup>                                       | TECC info; e.g., brochures about smoke-free complexes                                                         |
| CommuniCare TPP (Davis)                       | Exec. Dirs of CHOC and SAMC; SAMC leadership and site managers <sup>6</sup>      | -                                          | 1. 11 Community Info Nights at 9 MUHs<br>2. Resident advocates<br>3. Tenant polls/6 MUHs                                  | Extensive education packet presentations for SAMC leadership; <sup>7</sup> gift baskets and meetings with MUH mgrs       | Flyers, brochures, presentations (prizes, food), pre-/ post tests, polls; post-policy newsletters             |
| ETR CCAP (Sacramento)                         | City/county policy makers via DHS/TCS-funded orgs & others                       | -                                          | No.                                                                                                                       | Updating smoke-free MUH literature, providing training/technical assistance to LLAs, etc.                                | -----                                                                                                         |
| Fresno Co. EOC RTEP (Fresno)                  | Owners, managers, key opinion leaders                                            | -                                          | 1. Noche de Cine <sup>8</sup><br>2. Public opinion poll <sup>8</sup>                                                      | Anti-tobacco educational material, presentations re: litter and SHS                                                      | Presentations (litter, SHS), anti-tobacco material, Smoker's Helpline brochures                               |
| Imperial Co. TEP (El Centro)                  | Housing authority directors and staff                                            | -                                          | 1. Resident surveys + key informant interviews<br>2. TEP/resident fact sheet creation<br>3. Training tenants <sup>9</sup> | 1-hr presentations to 72 housing authority staff with ed. packets, 6 shorter sessions with managers with sample policies | 8 presentations plus 131 educational packets; 250 fact sheets "spearheaded" by tenants were also distributed. |
| NCCWB Respiro Libre (Santa Rosa)              | Management of 4 MUHs serving Latinos                                             | Management of 2 other MUHs                 | Key informant interviews w/9 tenants post-policy                                                                          | Multiple presentations to initial target management                                                                      | -----                                                                                                         |



| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)              | DECISION MAKERS TARGETED                                        |                                                 | TENANTS<br>ENGAGED?*                                                                                  | NATURE OF EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                     | INITIAL FOCUS                                                   | FOCUS<br>CHANGED<br>TO:                         |                                                                                                       | FOR DECISION MAKERS                                                                                                                | FOR TENANTS                                                                                                                       |
| Pasadena PTPC<br>(City of)          | Landlords/owner/<br>managers, condo<br>homeowner's board        | -                                               | 51 residents of a 72-unit<br>condo took a survey                                                      | Seminars, technical assistance                                                                                                     | Some presentations, 2<br>seminars, some technical<br>assistance                                                                   |
| PHFE In the Zone<br>(Corona)        | City policy makers,<br>MUH owners/mgrs                          | -                                               | 1. Presentations (4<br>tenant groups)<br>2. Tenant focus groups<br>3. Survey their MUH                | Meetings, phone consults,<br>educational packet, sample<br>policies, and signage                                                   | "Tobacco 101" trainings for<br>15-20 tenants                                                                                      |
| Plumas Co. TURP<br>(Quincy)         | Owners/managers &<br>MUH board members                          | -                                               | Some served as Key<br>Informants.                                                                     | Written surveys and Key Informant<br>interviews.<br><i>[Other contact &amp; "packets" hinted<br/>at but not described in FER.]</i> | <i>[No materials or contact<br/>beyond Key Informant<br/>interviews mentioned in FER]</i>                                         |
| REACT<br>(Fresno/Dinuba)            | Owners/mgrs, mgmt<br>companies, housing<br>authority agencies   | -                                               | A total of 95 tenants at 5<br>MUHs responded to a<br>public opinion survey                            | "[T]echnical support and staff<br>resource" plus "an informational<br>packet" and "training."                                      | "[E]ducational presentations"<br>& "educational materials" plus,<br>for some, a survey                                            |
| Sacramento Co. TEP<br>(Sacramento)  | MUH owners &<br>builders                                        | -                                               | Tenants surveyed at 3<br>MUHs                                                                         | Mailings to 12,000 owners/mgrs,<br>presentations to owners/mgrs,<br>brochures sent to 10 builders                                  | <i>[No contact or materials<br/>mentioned in the FER except<br/>surveys that were mailed]</i>                                     |
| San Francisco TFP<br>(City)         | Board of Supervisors                                            | -                                               | No.                                                                                                   | Educational material, including a<br>specially-designed model policy                                                               | -----                                                                                                                             |
| The Santa Cruz<br>Tobacco Free LGBT | Owners/managers (10<br>target, 10 control) <sup>10</sup>        | 8 owner/managers<br>only <sup>10</sup>          | No.                                                                                                   | SHS information, newspaper<br>article re: proposed state law<br>allowing smoke-free units                                          | -----                                                                                                                             |
| Santa Cruz Co.<br>(Santa Cruz)      | Property owners/mgrs                                            | -                                               | 1. Tenants at 16 MUHs;<br>2. Tenants at 1 MUH                                                         | Seminar attended by 33<br>owner/mgrs; TA as requested                                                                              | 1. Health fairs w/ information<br>on tobacco/nutrition/etc.; <sup>11</sup><br>2. Tenants surveyed (small<br>incentive offered)    |
| Sutter Co. STEP<br>(Yuba City)      | 1. Owners/managers                                              | 2. A single owner<br>with 4 ideal<br>properties | Resident surveys pre- &<br>post-intervention, also a<br>4-person focus group<br>(\$15 gift card each) | 1. Survey of owners/managers,<br>packets of educational material; 2.<br>a draft lease addendum per MUH                             | Lease addenda to sign (coffee<br>cup for returning them); letters<br>& health updates; signage; ed.<br>packets to the focus group |
| Ventura Co. LLA<br>(Ventura)        | Decision makers &<br>key opinion leaders/<br>groups in 2 cities | -                                               | Resident surveys                                                                                      | Public and private meetings to<br>educate decision makers in both<br>cities; fact sheets, sample policies                          | -----                                                                                                                             |
| Yolo Co. TPP<br>(Woodland)          | Apt. managers, Davis<br>Rental Mgrs Assoc.                      | -                                               | No.                                                                                                   | Informational 1-on-1 meetings,<br>luncheon seminar (8 mgrs), follow-<br>up meetings with 2 managers                                | -----                                                                                                                             |

\*This column refers only to tenants living in the target MUHs as opposed to "tenants" as a category. Some projects gathered survey information from apartment residents in convenience samples in the city or general area of the target complexes; information about that communication and those results may be used elsewhere in this report but not here.

<sup>1</sup> BCSET staff learned that apartment managers couldn't make policy and thus switched to property management firms and owners. But then they found that was hard to reach decision makers at these large firms, so in the end they focused solely on privately-owned MUHs with identifiable, accessible decision makers.

<sup>2</sup> *A Resource Guide to Easy & Affordable Smoke-Free Apartment*, containing 10 offerings ranging from statistics on tobacco usage and effects, through why and how to go smoke free, to sample rental agreements and how BCSET can help.

<sup>3</sup> The FER made a brief comment about tenants in two migrant farm worker labor camp apartment complexes being addressed in Spanish by a staff member and given the opportunity (presumably by the MUH manager) to vote on whether their housing units should be covered by a smoke-free policy. If project staff spoke to tenants in the other two complexes about second-hand smoke (in addition to offering them cessation classes, which *is* documented in the FER), it isn't mentioned.

<sup>4</sup> The SFASD Projects' FER reports, "The distribution of educational materials to tenants may have raised awareness on the issue, but did not spark any large scale advocacy campaigns by residents."

<sup>5</sup> *Smoke-free Living* packets contained "copies of articles, stories and smoking data on the adverse consequences of smoking as well [as] information on insurance benefits." Staff also developed and included "An educational DVD that portrays the cost of secondhand smoke on the overall benefits of creating smoke-free complexes..."

<sup>6</sup> The CommuniCare TPP aligned itself with CHOC, a non-profit affordable housing development agency, and worked through its subsidiary, SAMC, which manages CHOC's MUHs, to carry out the intervention. Although the TPP worked with management at the individual MUHs, it appears that the primary decision maker was the executive director of CHOC.

<sup>7</sup> The TPP emphasized that the "high quality education packet" they developed for SAMC leadership and site managers included special focus on affordable housing and resident health (a nod to the protective nature of this affordable housing provider), not *just* the cost-benefit of smoke-free housing, plus a signage catalog.

<sup>8</sup> The FER's objective encompassed 15 MUHs and the RTEP describes family movie nights at 2 complexes totaling 240-280 units, after which tenants supported and obtained smoke-free common area policies. The FER also reports 305 surveys being completed after the movie nights. But we aren't told how many MUHs actually held movie nights or how many presentations were given to residents of which complexes, making it difficult to tie the intervention to the outcome.

<sup>9</sup> Residents of two targeted housing authority complexes received "train-the-trainer" programs (26 from one area and 22 from another) after some tenants called the LLA "...inquiring how they could be involved" that equipped them to post smoke-free signage, go door-to-door to educate fellow tenants, and even help organize community workshops. Those who completed the activity received plaques of recognition.

<sup>10</sup> The Tobacco Free Community Planning Group (CPG) hypothesized that the LGBT population would tend to live in MUHs for a number of reasons and expected to have no trouble designing an experimental approach that included 20 owner/managers of the MUHs. But the CPG discovered that the LGBTs live in types of MUH that fall outside TCP guidelines, such as shared or subdivided single houses split into multiple apartments. The CPG was obliged to recast their design around the 8 complexes that fit TCP criteria.

<sup>11</sup> Project staff, planning on 2-3 tenant health fairs, sent information to 200 properties. The response was overwhelming and staff had to cut it off at 16. Partner agencies provided bilingual staff to help with South County housing complexes. "The majority of these were in Senior housing settings, which confirmed the advice provided by RESPECT that senior housing is currently one of the most available venues for smoke-free housing advocacy."



Determining point of access: strategies in selecting targets. Many FERs described past activities among target populations, MUH complexes, or local government entities as providing natural beginning points for the activities planned under the project's current objectives. These groups had the advantage of being familiar with the territory in which they proposed to work, often with the added benefit of previously-established good will among colleagues and other contacts. Other groups were beginning fresh with a new objective and appeared to settle first what they wished to accomplish and then to select the MUH complexes that they thought would suit their design. In the latter case, determining which owners/managers would be amenable to considering adopting a smoke-free policy often required a winnowing process that took quite a bit of time.

At least three projects chose their target MUH complexes based upon resident complaints. A resident of Independence Plaza, a five-building senior housing complex in Alameda, CA, called the American Lung Association, East Bay Smoke-Free Housing/EBSFH staff to complain about a neighbor's drifting cigarette smoke. Asked to show that other neighbors also considered this to be a problem, this resident attended the Alameda Housing Commission's next monthly meeting with eight letters from other neighbors in hand. Independence Plaza thus became one of the EBSFH Project's target complexes—and one of their success stories. Similarly, an asthmatic tenant at Plum Orchard Apartments drew BREATHE California of the Bay Area's attention when she called them to ask if anything could be done about smoke drifting into her apartment from nearby units. It was she who referred the staff member to the apartment manager, which ultimately led to a smoke-free complex. The Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Tobacco Education Program (TEP) responded to a phone call from a tenant who had recently moved to the East Cliff Village housing complex for "income seniors and persons with mobility impairments...operated by Volunteers of American, one of the nation's largest nonprofit providers of affordable housing for low-income housing." She asked for help in dealing with secondhand smoke in her apartment unit. Calls from other tenants followed, so the TEP sent educational material to them and a letter to the facility manager. This led to an interchange of questions and answers, culminating in East Cliff Village becoming a project case study, written up at length in the FER. (It would be nice to report that, after the considerable amount of time and effort devoted to it, ECV adopted a complex-wide smoke-free policy, but in fact the original manager departed and the new manager who arrived opined that smoke-free units would not be feasible: "way too big a job." Boy, were they pissed.)

One of the valuable discoveries reported in several FERs concerned the recognition that the initial set of decision makers or point of access was not the best choice for achieving the project's goals. The American Lung Association of Sacramento/RESPECT had that experience. They reasoned that an effective way to reach developers, contractors, and builders with information on smoke-free housing would be to go through the permit center where applications are received for building projects. But after studying this intervention zone more closely, RESPECT staff concluded that permit offices, though very helpful in matters of construction culture and infrastructure, are not typically the gatekeepers of information and decision making. Instead, as they reported in their FER, "...achieving new policies was easier when working directly with owners and managers or city and county governments."

Making contact with decision makers. Once the target selection process was complete, project staff had to find ways to contact the decision makers with whom they hoped to work. This took time; FERs described multiple phone calls and repeated visits with either public officials or owner/managers before serious talks could begin.

Reaching decision makers in local government. Projects targeting public officials have the advantage of working with people who have deliberately entered public service and have thus made themselves accessible to their constituency, at least in principle. Still, the five organizations that chose to pursue their secondhand smoke objectives by seeking city or county ordinances—ALA of Sacramento/RESPECT, ETR CCAP of Sacramento,

PHFE In the Zone, San Francisco TFP, and Ventura County LLA—found that the members of the city council and county board of supervisors could be quite elusive.

Several projects found that two approaches proved to be particularly effective:

- providing local representatives with tangible evidence of the problem, such as clear plastic bags filled with cigarette butts gathered at the target area, together with statistics based on polls conducted with tenants and/or landlords showing the preferences of their constituents, and
- packing council and board meetings with vocal members of local anti-tobacco groups and articulate stakeholders, using the occasion both to inform the policy makers and to gain some media attention.

The application of youthful volunteers to either of these efforts tends to add an element of appeal and drama to the activity that is always helpful.

Busy county supervisors and city council members sometimes delegate meetings with advocates to their staff members. The Tobacco Free Coalition members associated with San Francisco's Tobacco Free Project (TFP)—the only one of the five projects targeting public officials that was unable to meet its objectives—lost a great deal of time and learned some bitter lessons when they politely agreed to work with the legislative aide of a selected member of the Board of Supervisors, a man they hoped would sponsor the ordinance to restrict smoking in MUH complexes throughout the city and county. They engaged in months of good-faith negotiations with this aide, only to be told at the end of that time "...that the supervisor was not willing to sponsor all the policy options that had been negotiated between the Coalition and the aide." Having to start over with another potential sponsor set the project back a whole grant cycle. They emerged from this experience with a wealth of dearly bought knowledge: "Clearly assess policy makers and their level of support for the issues. Be sure you know where the policymaker stands before beginning a negotiating process. Don't put all your eggs in one basket regarding sponsorship. Wait until the right policymaker is identified, ideally someone the Coalition has worked well with in the past. Have access to allies who can educate the Coalition about how the political process works."

Despite this unfortunate experience, it is generally true that an alliance with sympathetic local politicians—the more respected, the better—gives a MUH smoke-free project a leg up in the struggle for local government's time and recognition with other worthy projects. ALA of the East Bay/EBSPH staff, for example, met with the mayor of the City of Dublin and a senior housing complex administrator (whose MUH complex was 100% smoke free) to discuss such housing policies. The mayor, known to be already supportive of smoke-free policies, subsequently required that a new city-subsidized senior multi-housing complex open with 100% smoke-free units.

Reaching decision makers in the housing industry. Several FERs discussed problems they encountered in attempting to search out the individual actually able to make the decision about instituting a non-smoking policy. For some projects, this effort turned out to be the most frustrating and time-consuming activity in the intervention plan. For reasons as varied as the targeted MUH complexes and housing authorities themselves, personal and bureaucratic obstacles were frequently placed in the path of project staff trying to locate the right person to talk to about their plan for protecting residents from secondhand smoke. In at least one case, as the PHFE In the Zone's FER noted, it turned out managers were deliberately blocking access to the owner because they were smokers themselves and didn't want to have to change their own comfortable habits.

Sorting through a complicated organization chart on the way to locating the true decision maker—and attempting to do this on a large scale—kept Catholic Charities' Smoke-Free for All San Diegans (SFASD) project from reaching its goals. Project staff planned an educational intervention to help address the need for tobacco control policies among low-

SES MUHs in San Diego County. After contacting 192 MUH administrators, SFASD staff obtained permission to give a presentation to 111 “owner/managers,” but they couldn’t be entirely certain that they were addressing the right individuals: According to their FER, “Although efforts were made to speak directly to those who had authority over policy decisions, it was often difficult to determine if the person interviewed for the education intervention was an individual who had the ability to set or alter housing complex politics.”

BREATHE of Sacramento/BCSET started out trying to contact apartment managers but found them difficult to reach and reluctant to return phone calls—and, more to the point, they were not empowered to make policy decisions. Next they targeted large property management firms, where they had trouble sorting through the bureaucracy to identify and contact true decision makers. Finally they settled on locating small, privately-owned complexes where they could work directly with the owner/decision-maker, which allowed them to tailor their strategies to the unique situation and needs of each MUH and also allowed them to succeed in meeting their objective.

The Northern California Center for Well-Being’s Respiro Libre Program, on the other hand, found that “The strategy of targeting individual MUH complexes...was very labor intensive [i.e., personal visits to each site multiple times to talk with the owners/managers].” Using that approach cost them a successful outcome. Their suggestion: “Targeting specific cities that show interest in smoke-free housing to adopt ordinances might prove to be more cost-effective, less labor-intensive, and increase the number of smoke-free housing more rapidly.”

Reaching the residents of MUH complexes. Most of the FERs in this set described projects whose successful outcomes depended in large part upon the buy-in from the residents of the targeted MUH complexes. In order to appreciate the magnitude of the task awaiting the project staff, it is helpful to consider who they were trying to reach. Thirteen of the projects seeking to reduce or eliminate secondhand smoke in MUH complexes explicitly targeted lower socioeconomic status “priority populations” whose use of tobacco products tends to run several percentage points higher than the rest of California. Eight projects focused on senior housing, three selected Latino/Hispanic residents, and two others, by comprising all of San Diego County and all of San Francisco, encompassed both populations. The Santa Cruz Tobacco Free LGBT project concentrated specifically on that special population, which statistically has the highest rate of smokers of all.

Tenants that initiated intervention by contacting local non-smoking projects were rare but, despite their comparatively high percentage of tobacco use, most residents of the targeted MUH complexes appeared to greet project staff bent on curtailing smoking with interest and gratitude rather than suspicion and hostility. CommuniCare Health Centers in Yolo County observed that even low-SES tenants, though statistically likely to be smokers, turned out to support new policies prohibiting smoking when educated about health benefits of smoke-free surroundings.

One of the standard ways of meeting and engaging tenants is by conducting resident surveys and focus groups (in English, Spanish, and Chinese). Not only do such surveys and round-table discussions tend to show broad support for smoke-free living that can be used to convince decision makers that residents are strongly in favor of limiting or eliminating tobacco use in the complex, they also serve to educate and involve tenants, giving them a stake in the matter. The Fresno County EOC RTEP engaged migrant workers and their families at two camps by holding “Noche de Cine” gatherings, preceding the movie with an anti-tobacco commercial and following it with surveys. Health fairs gave at least three projects an opportunity both to reach and to educate residents of MUH complexes, though not necessarily tenants in the MUHs they were targeting.

Four projects went beyond polling tenants to holding meetings at the complexes to provide education, discuss results of resident surveys, and secure tenant involvement. As the Plumas

County Tobacco Use Reduction Program noted, “Program staff felt that soliciting resident buy-in would make it their policy, and therefore would more likely be implemented. That is, rather than being imposed from “outside,” these policies, if adopted, would belong to the residents themselves.” ALA of the East Bay/EBSPH convened a Smoking Policy Committee (comprising housing commission members, management staff, and a resident from each of five buildings) that met monthly to consider smoke-free protections.

Educating decision makers and tenants. An examination of the FERs suggests that among the components of a successful educational intervention, two attain special eminence: appropriate educational materials and personal relationships.

Assembling educational materials. Although each project was unique, there were similarities in the process of collecting information to illustrate and support the projects’ marketing strategy in nearly every FER. Three sources of information were mentioned most frequently:

- the clearinghouse of current, accurate information in persuasive packages of proven efficacy: the California Department of Public Health, Tobacco Control Program websites (particularly the Tobacco Education Clearinghouse of California [TECC], C-STATS, the Technical Assistance Legal Center [TALC], and the Tobacco Control Evaluation Center [TCEC]) that can be adapted and accessorized for local use;
- other agencies with experience in tobacco control advocacy, from national organizations such as the American Lung Association, to other LLAs and Compets with expertise in similar work, to local CBOs and city/county health departments whose visible collaboration lends legitimacy to the project in addition to materials and advice; and
- independent research to gather intensely pertinent local data, from public sources such as local government meeting minutes and local and national print media to the most effective educational tools of all: the results of process evaluation activities conducted specifically for this project, especially through tenant surveys and key informant interviews.

Establishing personal relationships. Building on preliminary contacts and early exchanges of views, project staff went out of their way to develop close relationships with decision makers and residents. Nearly one-third of this set of FERs explicitly emphasized how vital personal relationships are to the success of policy adoption, and several more made similar points less directly. In an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect, projects can move forward more quickly and focus their efforts more effectively in tailoring information and guidance to each decision maker’s specific needs. Projects offered the following comments:

- “Personal contact and trusted relationships with key decision makers such as city officials, housing authorities, owners and managers and apartment association leadership was a key ingredient for the successful passage of smoke-free/restricted smoking policies. ... interactions by property owners and managers with RESPECT’s own staff consultants made a greater impact than just distributing educational materials alone. Building personal relationships was especially important in smaller/rural communities.”—ALA of Sacramento/RESPECT
- “Cultivating a relationship with and backing from the Rental Housing Association, thus providing the project with credibility among apartment managers, property managers, and property owners....During the three years, staff fine-tuned their method for working with apartment complex owners and managers on policy adoption, reporting their relationship with the Rental Housing Association as a ‘key’ contributing factor to project success.”—BREATHE of Sacramento/BCSET
- “The most important factor leading to the successful adoption of smoke-free policies was relationship building and providing continuous support to the property managers.”—BREATHE of the Bay Area, CommuniCare

- “[W]orking with RESPECT and conducting a presentation for the Apartment Association of the Greater Inland Empire...That was very well received...and created a great rapport with the owners/managers who attend these meetings.”—PHFE In the Zone
- Finally, the Sutter County STEP developed a relationship of such trust with the busy owner of their four target MUHs (and a great deal of other rental property as well) that it “...eventually resulted in him giving us permission to do the work required to implement the policy on his behalf including: drafting the contract addendums [sic]; writing letters to residents informing them of the proposed policy and contract addendum; and distributing and collecting the signed addendums from residents.”

Table 5 below sketches the educational activities undertaken by the projects in this set, emphasizing the degree of contact with the individuals and groups involved in making the decisions about adopting smoke-free policies and in living with them.

**Table 5. Training and technical assistance**

(Shading: *blue* = objectives exceeded, *green* = objectives met, none = objectives not met)

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)                              | TRAINING/TECHNICAL<br>ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO:                                                                                                            | CONSISTING OF:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ALA of the East Bay/<br>EBSFH<br>(Emeryville)       | Property management staff of the two MUHs targeted for this project, plus the staff of two additional MUHs                                               | Meetings with property management staff, 2 <sup>nd</sup> -hand smoke training, sample lease addenda and model policies, smoke-free housing teleconference, tenant surveying and training as health promoters and surveyors, helping educate tenants re: new policies |
| ALA of<br>Sacramento/RESPECT                        | Over 27 trainings for 19 LLAs plus county staff and associations of managers and rental owners; 516 hours of technical assistance to TCS-funded projects | “Building on a Smoke-free Foundation” Campaign, including developing a full range of educational material in an Action Kit plus a City/County Model Resolution: “Apt. Owners Smoke-Free Bill of Rights”                                                              |
| BREATHE of<br>Sacramento (BCSET)                    | <i>(Policy implementation activity with MUH owners implied but not described.)</i>                                                                       | Information packet ( <i>A Resource Guide to Easy &amp; Affordable Smoke-Free Apartments</i> ) prepared/sent to over 350 MUHs.                                                                                                                                        |
| BREATHE of Bay Area<br>(San Jose)                   | Managers/administrators responsible for the 4 MUHs; tenants in 2 Latino camps                                                                            | “Considerable support and consultation” with project staff at 2 MUHs plus assistance in developing a post-policy brochure at 1 of those; bilingual coaching plus model lease agreement and help with signage at 2 migrant camp MUHs.                                 |
| Catholic Charities<br>(SFASD Project, San<br>Diego) | 111 owner/managers of low-SES MUHs in SD County that did not have smoke-free policies                                                                    | 111 30-40-minute presentations plus distribution of model policies and comprehensive educational packets.                                                                                                                                                            |
| CommuniCare TPP<br>(Davis)                          | SAMC property management leadership and site managers                                                                                                    | Comprehensive education packet, presentations and meetings, 2 training sessions, brochures for tenants, signage                                                                                                                                                      |
| ETR CCAP<br>(Sacramento)                            | 38 agencies, including the county and 4 cities that ultimately adopted ordinances.                                                                       | 1-on-1 technical assistance; trainings and teleconferences; updating educational materials; website, billboards                                                                                                                                                      |
| Fresno Co. EOC RTEP<br>(Fresno)                     | Owners, managers, key opinion leaders                                                                                                                    | <i>[Beyond initial presentations and meetings during which educational materials were offered, no TA was described.]</i>                                                                                                                                             |
| Imperial Co. TEP<br>(El Centro)                     | Housing authority managers/community service specialists; housing authority staff                                                                        | 6 10-20-min. educational sessions plus policy samples; 1-hour presentation to 72 staff with informational packets                                                                                                                                                    |
| NCCWB Respiro Libre<br>(Santa Rosa)                 | Management of 2 MUH complexes, local MUH owners/managers                                                                                                 | “Both managers rated the technical assistance they received as excellent...” – <i>[specifics not offered in FER]</i> ; Secondhand Smoke Forum, a seminar                                                                                                             |
| Pasadena PTPC<br>(City of)                          | Landlords (owners/managers), homeowners associations <sup>1</sup>                                                                                        | 2 seminars ( <i>How does smoke affect your property &amp; tenants?</i> ); tailor policy options to individual needs <sup>1</sup>                                                                                                                                     |
| PHFE In the Zone<br>(Corona)                        | Officials in 4 cities;<br>MUH owners/managers                                                                                                            | Sample signage, sample policies <i>[FER vague about how many city officials and owners/mgrs, what material offered, etc.]</i>                                                                                                                                        |
| Plumas Co. TURP<br>(Quincy)                         | <i>[Policy implementation activity with MUH owners/mgrs implied but not described.]</i>                                                                  | <i>(An information packet was alluded to but not described; no active technical assistance was described.)</i>                                                                                                                                                       |
| REACT<br>(Fresno/Dinuba)                            | Managers and management company personnel                                                                                                                | Training with educational materials, technical support, and “staff resource.”                                                                                                                                                                                        |

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)              | TRAINING/TECHNICAL<br>ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO:                                                                      | CONSISTING OF:                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sacramento Co. TEP<br>(Sacramento)  | <i>[Policy implementation activity with MUH owners/mgrs implied but not described.]</i>                            | <i>[No active technical assistance was described, though the FER mentioned obtaining sample rental agreements.]</i>                                                                                         |
| San Francisco TFP<br>(City)         | The legislative aide of a member of the Board of Supervisors                                                       | Repeated meetings to offer a general education on SHS and to discuss specific "model policy" options and strategies                                                                                         |
| The Santa Cruz<br>Tobacco Free LGBT | 2 of the 8 owners/managers targeted by the project                                                                 | <i>[Actual technical assistance to these individuals was not described, though the FER hints at meetings.]</i>                                                                                              |
| Santa Cruz Co.<br>(Santa Cruz)      | Owners/managers at targeted MUHs and several landlord seminar attendees who asked for assistance after the meeting | Landlord education seminar (33 attendees) and "extended communication" about developing policies/lease agreements with interested owners/managers                                                           |
| Sutter Co. STEP<br>(Yuba City)      | The owner and managers of 4 MUHs                                                                                   | Staff worked with owner to incorporate tenant poll results into lease addenda; staff ended up doing most of the implementation.                                                                             |
| Ventura Co. LLA<br>(Ventura)        | 17 local decision makers, 3 state legislators, 1 county supervisor, Cabrillo Economic Development Corp. board      | Fact sheet ( <i>Smoking in Apartments-Problems and Solutions</i> ), sample policy, PowerPoint presentation to Oxnard City Council, attendance at Thousand Oaks City Manager's Stakeholders Grp <sup>2</sup> |
| Yolo Co. TPP<br>(Woodland)          | 1. 8 apartment managers;<br>2. 2 apartment managers                                                                | 1. luncheon seminar re: benefits/trends in smoke-free housing, policy guidelines; 2. information about surveying tenants                                                                                    |

<sup>1</sup>The PTPC's FER provided a brief list of interventions and activities without descriptive detail and, because much of it was presented in the present and future tense, gave no hint as to whether the work described had actually been performed or whether the FER was just restating the project's goals and intentions.

<sup>2</sup>Attending the City Manager's Stakeholders Group, described in the Ventura County LLA's FER as "highly contentious" and "the Mad Hatter's Tea Party," was a vastly time-consuming and difficult task, and ultimately proved to be a disappointment, since the policy didn't require that the designated smoke-free units be contiguous, as staff had hoped.

Educating local government officials. Staff of the five projects that focused all or part of their efforts on getting city or county legislation passed spent a considerable amount of their time in one-on-one meetings with targeted individuals and working to get on the agendas of city councils and county boards of supervisors. There they made numerous formal and informal presentations that emphasized the hazards of secondhand smoke in MUH complexes together with a variety of solutions and compromises. PHFE In the Zone was able to bring dedicated volunteers, including high-school youth recruited from American Cancer Society youth groups, into the effort with positive results. Carefully constructed information packets, most including local statistics and results of community polls, were part of the standard intervention strategy, as were model resolutions and model policies adapted to the locality's unique circumstances and requirements. As mentioned above, all but one of the projects were able to meet their goals.

Educating owners/managers. A brief analysis of the nature of the interventions with MUH decision makers described in this set of FERs (summarized in Tables 4 and 5) demonstrates that the projects pursued similar activities and used similar materials in their efforts. They made endless phone calls and repeatedly met in person with administrators of property management companies and with individual owners and managers of single and multiple MUH complexes. Materials offered included

- special information packets that featured as much local information as possible, typically gained through conducting resident surveys at the targeted MUH complexes (where remarkably high percentages of tenants, even smokers, invariably responded that they wished for smoke-free housing, or at least for restricted tobacco use, in their complexes);
- sample policies and lease agreements, often from similar MUH complexes in the same or nearby areas, together with assurances of hand-holding technical assistance through every aspect of policy adoption; and
- embellishments such as gift baskets and DVDs of elegant presentations.

Deserving special mention as particularly powerful educational tools are specially-designed seminars, which worked very well for four projects. One was a luncheon, two were half-day events, and the two held by the fourth project were not described. All five events were said to be well attended and well received by area owners and managers, and brought in their wake follow-up requests for information and assistance.

- The Northern California Center for Well-Being's Respiro Libre Project in Santa Rosa held a Secondhand Smoke Forum—designed to educate owners/managers of MUH complexes about return on investment, health effects of secondhand smoke, how to adopt smoke-free policies, and success stories of cities and complexes that adopted such policies—and reported that it “was very valuable...and should have been something that was done much earlier in the project.”
- The City of Pasadena's Tobacco Control Program staff conducted two seminars in May and October of 2006, entitled “How Does Smoke Affect Your Property and Tenants?” which they worked hard to publicize, and the FER reported that “[b]oth seminars drew approximately 15 attendees.” The FER further states, “The Pasadena Tobacco Control Program's experience has been that these seminars have been an effective way of reaching those interested in a smoke-free housing policy that ultimately resulted in two housing complexes adopting a 100% smoke-free voluntary policy.”
- The seminar that the Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Tobacco Education program offered was attended by 33 owners/managers, all but two of whom already had some kind of smoke-free policy at their MUH. The FER said, “The value of the seminar was in providing them updated information and reassurance that their policies were legal and non-discriminatory.” In addition, six of the nine attendees surveyed were interested in coming to future seminars and three “were willing to be listed as referrals for community members seeing smoke-free housing.”
- The Yolo County TPP held an informational luncheon, attended by eight MUH managers, at which they disseminated educational material and discussed the benefits of smoke-free housing and the details of implementing policies. Several policies were subsequently implemented, for which the TPP felt they should get some of the credit.

This set of FERs offered a rich fund of experience-based advice on interfacing with owners and managers along the full spectrum of interest in smoke-free policies, from those who are ready to embrace the concept and just need a little help with the technical details to those who are resistant almost to the point of hostility. The sampling offered below is intended to show how much thought and effort went into devising strategies that would enable the projects to reach successful outcomes.

*For those in charge of multi-unit housing complexes and property management organizations who are already prepared to discuss developing policies, project staff had the following advice:*

- Sometimes all they need is momentum and assistance with the technical details in order to move forward with policy development. --ALA of the East Bay/EBSFH (Emeryville), CommuniCare TPP (Davis)
- “[P]roviding participants in the housing industry with the smoke-free ‘rationale’ combined with ‘how-to’ steps can significantly increase the likelihood of success in persuading rental property owners and managers to adopt smoke-free policies for their units.” --ALA of Sacramento/RESPECT

*For those in charge of multi-unit housing complexes and property management organizations who are being approached for the first time and are unfamiliar with the ramifications of smoke-free policies, project staff have some general guidance:*

- “Education presentations should be short, clear, and to the point. Strategize and customize what kind of information should be presented depending on each situation at the spot. Provide information that the managers probably do not know. Give them more time for questions and answers instead of just giving presentation. Focus on what managers/owners want to know.” –Catholic Charities (SFASD Project, San Diego)
- “Each complex should be treated uniquely: a ‘cookie-cutter’ approach does not work.-BREATHE of Bay Area (San Jose)
- “It is important to meet them face to face.” --BREATHE of Bay Area (San Jose)
- Bring a property owners who has successfully adopted a smoke-free policy and can provide a first-hand account of the experience in operating a MUH complex under a smoke-free policy. One manager, responding to a telephone survey after the seminar at which a landlord was a speaker, said, “ Beneficial to hear from an actual manager and the obstacles that he encountered.”—Santa Cruz County LLA
- “It would have been helpful to have apartment managers who have implemented smoke-free policies as allies, because this is what seemed to be effective in swaying opinions.” –Yolo County TPP
- “Non-profit housing agencies have different agendas than for-profit management companies.” Their concerns tend to involve social justice and health more than monetary considerations and while smoke-free living is better for tenant health, smoke-free policies might require limiting housing available to lower-SES people already having trouble finding homes. These conflicting issues require careful management.--Communicare TPP (Davis)
- Conducting owner/manager surveys can break the ice and open lines of communication. “Survey tool should be concise and only include the minimum necessary items since property managers are very busy [and] prefer not [to] answer many detailed questions.--Catholic Charities/SFASD Project (San Diego)
- Stimulating curiosity and interest in smoke-free housing gets smoke-free living on the minds of owners, managers, and tenants.--BREATHE of Sacramento/BCSET

*For those who regard the effort to educate them about secondhand smoke, its impact upon their tenants, and the benefits to all of smoke-free policies with grave misgivings and suspicion, project staff suggest:*

- Directly addressing the concerns that MUH administrators may have about the legality of smokers and the validity of their rights may help avoid the possibility that such undisclosed reservations can impede or derail initial discussions of smoke-free policy implementation. “Some property managers/owners are afraid of being sued by smokers because they believe that implementing a smoke-free policy may be discriminatory. For these managers, it is important to emphasize that while smoking is legal, it is not a protected right.” --Catholic Charities/SFASD Project (San Diego)
- “Unless there are already effective methods to enforce a smoke-free policy, property managers/owners do not want to implement the policy. It is imperative to come up with good enforcement plans to support the adoption of policies.” --Catholic Charities/SFASD Project (San Diego)



- “Flexibility is essential and suggesting a reluctant manager/owner start small,” with smoke-free playgrounds, recreation, and common areas can lead to other policies.-- BREATHE of Sacramento/BCSET
- “LLAs should be supportive and patient with ‘small wins’ and use them as leverage for future activities.” --Imperial Co. TEP (El Centro)
- “Be patient, it takes little steps.” --NCCWB Respiro Libre Project (Santa Rosa)

*For those who are disinterested and obstructive when approached to consider the possibility of adopting even the least intrusive smoke-free policies, the Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency TEP recommends wasting no further time. Under the heading “Resistance Precedes Reasons for Resistance,” the FER advises, “In some cases the project found itself responding to a series of reasons why a smoke-free policy could not be adopted. Each time project staff would provide an answer to one reason, a new one was put in place. It seems likely that such managers objected to smoke-free policies for reasons they did not wish to state, instead offering more reasonable-sounding grounds for inaction. Time and resources may be better spent working with the many landlords who are genuinely interested in smoke-free policies.”*

Additional insights into the complicated and challenging business of convincing owners/managers of MUH complexes to adopt smoke-free policies are provided in Appendix A.

Educating tenants. Many projects went out of their way to approach and cultivate relationships with the tenants of the targeted MUHs, learning from them, teaching them about the perils of second-hand smoke and the advantages of smoke-free housing, and turning them into helpers and allies. PHFE In the Zone conducted “Tobacco 101” trainings for at least 15 tenants and said in its FER, “Training [MUH residents] on the importance of tobacco prevention efforts, and data collection activities such as observation surveys and key informant interviews, increases local involvement and ownership of the project.” The Plumas County TURP took the same view: “Program staff felt that soliciting resident buy-in would make it their policy, and therefore would more likely be implemented. That is, rather than being imposed from ‘outside,’ these policies, if adopted, would belong to the residents themselves.”

A well-educated, strongly-motivated group of tenants which is recognized within their housing complex has a built-in credibility that few outside groups can match. Older tenants with some time on their hands may be glad to have some interesting and responsible work to do, as the ALA of the East Bay/EBSFH Project found at one of the MUHs they targeted. At Sojourner Truth Manor, the project staff selected six tenants to be “health promoters” and educated them about asthma and second-hand smoke issues. These health promoters knocked on every door in the three buildings of the complex with tenant surveys in hand, filling out the surveys themselves as the tenants answered the questions. They were able to complete 68 surveys out of a possible 87 for a response rate of 78%. In addition, as the City of Pasadena PTPC’s FER noted, residents “can assist the association or landlord in deciding whether they want to adopt such a policy and help shape the parameters of their policy (such as whether they should have a smoke-free section versus a 100% smoke-free building).”

Projects involved in this work used similar educational materials and similar means of getting their messages across. Most FERs reported obtaining survey and interview instruments through state Tobacco Control Program sources, from trusted and experienced nonprofits such as CCAP, and from other projects engaged in similar efforts, and then adapting them to their specific localities and populations. In addition to conducting surveys—both in person and via pencil and paper—and focus groups, project

staff and volunteers opened a potential dialogue with MUH residents by distributing fliers and handouts (in one of at least three languages, depending upon the resident population) describing the dangers of exposure to secondhand smoke and the advantages of smoke-free complexes. Information on accessing the Smoker's Helpline and locating cessation assistance was often part of the educational packets distributed. Some projects also made an effort to give tenants the chance to read and comment upon sample policy and lease agreements. In several cases after policies were adopted, project staff assisted MUH management by creating and distributing brochures and newsletters describing the new guidelines, how they worked, when they took effect, who they affected, and so on. They also held post-policy presentations to explain—in English and in Spanish—about the changes and to answer questions.

It would be misleading to portray the residents of the MUH complexes targeted by this set of projects as uniformly welcoming and enthusiastic. While vocal opponents constituted a small minority of the whole, comments some of them made at meetings, in focus groups, to surveyors, and in writing mirrored the strongest reactions from MUH managers and owners. The key informant interview that NCCWB Respiro Libre in Santa Rosa conducted with MUH residents after a no-smoking policy adoption produced mostly positive responses, but two tenants were less enthusiastic. One said, "I think I should be able to smoke in my home and on my deck," and the other, less clear on the concept of no smoking within his unit, said, "It's a good idea, as long as our rights are not violated to smoke in our home." The four residents who took part in a focus group convened by the Sutter County STEP were dubious about smoke-free policies in general and compliance with the new rules in particular. As the STEP FER explained, "While those present said that they would comply if the landlord implemented a policy, they felt that a penalty would have to be in place to prompt those who smoke to comply...They questioned how enforcement of such a policy would occur: 'Are we supposed to call (Landlord) at 6AM?'"

Significance of this factor. In assessing the importance of educating local officials, owners/managers and tenants to a successful outcome as demonstrated in this set of FERs, it appears to be of major significance. Project staff devoted a great deal of time to designing and implementing elaborate, innovative approaches to reach decision makers and tenants, worked closely with them throughout the process of considering and agreeing to policy adoption, and provided continual technical assistance and material help throughout the process and well after the policy had been adopted. The degree of education and assistance seems to be directly related to the success of the outcome.

### **Working with volunteers**

Nine FERs mentioned bringing volunteers into their projects and two of those involved youth in addition to adults. (A third project, run by the Yolo County TPP, made extensive use of student interns. Interns are usually paid workers but they aren't paid much. Student interns are a classic example of a mixed blessing: smart, energetic, dedicated, and cheap, they are also highly transitory and the need to train a new crop of students used up a lot of staff time.) In general, there was little discussion about the role of volunteers or their importance to the intervention in this set of FERs. It is possible that more projects, by engaging MUH residents as de facto assistants, actually did utilize volunteers without reporting their activities as such. (Descriptions of tenant activities on behalf of project implementation are offered in the previous section.)

The limited amount of information that could be extracted from this set of FERs is shown below in Table 6.

**Table 6.**

**Volunteer activity**

(Shading: *blue* = objectives exceeded, *green* = objectives met, none = objectives not met)

| LLAS/COMPETS (CITY)              | NO. OF VOLUNTEERS                                 | FUNCTIONS                                                                                                   | HOW RECRUITED                                                       | REWARDS/ INCENTIVES                                                         |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ALA of the East Bay (Emeryville) | 7 adults                                          | 1: Chinese translator<br>6: "health promoters," door-to-door surveyors                                      | Through the "Smoking Policy Committee"                              | Small stipend offered.                                                      |
| ALA of Sacramento/RESPECT        | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| BREATHE of Sacramento (BCSET)    | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| BREATHE of Bay Area (San Jose)   | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| Catholic Charities (San Diego)   | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| CommuniCare TPP (Davis)          | 13 adults                                         | Cadre of Resident Advocates w/many tasks <sup>1</sup>                                                       | At educational presentations                                        | <i>[not discussed]</i>                                                      |
| ETR CCAP (Sacramento)            | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| Fresno Co. EOC RTEP (Fresno)     | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| Imperial Co. TEP (El Centro)     | 48 adults                                         | Residents trained to explain smoke-free living to neighbors                                                 | Contacted LLA                                                       | Plaques of recognition                                                      |
| NCCWB Respiro Libre (Santa Rosa) | <i>[at least]</i> 9 youth                         | (1) Skit— <i>Mr. Malburro on Trial</i> —performed by/for high school students; (2) focus group <sup>2</sup> | <i>[not specified]</i>                                              | Held a celebration (5 of 9 came); focus group suggested snacks at meetings. |
| Pasadena PTPC (City of)          | <i>[mention but no description of volunteers]</i> | Conducted face-to-face surveys.                                                                             | <i>[not specified]</i>                                              | -                                                                           |
| PHFE In the Zone (Corona)        | 1. 35 adults<br>2. 11 youth                       | 1&2. Met with city officials, trained for apt surveys; 2. Spanish radio & cable TV interviews               | 1. CBO & tenant presentations; 2. Am. Cancer Soc./ HS youth council | <i>[Incentives mentioned but not described]</i>                             |
| Plumas Co. TURP (Quincy)         | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| REACT (Fresno/Dinuba)            | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| Sacramento Co. TEP (Sacramento)  | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| San Francisco TFP (City)         | ? Coalition members                               | Guided by TFP & Dave Binder Research, attempted policy change w/Board of Supervisors                        | ?                                                                   | ?                                                                           |
| The Santa Cruz Tobacco Free LGBT | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| Santa Cruz Co. (Santa Cruz)      | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| Sutter Co. STEP (Yuba City)      | ?                                                 |                                                                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                             |
| Ventura Co. LLA (Ventura)        | Coalition members                                 | Vigorously attended meetings with decision makers in 2 cities                                               | Existing Coalition                                                  | Satisfaction of doing a good job                                            |
| Yolo Co. TPP (Woodland)          | Student interns <sup>3</sup>                      | Prepared material, set up 7 meetings w/apt. mgrs, helped w/presentations, etc.                              | <i>[not specified]</i>                                              | Probably paid the usual pittance                                            |

<sup>1</sup>The Resident Advocate program trained selected low-SES tenants to serve as "a support system for the TPP, to help conduct intervention activities and foster support for smoke-free policies among MUH residents." Specific activities

included training as advocates (with the help of RESPECT) and (for 2) to participate in a radio broadcast, administering public opinion polls (100 polls at the 6 largest MUHs), distributing information to neighbors, and attending meetings with MUH managers.

<sup>2</sup>Youth participants in the focus group explained their willingness to participate: “having a family member affected by smoking and having been affected by smoking themselves.”

<sup>3</sup>Students used in this project were not strictly volunteers; they received intern-level pay for at least some of their activities.

Several projects described three ways their adult and youthful volunteers were deployed: distributing information to MUH complex residents, conducting surveys at apartment complexes and in neighborhoods, and lobbying local officials both in private sessions and in public forums such as city council and county board of supervisor meetings. The NCCWB Respiro Libre FER reported a more imaginative way to position its young volunteers: “Project highlights included a skit performed by High School students from Roseland University Prep titled: ‘Mr. Malburro on Trial,’ at their school on March 20, 2007, and at the *Cinco de Mayo* Festival in Roseland on May 5, 2007. Over 300 students and community members viewed the skit which had huge success and media coverage.” The ALA of the East Bay/EBSFH project was fortunate in having a resident in one of its targeted MUH complexes who not only joined their active Smoking Policy Committee but also offered to translate the Resident Survey into Chinese—and then met with 40 the Chinese-speak residents “to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer any questions.”

Significance of this factor. In assessing the importance of the role of volunteers to a successful outcome as demonstrated in this set of FERs, we are offered too little information in most FERs to make an informed judgment. Certainly those projects that took the time to develop and deploy volunteers were able to reach more people than they could with paid staff, which may have had an important effect on the eventual outcome for three of the five projects that exceeded their objectives. Of the two projects which reported the largest cadres of volunteers (Imperial County TEP, 48 adults; PHFE In the Zone, 35 adults and 11 youth), the former did not meet its objectives and the latter did. Evidence for the significance of this factor is inconclusive.

## **Using media for education and advocacy**

Projects sited in urban areas can choose from a variety of media outlets—newspapers in multiple languages, newsletters for businesses and the housing industry, radio and TV stations serving audiences of many cultures, even billboards and bus ads—when planning their media campaigns. They can target the specific populations living in the MUH complexes they plan to approach in the appropriate languages. In addition, they have often developed contacts in the local media who can be alerted for coverage of special events, such as health fairs and city council meetings when something dramatic is planned, and to whom press releases can be channeled with some hope of publication. The Ventura County LLA advised other groups targeting MUH complexes to “[u]se media to get survey results out to the public, using media outlets that influence decision makers.” This is good advice in areas where a selection of media outlets exists.

Smaller communities in rural areas have the dual disadvantage of very limited media coverage—usually a single newspaper and perhaps one radio station that serves the whole area—together with considerable independence on the part of the owners of the paper and the station. While paid advertisements may be accepted, letters to the editor, op-ed pieces, and contributed articles may simply not get published in conservative locales where the culture of smoking is protected. Similarly, paid radio commercials may get played at peak listening times—or not—but interviews and news items may not get a hearing at all.

Six projects reported no media activity at all, either paid or free, although three of the six did have funds budgeted for that purpose. Table 7 shows the media coverage obtained by the rest of the projects and the amount of money they were prepared to spend for it. The names of newspapers and more detailed descriptions of the media activity—where provided by the FERs—are offered in the accompanying footnotes.

**Table 7. Media used and amount budgeted for primary objectives**  
 (Shading: *blue* = objectives exceeded, *green* = objectives met, none = objectives not met)

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)                        | MEDIA OUTLETS                                                                                         |                                          |                                                   | AMOUNT<br>BUDGETED                               |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
|                                               | PRINT                                                                                                 | RADIO                                    | TV                                                |                                                  |
| ALA of the East Bay/<br>EBSFH<br>(Emeryville) | 1 newsletter, 1 newspaper article/<br>photo <sup>1</sup>                                              | -                                        | ABC News <sup>2</sup>                             | \$1,305 for 2 primary objectives                 |
| ALA of Sacramento/RESPECT                     | 4 full-page ads in periodical, 2 newspaper articles, 1 ad in conference pgm <sup>3</sup>              | -                                        | CBS News, CW 31 News                              | Found under CG 07-100, but only for 2010 project |
| BREATHE of Sacramento (BCSET)                 | 1 ad in apartment association magazine                                                                | -                                        | -                                                 | \$9,566 for 1 primary objective                  |
| BREATHE of Bay Area (San Jose)                | Press releases, PSAs, and news articles in several languages <sup>4</sup>                             | AM 910, 960, 1590; FM 103.7 <sup>4</sup> | News and talk shows: KTVU, KDTV, KGO <sup>4</sup> | \$10,349 for 1 primary objective                 |
| Catholic Charities (SFASD Project, San Diego) | 1 article and 4 ads published in 2 local ethnic newspapers <sup>5</sup>                               | -                                        | -                                                 | \$4,200 for 1 primary objective                  |
| Communicare TPP (Davis)                       | ?                                                                                                     | KDRT (live talk show)                    | -                                                 | \$2,280 for 1 primary objective <sup>6</sup>     |
| ETR CCAP (Sacramento)                         | Billboards in 2 cities, ads in rental housing magazines                                               |                                          |                                                   | \$295,163 for 4 primary objectives               |
| Fresno Co. EOC RTEP (Fresno)                  | ?                                                                                                     | ?                                        | ?                                                 | \$88 for 2 primary objectives                    |
| Imperial Co. TEP (El Centro)                  |                                                                                                       | 5 30-sec. spots                          |                                                   | \$7,295 for 4 primary objectives                 |
| NCCWB Respiro Libre (Santa Rosa)              | Ads in <i>La Voz</i> , a bilingual newspaper (circulation: 80,000)                                    | Multiple segments                        | Univision interviews in Spanish                   | \$3,200 for 1 primary objective                  |
| Pasadena PTPC (City of)                       | ?                                                                                                     | ?                                        | ?                                                 | \$0 for 3 primary objectives                     |
| PHFE In the Zone (Corona)                     | -                                                                                                     | Talk radio spots <sup>7</sup>            | Cable TV interview <sup>7</sup>                   | \$7,071 for 1 primary objective                  |
| Plumas Co. TURP (Quincy)                      | ?                                                                                                     | ?                                        | ?                                                 | \$5,147 for 3 primary objectives                 |
| REACT <sup>8</sup> (Fresno/Dinuba)            | ?                                                                                                     | SHS ads in Spanish                       | SHS ads in Spanish                                | \$15,035 for 1 primary objective                 |
| Sacramento Co. TEP (Sacramento)               | Up to 3 articles in up to 5 newsletters <sup>9</sup>                                                  |                                          |                                                   | \$90,512 for 3 primary objectives                |
| San Francisco TFP (City)                      | ?                                                                                                     | ?                                        | ?                                                 | \$0 for 3 primary objectives                     |
| The Santa Cruz Tobacco Free LGBT              | ?                                                                                                     | ?                                        | ?                                                 | \$11,750 for 1 primary objective                 |
| Santa Cruz Co. (Santa Cruz)                   | Newspaper ads re: landlord seminars                                                                   | ?                                        | ?                                                 | \$3,000 for 4 primary objectives                 |
| Sutter Co. STEP (Yuba City)                   | Newspaper ad thanking owner; article on County website; 2 newsletter articles; and more <sup>10</sup> | PSA for 1 week                           | ?                                                 | \$6,650 for 3 primary objectives                 |
| Ventura Co. LLA (Ventura)                     | Articles in English and Spanish newspapers                                                            | Ads in Eng./Spanish                      | ?                                                 | \$22,452 <sup>11</sup> for 3 primary objectives  |
| Yolo Co. TPP (Woodland)                       | ?                                                                                                     | ?                                        | ?                                                 | \$2,863 for 3 primary objectives                 |

<sup>1</sup> Ming Pao Daily News, SF (photo, article in Chinese), AASC Insight member spotlight (association newsletter)

<sup>2</sup> Story coincided with upcoming hearing from the City of Oakland's smoke-free ordinance, filmed at one of the MUHs.

<sup>3</sup> 4 ads in *Perspectives*, The California Apart. Assoc. magazine, circulation 50,000; press releases leading to articles in *Sacramento Bee* and *Redding Record*; ad in 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Trade Show and Education Conference of the Apt. Assoc. of the Greater Inland Empire program.

<sup>4</sup> This project's FER addresses Indicators 2.2.12 (smoke-free indoor common areas) and 4.1.1 (smoking cessation services) together, and while its ambitious media program appeared to combine the two messages, more emphasis seems to have been devoted to advertising/ promoting the cessation aspect in ethnic papers, newsletters, and talk shows.

<sup>5</sup> There was at least one response to the ads and article: A condo owner who used SFASD material to talk to her homeowners' association board about instituting policies to prohibit smoking in parts of her complex.

<sup>6</sup> The note in OTIS under Budget Justification, Other Costs, reads: "Moving \$720 to Educational Materials as Media budget didn't occur."

<sup>7</sup> An unspecified number of youth took part in more than one radio program discussing smoke-free MUHs, at least one of which was in Spanish. The cable TV interview also involved youth.

<sup>8</sup> "Conducted a media campaign to increase awareness about secondhand smoke and garner support for smoke-free policies," which probably included some print media and possibly radio/TV spots in English as well as the ads in Spanish specifically mentioned in the FER.

<sup>9</sup> Possibly due to staff changes during the project, the Sacramento County FER was vague about articles written for/sent to local newsletters: "Developed an article about the smoke-free units, which was *submitted to* [italics added] 5 different newsletters...Two articles appeared in the RHA Magazine with a distribution to well over 1,000 MUH owners/managers."

<sup>10</sup> The congratulatory ad ran in the local paper [unnamed], an article was written for the Sutter County website ([www.suttercounty.org](http://www.suttercounty.org)), articles entitled *Secondhand Smoke and Multi-Unit Housing* and *Yuba City Apartments Go Smoke-free* were published in the Sutter County Wellness Newsletter, plus the MUH owner was nominated for CCAP's Public Health Leadership Award and for the "gold resolution award" whereby he would be recognized by the Sutter County Board of Supervisors.

<sup>11</sup> The note in OTIS under Budget Justification, Other Costs, reads: "06-07 revision reflects both print and radio media campaign to support smokefree housing policy efforts, as well as some general awareness ads/PSAs." The budgeted amount in 06-07 is \$22,252, suggesting that most of the Ventura County LLA's media budget went to their housing work.

~~~~~

A brief analysis of the use of media in the effort to protect MUH complex residents from secondhand smoke produces the following observations:

- 11 projects purchased space for ads, 8 in some form of print media, 5 on radio, and 1 on television (one project used all three outlets). Of these, 8 were in a language other than English.
- 9 projects received free coverage via articles in newsletters and newspapers (8), mention or interviews on radio (4), and segments on television (5). Of the articles, news reports, and talk radio shows, 5 were in Spanish.

The amounts budgeted for media varied widely, from no media budget at all in two cases (Pasadena PTPC and San Francisco TFP) to ETR CCAP's budget (spread over four primary objectives) of \$295,163. To summarize: of the 19 projects with media budgets,

- 6 came in under \$5,000;
- 5 were over \$5,000 but under \$10,000; and
- 7 were over \$10,000 (some just slightly over).

Sacramento County TEP, at \$90,512 for three primary objectives, was the second highest spender and the Ventura County LLA, with \$22,452 to cover three objectives, was the third highest. The Fresno County EOC RTEP reduced its media budget to \$88 after its generous offer to treat MUH complexes adopting smoke-free policies to newspaper or radio ads was spurned two years running. From the Budget Justification, Other Costs, in OTIS comes the EOC's querulous comment: "Fiscal Year 06/07 is being reduced by \$1,000 because multi-unit housing adopting a smoke-free policy do not want to accept the newspaper advertisement or radio announcement. Because they already have their new marketing office and want a more expensive advertisement that our program does not have the funds to provide...Fiscal Year 07/08 is being decreased by \$900 because of the multi-unit housing continuing to want funds to do their own advertisement. Media is very costly in Fresno and our program does not have the funds."

Few FERs commented extensively on their use of media as a resource; few, in fact, stated which outlets they used for ads and press releases. The NCCWB Respiro Libre Project's FER was an exception, reporting enthusiastically, "Advertisement of the Respiro Libre program through *La Voz*, a bilingual newspaper with a readership of over 80,000, drew huge success. To date, 80-85% of the complaint calls came from tenants who had read about the program in the bilingual newspaper." About the project's use of the airwaves as well, the FER continued, "Offering educational presentations through local Spanish-language radio was effective in disseminating the message that smoking is not a protected right and that tenants could do something about their problems around secondhand smoke."

The only project that reported making a particular effort to assess the value of free or paid media to their work was ETR CCAP, which had billboards placed in Sacramento and Redding "to promote awareness of second hand smoke exposure in multi-unit housing complexes." The billboards read, "Protected at Work but not at Home," and the billboard company told CCAP that the signs received 5,090,230 "looks." Reporting on the results of a short online survey in the two cities, the CCAP FER said, "Public response to billboards was minimal but positive," and added that one respondent suggested that "a catchier picture or phrase" might have sparked more interest. (Sadly, CCAP didn't attach a picture of the billboard to their FER.)

Significance of this factor. In assessing the importance of creative use of multiple media to a successful outcome as demonstrated in this set of FERs, it may be of less significance than the other factors for this particular kind of intervention. Those projects working with local officials probably benefited most from media coverage, given that population's occupational interest in media coverage, and Spanish language newspaper and radio ads may have helped educate residents and managerial staff in areas with a high Latino/Hispanic population. No project except ETR CCAP attempted to evaluate the impact of media coverage, paid or free, and CCAP concluded that "we cannot accurately comment on the impact of these billboards."

### **The impact of project staffing**

Reports on previous sets of FERs from this funding period have found that *predictors of success* for TCP-supported projects pursuing other objectives include the following:

- "LLA staff that is stable, knowledgeable, creative, and highly motivated" and
- "An evaluator who is closely connected with the project from start to finish."

There is no reason to think that these assertions are any less true with respect to the current set of FERs, and indeed we find them to be still valid.

Whopping, unwieldy Table 8 summarizes the number of staff members working on each project, their classification, and the amount of time each was budgeted to work. The Total Group Workload (presented in numbers of primary objectives) is also provided to give a sense of the scope of their responsibilities, with the number assigned to MUH objective in bold. Most evaluators were outside consultants and most were retained for the full funding period. Their compensation was variously reported, usually in dollars per hour.

**Table 8. Project staffing: staff titles, FTEs, and the number of primary objectives that constituted their workload**

(Shading: *blue* = objectives exceeded, *green* = objectives met, none = objectives not met)

(Source of FTE figures: OTIS, Budget Justification, A. Personnel Costs; source of external evaluation figures: F. Subcontracts and Consultants)

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)                 | STAFF TITLES                                                            |                                                 |                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                               | TOTAL GROUP<br>WORKLOAD*             |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                                        | DIRECTOR                                                                | HEALTH ED. SPEC.<br>&/OR COORDINATOR            | CLERICAL                                                   | OTHER                                                                                                                                                                         |                                      |
| ALA of the East Bay/EBSFH (Emeryville) | Project Director<br>(.20/.15/.23 FTE x 36 mo.)                          | Project Coordinator<br>(.80 FTE x 36 mo.)       | Program Assistant<br>(.15-.20 FTE x 36 mo.)                | Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$80/hr x 100 hr in yrs 1 & 2,<br>\$85/hr x 140 hr in yr 3)<br>Tenant Health Promoters<br>(\$15/hr x 35 hr = \$575 x 5<br>Promoters x 3 yrs)        | 2 primary objectives: #2,#4          |
| ALA of Sacramento/RESPECT              | Found under CG 07-100,<br>but only for 2010 project                     |                                                 |                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                               | 1 primary objective: #1              |
| BREATHE of Sacramento (BCSET)          | Program Director<br>(.40 FTE x 36 mo.)                                  | Program Associate<br>(.30-.50 FTE x 36 mo.)     | Support Staff<br>(\$15/hr→300 hr, 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr only) | Asst. Program Coordinator<br>(.50/.30/.30 FTE x 36 mo.)<br>Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$39,575 over 3 yrs)                                                                     | 1 primary objective: #1              |
| BREATHE of Bay Area (San Jose)         | Project Director<br>(.60-1.0 FTE x 36 mo.)                              | Project Coordinator<br>(.20-.40 FTE x 36 mo.)   | -                                                          | Director of Communications<br>(.10-.20 FTE x 36 mo.)<br>Community Worker<br>(\$13/15 x 20-30 hrs/pp x 36<br>mo.)<br>Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$23,400 over 3 yrs)            | 1 primary objective.: #3             |
| Catholic Charities (San Diego)         | Assistant Project Director<br>(1.0 FTE x 24 mo.)                        | Program Coordinator<br>(1.0 FTE x 24 mo.)       | -                                                          | Outreach Worker<br>(.50 FTE yr 1, 1.0 FTE yr 2)<br>Outreach Worker<br>(.45 FTE x 24 mo.)<br>Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$1,350/\$1,350 over 2 yrs)                             | 1 primary objective: #2              |
| CommuniCare (Davis)                    | Director, Health Education<br>& Outreach Programs<br>(.25 FTE x 24 mo.) | Health Program Supervisor<br>(1.0 FTE x 24 mo.) | -                                                          | Health Education Specialist<br>(1.0 FTE x 24 mo.)                                                                                                                             | 1 primary objective: #1              |
| ETR CCAP (Sacramento)                  | Project Director**<br>(1.0 FTE x 36 mo.)                                | Project Administrator<br>(.10 FTE x 36 mo.)     | Administrative Assistant<br>(1.0 FTE x 36 mo.)             | Education & Advocacy 1<br>(.25/.15/.15 FTE over 36 mo.)<br>Education & Advocacy<br>Specialist 2<br>(.25/.15/.15 FTE over 36 mo.)<br>Senior Researcher**<br>(.35 FTE x 36 mo.) | 4 primary objectives:<br>#1,#2,#3,#4 |



| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)                | STAFF TITLES                                                              |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | TOTAL GROUP<br>WORKLOAD*             |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                                       | DIRECTOR                                                                  | HEALTH ED. SPEC.<br>&/OR COORDINATOR                                            | CLERICAL                                                                                                                                         | OTHER                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                      |
|                                       |                                                                           |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                  | Research Associate**<br>(.35 FTE x 36 mo.)<br>Health Educator 1<br>(1.0 FTE x 24 mo.)<br>Information Technology Spec.<br>(.15 FTE x 36 mo.)<br>Project Consultant<br>(\$37/hr x 1,324 hrs over 3 yrs)                                                                |                                      |
| Fresno Co. EOC RTEP<br>(Fresno)       | Bilingual Program<br>Coordinator<br>(1.0 FTE x 36 mo.)                    | Bilingual Health Educator<br>(1.0 FTE x 36 mo.)                                 | -                                                                                                                                                | Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$40/hr x 531.25 hrs over 3 yrs)                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 2 primary objectives: #1&#3          |
| Imperial Co.<br>(El Centro)           | Project Director/<br>Coordinator<br>(1.0 FTE x 36 mo.)                    | Health Education Specialist 1<br>(1.0 FTE x 12 mo.)                             | Office Assistant<br>(.20 FTE x 36 mo.)                                                                                                           | Community Service Worker (.50<br>FTE x ?)<br>Evaluation Consultant<br>(.10 x 12 mo.)                                                                                                                                                                                 | 4 primary objectives:<br>#1,#2,#3,#4 |
| NCCWB Respiro Libre<br>(Santa Rosa)   | Program Manager<br>(.80 FTE x 24 mo.)                                     | Tobacco Educator<br>(.50 FTE x 24 mo.)                                          | -                                                                                                                                                | Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$80/hr x 48 hr in yr 1,<br>x 152 hr in yr 2)                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1 primary objective: #1              |
| Pasadena PTPC<br>(City of)            | Tobacco Control Program<br>coordinator II<br>(.80/.80/.75 FTE over 3 yrs) | -                                                                               | Program Assistant<br>(Community Services Rep. II)<br>(1.0/1.0/.50 over 3 yrs)                                                                    | External Evaluation Consultant<br>(129 hours, 1 <sup>st</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> yrs only)                                                                                                                                                                            | 3 primary objectives:<br>#3,#4,#5    |
| PHFE In the Zone<br>(Corona)          | Project Director<br>.85-.90 FTE x 36 mo.)                                 | Project Coordinator<br>(.50 FTE, 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr)          | -                                                                                                                                                | Evaluation Consultant<br>(171 hrs x \$35/hr x 3yr=\$6,000)                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 1 primary objective: #1              |
| Plumas Co. TURP<br>(Quincy)           | Project Director<br>(.50-1.0 FTE x 36)                                    | Project Coordinator<br>(.80-1.0 FTE x 36 mo.)                                   | Office Assistant <sup>1</sup><br>(.10-.20 FTE x 12 mo.)                                                                                          | Dept. Fiscal Officer 1**<br>(.25 FTE x 36 mo.)<br>Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$26,000 over 3 yrs)                                                                                                                                                                     | 3 primary objectives:<br>#1,#3,#4    |
| REACT <sup>2</sup><br>(Fresno/Dinuba) | Program Manager<br>(.80/.80/.20 FTE x 36 mo.)                             | Program Assistant/ Health<br>Educator<br>(\$18,063/24,959/30,729 over<br>3 yrs) | Program Assistant/Outreach<br>Specialist<br>(\$6,825 for 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr only)                                                                | Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$8,000/5,000/10,107 over 3<br>yrs)                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 1 primary objective: #2              |
| Sacramento Co. TEP<br>(Sacramento)    | Sr. Health Program<br>Coordinator<br>(0-.50 FTE x 36 mo.) <sup>3</sup>    | Health Program Coordinator<br>(.75-1.0 FTE x 36 mo.)                            | Admin. Services Officer II<br>(0-.30 FTE x 36 mo.)<br>Office Assistant II<br>(.40-.60 FTE x 36 mo.)<br>Sr. Office Assistant<br>.50 FTE x 10 mo.) | Health Educator Range B<br>(.30-1.0 FTE x 36 mo.)<br>Health Educator Range A<br>(0-1.0 FTE x 36 mo.) <sup>4</sup><br>Health Educator Range B<br>(.50 FTE x 6 mo.)<br>Evaluator**<br>(\$29,379, last 2 yrs)<br>Media Consultant<br>(\$3,000, 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr only) | 2 primary objectives: #3,#4          |

| LLAS/COMPETS<br>(CITY)              | STAFF TITLES                                                                |                                                             |                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | TOTAL GROUP<br>WORKLOAD*             |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                                     | DIRECTOR                                                                    | HEALTH ED. SPEC.<br>&/OR COORDINATOR                        | CLERICAL                                                    | OTHER                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                      |
| San Francisco TFP<br>(City)         | Sr. Health Educator/<br>Project Director<br>(.80 FTE x 36 mo.)              | Health Educator<br>(.50 FTE x 24 mo. &<br>.60 FTE x 12 mo.) | -                                                           | Health Program Coordinator II<br>(.60 FTE x 24 mo. &<br>.50 FTE x 12 mo.)<br>Principle [sic] Accountant<br>(.25 FTE x 12 mo.)                                                                                                           | 3 primary objectives:<br>#1,#5,#6    |
| The Santa Cruz<br>Tobacco Free LGBT | Project Director<br>(.90 FTE x 24 mo.)                                      | Program Coordinator<br>(.50 FTE x 24 mo.)                   | Office Manager<br>(.35 FTE x 24 mo.)                        | Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$60/hr x 20 hr/mo. x 24 mo.)                                                                                                                                                                                 | 1 primary objective: #1              |
| Santa Cruz Co.<br>(Santa Cruz)      | Project Director <sup>5</sup><br>(.50 [.40-.75] FTE x 36 mo.)               | Project Coordinator<br>(.80 FTE x 36 mo.)                   | Typist Clerk III<br>(.15 [0-.15] FTE x 36 mo.) <sup>6</sup> | Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$13,000, 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr only)                                                                                                                                                                            | 4 primary objectives:<br>#1,#2,#3,#5 |
| Sutter Co. STEP<br>(Yuba City)      | Project Director <sup>7</sup><br>(.62 FTE x 36 mo.)                         | Health Program Specialist<br>1.05 FTE x 36 mo.)             | Evaluation Consultant<br>(\$15,000/yr x 3 yrs)              | -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 3 primary objectives:<br>#1,#2,#3    |
| Ventura Co. LLA<br>(Ventura)        | Public Health Program<br>Coordinator <sup>8</sup><br>([0-26pp] 1.0 FTE x ?) | Community Services<br>Coordinator<br>([9-26pp] 1.0 FTE x ?) | Office Assistant III<br>(.05-25 FTE x ?)                    | Health Care Agency Training &<br>Education Asst.<br>(0-8pp 1.0 FTE, 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr only)<br>Health Care Agency Training &<br>Education Asst.<br>(12-16 pp, 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr only)                                                 | 3 primary objectives:<br>#1,#2,#3    |
| Yolo Co. TPP<br>(Woodland)          | Deputy Director Health<br>Education<br>(~.05-.055 FTE x 36 mo.)             | Health Program Coordinator<br>(.85/1.0/.85 FTE over 3 yrs)  | Admin. Pool<br>(.64/.63/.62 FTE over 3 yrs)                 | Outreach Specialist II (A)<br>(.85/.60/.60 FTE over 3 yrs)<br>Program Evaluator<br>(.03/.01/.027 FTE over 3 yrs)<br>Community Health Assistant<br>(.05 FTE, 1 <sup>st</sup> year only)<br>Extra Hire <sup>9</sup><br>(.37 FTE x 24 mo.) | 3 primary objectives:<br>#2,#3,#4    |

\*Spreading staff among several objectives can have negative consequences for all the projects an agency undertakes. For example, the Ventura County LLA not only reported “diluted efforts” in their attempt to meet two objectives in the City of Oxnard, but also “...the challenge of presenting two issues at the same time to the same decision makers...” which cost them one, if not both, of the objectives.

\*\*Noted that this position was replaced once during the project.

<sup>1</sup>From the Budget Justification, Personnel Costs, OTIS: description confusing; says “All 3 years” in one place and “Year 2&3 position eliminated” in another.

<sup>2</sup>When the Program Manager’s time was reduced to 20% in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, the Program Assistant/Health Educator relinquished clerical duties, was reclassified as Project Coordinator to assume some of the Program Manager’s duties, and the Program Assistant/Outreach Specialist was brought in to take over clerical support. In another era, she would be a “clerk.”

<sup>3</sup>Served as Acting Project Director in anticipation of actual Project Director being hired. The only sign that ever happened was a comment in the FER: “It should be noted that neither the current Project Director nor Evaluator were involved in the planning or early stages of this scope of work, therefore some inconsistencies exist between how the project was planned and actually carried out.”

<sup>4</sup>This person was replaced by a new Health Educator Range B but it looks like the budgeting for this position overlapped that one.

<sup>5</sup>Their note said: “This position is funded 45-50% Prop. 99 and 50-55% MSA.”

<sup>6</sup>Their note: “As the result of funding shortfall, the Typist Clerk III was cut out of the budget for the final two years of the project.”

<sup>7</sup>Their note explains that the “assistant director of human services [is] sharing the project director position at 13% of time to fulfill the 75% project director requirement. The 13% time will be provided to the program as an un-budgeted contribution.”

<sup>8</sup>As the FER explained in some despair, there were three Project Directors during the grant period "...and support staff came and went." Notes under Duties Description in OTIS' *Budget Justification* for the position seem to indicate that the Program Coordinator retired but acted as consultant, then retired altogether and vanished.

<sup>9</sup>Their note: "This position was added to the 06/07 Fiscal Year contrary to what was reported in the 05-06 revision in order to assist the Outreach Specialist position who will still be operating at 60%."

It is difficult to demonstrate a connection between the number of “staff FTEs” devoted to a project and that project’s ultimate success. Many other factors intervene: how well trained, well organized, creative, and hard-working the staff members are; how skilled they are at recruiting and deploying volunteers and partner organizations, including their tobacco control coalitions; how many other obligations are competing for their time; what ancillary issues outside their control—local economic difficulties or booms, events such as recent apartment fires—either benefit or hamper their intervention activities. The FERs themselves rarely refer to staffing numbers when bringing project staff into the discussion of reasons for successes or failures, but they do talk about the impact on both project and outcome of losing key staff members during the funding period.

Connections and continuity were broken when staffing changes occurred. A key informant interview of Northern California Center for Well-Being (NCCWB) staff who had worked on the Respiro Libre Project bypassed the newly-hired executive director of NCCWB. The three staff members who served as key informants agreed that, overall, “. . .the project went well and activities were completed, even though the project went through several staffing changes in a short amount of time, and their primary objective was not achieved.” They did report “staff changes” as one of their challenges, however, later in their FER.

The Sacramento County LLA’s FER made a point of noting that one of the project’s limitations was “. . .that neither the current Project Director nor Evaluator were involved in the planning or early stages of this scope of work, therefore some inconsistencies exist between how the project was planned and actually carried out.”

The Ventura County LLA felt that their project suffered fatally from “[c]hanges in LLA staffing and the lack of experience among new LLA staff, related in part to the inadequate funding of the LLA.” The FER added with some bitterness: “Ventura County is a large county funded through Prop 99 at very close to the small-county minimum.” One result of this is that the salaries they can offer tend to be low and trained staff are often hired away by better-paying employers.

Student internships, although potentially a bottomless source of smart, dedicated, energetic young people, come with their own disadvantages—chief among them a very high rate of turnover. As the Yolo County TPP observed about their UC Davis students, “It was difficult having a high turnover of student interns working on the project. Although staff remained the same, consistency suffered with the changeover almost every quarter. Retraining was also a large barrier to accomplishing program tasks.”

Significance of this factor. In assessing the importance of project staffing to a successful outcome as demonstrated in this set of FERs, one can only say that it is impossible to overestimate the importance of strong leadership, imaginative project design, total dedication, the willingness to work long hours, team effort, kindness, and humor—to list only a few of the essential attributes of the ideal project staff—to a successful outcome. Of the five elements chosen for investigation in this report, it is by far the most essential to success. At issue is not its importance but how these qualities can adequately be measured, and totaling up FTEs cannot alone capture or predict a positive outcome.

### **A test of the primary areas of investigation as links to successful outcomes**

As a preliminary measure of the validity of the critical components noted above in contributing to successful outcomes, we subjected the five projects that exceeded their goals to a closer scrutiny. We referred to the tables already constructed for each element to gauge their performance in that category and assigned letter grades from “A” for excellence to “C” for mediocre to the critical areas for each project. We also examined the FERs for each project to

see if there were special conditions or circumstances that might have contributed to their success apart from the factors under investigation. The results of this brief analysis are presented here (projects listed in alphabetical order):

1. **ALA of the East Bay/East Bay Smoke Free Housing (EBSFH) Project, Emeryville :**  
*By July 31, 2007, a minimum of two multi-unit housing units (MUH) for low income seniors—one each in Alameda and Contra Costa counties—will adopt and enforce a voluntary policy that designates common outdoor and indoor areas as smoke-free and protects residents from drifting secondhand smoke between units (Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12). Outcome: Four rather than two MUH complexes.*

|                                                                     |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations        | A+ |
| Educating decision makers and tenants                               | A+ |
| Working with volunteers (tenants, in this case)                     | A+ |
| Using media for education and advocacy (free coverage)              | B  |
| The impact of project staffing (well staffed, 2 primary objectives) | A  |

Special circumstances: In 2004, one of the targeted MUH complexes suffered a tragic fire caused by smoking while using oxygen in 2004 that took two lives, paving the way for the intervention. The campaign to make the other targeted MUH complex smoke free was assertively carried forward by a determined resident who recruited other tenants and hauled them off to the Alameda Housing Commission meetings. The additional MUH complexes came to the project via (1) a member of the EBSFH collaborative Project Campaign Team who connected with a MUH administrator interested in going smoke free and (2) as a result of TA given to a non-profit housing developer through another objective. Both these MUHs asked for and received the help they needed during the 2004-2007 funding period.

2. **CommuniCare Health Centers, Davis:**  
*By June 30, 2008, a minimum of 3 low-income MUH properties located in Woodland, Davis, and/or West Sacramento, will adopt and implement policies restricting the exposure to secondhand smoke (e.g., indoor and/or outdoor exposure in common areas and/or policies that protect residents from drifting secondhand smoke between units) (Indicator 2.2.12). Outcome: 18 rather than 3 MUH complexes.*

|                                                                    |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations       | A+ |
| Educating decision makers and tenants                              | A+ |
| Working with volunteers (tenants again)                            | A+ |
| Using media for education and advocacy (free coverage)             | B  |
| The impact of project staffing (well staffed, 1 primary objective) | A  |

Special circumstances: Vital to the overwhelming success of this project was its connection to a key community partner who had helped work on the initial needs assessment: the executive director of a large non-profit affordable housing development agency. She signed an MOU affirming that she would work with the project to bring nine properties under smoke-free policies. Subsequently, the head of this agency's subsidiary—moved by the project's compelling presentations and educational packets—added another nine properties to the effort.

3. **Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission (FCEOC) Rural Tobacco Education Program (RTEP):**  
*By June 30, 2008, a minimum of 15 multi-unit housing complexes in rural Fresno County will adopt a comprehensive policy reducing Secondhand Smoke (SHS) through smoke-free units, smoke-free buildings, smoke-free common areas (indoors and outdoors), and/or reducing cigarette litter (Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12). Outcome: 17 instead of 15 MUH complexes.*

Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations (not mentioned in FER)  
 Educating decision makers and tenants (presentations/material) A-  
 Working with volunteers (not mentioned in FER)  
 Using media for education and advocacy (none) C  
 The impact of project staffing (well staffed, 2 primary objectives) A

Special circumstances: The FCEOC RTEP’s FER cites its 11-year history of involvement in rural areas as positioning them for successful implementation of anti-tobacco policies. Project staff targeted migrant housing and attributed their successful outcome to their educational outreach to managers and tenants.

**4. Pasadena Tobacco Prevention Coalition (PTPC):**

*By June 30, 2007, at least three multi-unit housing complexes in Pasadena will adopt a formal policy to protect residents from drifting second hand smoke between units by requiring at least one-third of contiguous sections of the building or the entire building to be smoke-free (Indicator 2.2.13). Outcome: 4 instead of 3 MUH complexes.*

Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations B  
 Educating decision makers and tenants (not much information about this beyond planned activity in the FER) B+  
 Working with volunteers (possibly tenants) A  
 Using media for education and advocacy (0 budget, no mention) C  
 The impact of project staffing (well staffed, 3 primary objectives) A

Special circumstances: The PTPC’s FER was brief and offered little detail, but it did describe the two owner/manager seminars the staff conducted—heavily publicized through mailings and city-wide intranet postings—as responsible for two housing complexes adopting a 100% smoke-free voluntary policy. One may have been the fourth MUH complex claimed.

**5. Sacramento County Tobacco Education Program:**

*By June 30, 2007, a minimum of four new or existing apartment complexes with predominantly priority population residents in Sacramento County will allocate all or a portion of the units as smoke-free as documented in property rental agreements. (Indicator 2.2.13). Outcome: 5 instead of 4 MUH complexes.*

Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations: A  
 Educating decision makers and tenants A-  
 Working with volunteers (undisclosed number/activity) B  
 Using media for education and advocacy (2 articles in newsletters for sure, but no comment on deployment of large media budget for 3 primary objectives) B-  
 The impact of project staffing (well staffed, 2 primary objectives, but both project director and evaluator were replaced once and reported “inconsistencies” in program for that reason) B

Special circumstances: The only unusual circumstance that might account for an additional smoke-free MUH complex was a favor the TEP did for the Sacramento Resident Advisory Board (RAB): the RAB requested “a survey with residents at three selected complexes to determine resident support or opposition to smoke-free housing. This information was gathered for RAB to determine whether they would advise the Housing Authority to establish smoke-free buildings and/or communities.” The FER does not tie this occurrence into the additional MUH complex but it’s a possibility.

It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from the preceding experiment, given the size of the sample and the gaps in information provided by some of the FERs, but the following observations may be helpful: collaboration, education, and volunteer activity—where mentioned—appear to have a positive impact on outcome. All of the projects were adequately staffed when the FER was produced, with at least one full-time individual in charge of program activities, so staffing may also have contributed to a successful outcome in these cases. The use of media receives the lowest grades and may be assigned the smallest role in staging a successful project of this description—at least in this small study.

## **Conclusions**

### Regarding the primary areas of investigation

The purpose of this paper was to determine, if possible, whether the five elements selected by the Tobacco Control Evaluation Center as primary areas of investigation (and listed again below) are indeed linked to successful project outcomes.

- Collaborating with coalition members and other organizations
- Educating decision makers and tenants
- Working with volunteers
- Using media for education and advocacy
- The impact of project staffing

A careful and thorough examination of this set of FERs with these five elements always in mind leads to the following observations:

1. All of these elements have a role to play in the success of funded projects, but the relative importance of that role will change (and may even vanish) according to the nature of the objectives pursued—with one exception. The impact of project staffing will always be the invariable factor in a successful outcome. If all the other elements were in place and the project staff were not well trained and competent, the project would be likely to fail. On the other hand, many projects in this set that succeeded did so despite limitations among the other elements, leading to the conclusion that the staff made it happen, whatever it took.
2. In the present case, where the objective is to obtain protection for residents of MUH complexes by convincing decision makers to adopt smoke-free policies, the most prominent elements of a successful outcome appear to be collaboration with state and local—especially local—agencies and organizations, including representatives of the housing industry; the education of decision makers and tenants; and project staffing. The use of volunteers and of media can—and in some cases, did—play a complementary role but these elements are not essential to the projects' success. When other objectives are pursued, the roles of the four variable elements will change. For example, an effort to promote litter-free parks and beaches requires strong and continual media activity and troops of volunteers to play a prominent part in bringing the project to life and to fruition, while collaboration and educating decision makers will be less vital to a positive outcome.
3. Determining how well collaboration, subject education, and the use of volunteers and media are managed during the course of a project is relatively straightforward: a well-written FER generally provides that information in terms of numbers, activities, and accomplishments. However, the impact of project staffing—the most important factor of the five—cannot be assessed objectively. Lists of job titles and numbers of FTEs may be as misleading as they are helpful in attempting to measure the essential qualities of the project team and cannot capture the essence of their interaction or tell whether they are led by a strong and imaginative director. Perhaps the only way to assess the excellence of the LLA or Compet staff is to get to know them,

work with them, reinforce their strengths and help them overcome their weaknesses—just what the Tobacco Control Evaluation Center is already doing.

Regarding the objective of protecting MUH residents from secondhand smoke

Agencies that have been doing the work of protecting Californians from secondhand smoke in a variety of ways understand that success is experienced on a continuum, and that each positive outcome is a step further along the path. Attitudes change gradually but they do change in the face of quiet, unfaltering pressure continually applied over years. Even the most resistant individuals, the die-hard smokers, are beginning to come around, as the Ventura County TEP found when they commissioned a researcher from the California Lutheran University to survey current residents and potential (wait-listed) residents of the eight MUHs administered by Many Mansions, an affordable housing provider in Thousand Oaks. In summarizing their findings, the authors of the report concluded, “While a few respondents are of the ‘a man’s home is his castle’ school of thought, most respondents want to live in smoke-free settings. It made little difference whether they have smoked in the past, never smoked, or currently smoke.”

BREATHE California of the Bay Area noted that property management, at least in the Bay Area, appears to be aware of “a big push in support” for smoke-free housing in California. The FER observed, “...it appears that management is no longer concerned that smokers will contest what they view as their legal right to smoke in their unites. Property managers are now concerned about the rights and welfare of non-smokers, and this reflects a direct change in community norms about smoking in multi-unit housing complexes.”

The Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency TEP felt at the end of the grant period that their most important contribution during the project’s three years of work in the community was that “...the project continued to raise public awareness and dispel common misunderstandings and opinion regarding smoke-free multi-unit housing.”

Many project staff consider their work during this funding period to be a continuation of efforts begun in the last round of grants and a prelude to further work in this area during the next round. Relationships have been built, many people of influence in local government and property management are convinced that smoke-free MUH complexes are fair and inevitable, many tenants are willing to turn out and work for the right to breathe clean air.

As the San Francisco TFP said at the end of its FER (and at the end of a long and frustrating struggle, which had not so far succeeded, to improve a city-wide ordinance), “Be patient. It’s a process.”



## **Appendix A. Additional Insights into Work with MUH Complexes**

Appendix A presents a sort of sub-report, compiled from the rich assortment of ideas and information offered by this set of FERs that are not directly relevant to the main body of this report. Contained in Appendix A are:

- five findings and recommendations for successful project outcomes,
- a collection of challenges and barriers encountered by the projects in this set of FERs,
- reasons owners/managers gave for adopting smoke-free policies,
- feedback received from owners/managers after policy adoption,
- advice to owner/managers from owner/managers, and
- closing comments on the amoebic qualities of success, unintended consequences of project efforts, and the value of celebrations.

### **Findings and recommendations for successful outcomes**

The following is a distillation of the findings and recommendations for successful outcomes reported in this set of FERs. Each point was offered by a number of different agencies which together represent a cross-section of the historical, political, geographical, and social conditions that shape California communities. While perhaps not universal truths, they do provide some useful insights into practical approaches that work.

There is one caveat, however, before we imply that all projects have an equal probability of success if they follow certain precepts. It is an inescapable fact that a program's setting—its location within the state—has an immense impact on the project's likelihood of success. Overall, the advantage goes to those organizations sited in large urban centers of California. Urban characteristics that work in their favor include populations and policy makers are proportionately wealthier, better educated, and politically more liberal than in other areas of the state; a far greater selection of media through which to appeal to residents of various cultures; more—and more sophisticated—potential partners among local community-based organizations; and access to a considerably larger and more varied pool of potential volunteers. Still, groups able to work closely with individual owners/managers in more rural, conservative settings have also been successful in reaching many of their goals.

Common themes drawn from experiences described in this set of FERs include the following:

**Avoid surprises: research the target MUH/community/city council thoroughly.**

*"[After] the three years, what staff found is that many of the managers were themselves smokers, and even though an owner might be very interested, a manager might down play any possibility of making a policy work."—In the Zone, Corona.*

Whether a project focuses on individual or groups of MUH complexes, on non-profit or for-profit property management organizations, or on crafting a city- or county-wide ordinance that will apply to all MUH complexes in the target area, it is vital to learn as much as possible about all the factors that will affect the outcome of the effort. This means researching the setting's general historical, political, economic, and normative conditions to understand the backdrop against which the project will be playing out *before* designing and launching an intervention. It is more difficult but also desirable to gain an understanding of the specific characteristics of the decision makers—owners/managers, administrators of rental organizations, local politicians and their staffs—who must be convinced that going smoke-free will benefit them in some way. Projects that did not allot sufficient time and resources to thorough investigations sometimes reported that

something as seemingly minor as the smoking habits of the manager of a MUH complex was the reason their whole project failed to achieve its objectives.

**Cultivate champions.** *“It is a matter of finding those initial champions and identifying who is interested in helping move the issue forward.”—NCCWB Respiro Libre, Santa Rosa.*

Many FERs constructed their objectives around past work in similar settings, taking advantage of good contacts among local health departments, community-based organizations, and past political supporters. They sought out and teamed up with individuals who have some influence with the target population. A range of people can fit into this category: vocal tenants ready to work hard with the management of their own MUH complex, administrators who have completed the transformation of their own MUHs and can speak in familiar terms with colleagues hesitating over the same decisions, local politicians convinced that restricting secondhand smoke is the right thing to do. Project staff also turned to respected national organizations with local chapters, such as the American Lung Association, which lent a convincing presence and provided objective educational material that supported presentations to decision makers.

**Build personal relationships.** *“Personal contact and trusted relationships with key decision makers such as city officials, housing authorities, owners and managers and apartment association leadership was a key ingredient for the successful passage of smoke-free/restricted smoking policies...”—RESPECT in Sacramento. “The most important factor leading to the successful adoption of smoke-free policies was relationship building and providing continuous support to the property managers.”—BREATHE CA in San Jose.*

A third of the FERs in this set made a point of saying how important it was to the success of the project to establish solid relationships with decision makers and also with the MUH residents, especially—but not exclusively—in smaller/rural communities. Project staff emphasized the value of taking the time to work one-on-one with individual owners and managers of targeted MUH complexes, with the administration of regional rental housing associations, with the personal assistants of local politicians as well as with the office-holders themselves, and with tenant groups and committees (and, if tenant committees don't exist, form them!). The Sutter County STEP developed a relationship of such trust with the busy owner of their four target MUHs (and a great deal of other rental property as well) that it “...eventually resulted in him giving us permission to do the work required to implement the policy on his behalf including: drafting the contract addendums [sic]; writing letters to residents informing them of the proposed policy and contract addendum; and distributing and collecting the signed addendums from residents.”

**Allay fears.** *The Program Coordinator for the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara, “...agreed with the principle of smoke-free housing [but] believed that implementing and enforcing a policy would be difficult and would ultimately be a violation of the tenant's rights.”—BREATHE CA in San Jose.*

Three main concerns expressed by landlords surfaced over and over in the FERs: the legal question of tenant's rights, the problem of policy enforcement, and the specter of lost revenue due to tenants being put off by smoking restrictions. Sometimes these concerns remained unspoken but were later found to be the cause of a general resistance not explained by issues that were raised and resolved by project staff. Confronting these concerns right up front with appropriate reassurances backed by legal opinions (in laymen's terms), actual examples of successful enforcement, and experiences and statistics that show properties being more, not less, attractive to tenants when smoke-free, can remove major obstacles from the path of policy consideration early in the intervention.

**Be flexible, be patient.** *“Flexibility is essential and suggesting a reluctant manager/owner start small...can lead to other policies.”—BREATHE CA of Sacramento. “LLAs should be supportive and patient with ‘small wins’ and use them as leverage for future activities.”—Imperial County LLA*

Although the ideal way to protect all tenants from secondhand smoke is to have a 100% smoke-free policy in all MUH complexes through city or county ordinances, project staff usually found that conditions in their localities would not support so universal an effort and several spoke in FERs of having to take “baby steps.” In some locations, projects targeted inside and/or outside common areas as a means of providing some protection to tenants while the management adjusted to the idea, then focused on restricting smoking inside units as the next objective. The same principle can work at the city and county level, with certain categories of MUH complexes given some level of protection against secondhand smoke while the local politicians assure themselves that there is not going to be a general uprising among the rental population before going further.

### **Challenges and barriers: a set of teachable moments**

There were several persistent—and erroneous—concepts that most projects reported encountering in their work with owners and managers of MUH complexes: the issue of smokers’ constitutional rights, the conviction that MUH complexes would lose tenants and revenue by instituting smoke-free policies, the concern that housing subsidy programs would not support efforts to curtail tobacco use, and more. Other challenges that surfaced in FERs included the valid concern about difficulties associated with policy enforcement; communication problems between project staff and MUH managers, between managers and owners, and between managers and tenants; and a few miscellaneous issues.

Common misunderstandings and misconceptions. The Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Tobacco Education Program (TEP) held a well-attended landlord seminar to deal with concerns about implementing smoke-free policies at MUH complexes and what that would mean. Among the topics of discussion were issues that had risen in prior projects of this sort, particularly the beliefs that smoke-free policies (1) “...would limit the potential pool of renters and thus diminish the value of a property,” (2) “...are not legal,” (3) “...that they conflict with housing subsidy programs,” and (4) “...that they unfairly penalize low income people.” Convincing owners and managers of MUHs that these issues are not valid was a major focus of the seminar and the project staff was somewhat dubious that all the attendees departed with their doubts and fears fully allayed.

Like the Santa Cruz TEP, the Sutter County STEP found that owners/managers often listed “that it is harder to find tenants” and “the likely loss of tenants” as significant barriers to adopting smoke-free policies.

In Yolo County, the situation is similar. The Yolo County TPP reported that “Many apartment managers did not believe that having designated smoke-free units was a good selling point, and many complexes that did have policies did not openly advertise them until it is time to sign the lease.” The FER also said this about local managers and their attitudes: “This project shows that although knowledge about dangers of secondhand smoke is high among apartment managers and owners, and personal beliefs tended to support smoke-free policies, vacancy rates and competition in the rental housing market was the largest driving force behind policy decisions...although information about the financial benefits of designating smoke-free units was provided, and in many cases already known...”

What about smokers’ rights? One of the most common sources of confusion and uncertainty among MUH owner/managers and tenants proved to be the legality and morality of smokers’ rights. Fearful of being perceived as trying to curtailing people’s rightful civil liberties and leaving

themselves open to lawsuits and negative publicity, MUH management often backed away from the concept of limiting or forbidding smoking within their complexes.

An abundance of well-written educational material exists to explain that smoke-free policies are legal and that discrimination laws do not protect smokers, but MUH administrators sometimes distrusted the information because they regarded project staff as anti-tobacco advocates. BREATHE of Sacramento (BCSET) staff found that aligning themselves and their effort with an organization respected by MUH owners and managers not only enhanced their position as advisors but also lent a luster of authority to the materials they presented. According to their FER, BCSET staff "... developed a relationship with the Rental Housing Association, which was receptive to helping with this issue, and placed an ad in the Sacramento Valley Rental Housing Magazine explaining the legalities of smoke-free policies in apartment complexes. The ad impacted the project by reinforcing the smoke-free housing movement and allowing staff to present information from a credible source." The staff further associated themselves with the Rental Housing Association by getting permission to use the Association logo on their documentation and by attending Association meetings, both of which, they said, "...helped immensely."

Key administrators at two of the BREATHE California of the Bay Area's target MUHs were concerned about smokers' rights. One manager of a 141-unit complex, concerned about the legal aspect of adopting a smoke-free policy, believed that smokers have the right to smoke anywhere they wanted. The Program Coordinator for the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara, responsible for an unspecified number of MUHs serving seniors and low-SES populations, "...agreed with the principle of smoke-free housing [but] believed that implementing and enforcing a policy would be difficult and would ultimately be a violation of the tenant's rights." (During the course of the project, the FER reports, the Housing Authority decided to adopt a smoke-free policy "...which covers several properties and includes 1,151 apartment units...all apartments, all common areas, and the parking lots.")

Catholic Charities' Smoke-Free for All San Diegans (SFASD) FER listed among the project's limitations the unwillingness of many managers in their sample even to *discuss* enacting new policies that affected smoking in common areas "...for fear of being accused of supporting what they believed were discriminatory practices towards people who smoke. This directly impacted their responses to the survey questions and the collection of data."

The Fresno County EOC's Rural Tobacco Education Program (RTEP) conducted key informant interviews with a selection of "key opinion leaders"—all of whom, to judge by the nature of the questions asked, have experience in managing MUHs—and found that 12 of 28 expressed reservations about smoke-free policies since "...these policies may affect their ability to rent to potential tenants."

The Imperial County Tobacco Education Program (TEP) considered that one of the primary reasons their target MUHs were reluctant to follow through with implementing voluntary policies for smoke-free common areas was "...housing authority complex management unwillingness to pursue the legal aspect of adopting a new policy at a local level."

The ill-fated effort made by San Francisco Tobacco Free Project's Coalition Task Force encountered significant resistance on two fronts in that very liberal political environment. First, surveys, focus groups and interviews made it plain that concern over the issue of smokers' rights was especially prevalent, according to both key informants and random members of the public. Findings included the following: "Among those who think current bans are too restrictive, there is concern for the rights of individuals and businesses that are negatively impacted by the laws. Participants cited Smoker rights, privacy rights, and over-regulation as reasons to oppose further bans." A second issue was concern for the rights of marginal populations. The Housing Rights Coalition said, "It's not a good idea to mandate nonsmoking in units. There are mostly low income tenants in SROs. A lot are vets, and smoking is a tranquilizer; when you're homeless, that's a

habit that you pick up. It's hard enough to train people how to use a unit." The Mission Agenda added, "There's a lot of landlords, especially in SROs, that will use any little thing that they can to get a room vacant. Rents are already up to \$600 or in some cases \$800, and if they can get the room vacant—a guy that's been three 20 years—if they can get him out, they can pump up the rates. The sky's the limit."

Landlords' persistent fear of legal consequences for limiting and prohibiting smoking dogged the Santa Cruz County TEP's efforts to convince owners and managers of the facts. Thirty-three property owners and managers attended an afternoon seminar which featured "...a review of legal issues for landlords, the process of implementing smoke-free housing policies, and sample lease language, together with a landlord who had himself put a smoke-free policy in place and could answer questions based on his own direct experience. Many of the participants in the seminar already had some form of smoke-free policies but will still concerned about enforcement and legal issues."

The Santa Cruz County TEP took on those landlords, tenants, and community members who were prepared to defend the rights of smokers. "There is a common assumption that prohibiting smoking unfairly denies housing to someone who is a smoker, and that they should not be so heavily penalized for their addiction," the FER said, and went on: "Many are affronted by what they see as an attempt to dictate to people what they are and aren't allowed to do 'in the privacy of their own home.' This strikes a strong chord in a culture that places preeminent value on the freedom of individuals and their use of private property. *It fails, however, to take into account the difference between smoking in a detached private home and smoking in multi-unit buildings where secondhand smoke permeates the living spaces of non-smokers. [italics added]*"

Worried about the impact of a no-smoking policy on personal rights, the focus group convened by the Sutter County STEP "...expressed the belief that individuals should have the right to make decisions about their personal behaviors...'You can't tell people what to do when they pay rent.'" The FER went on to say dryly, "One recommended solution was to not rent to smokers. Apparently, this wasn't seen as a form of discrimination, which is inconsistent with the idea of infringing on a person's personal rights."

Imagined conflicts with housing subsidy programs. The Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Tobacco Education Program (TEP) noted that a major concern that arose in the seminar they held for MUH owners/managers was "the widely held notion that smoke-free policies conflict with HUD regulations. It may be that HUD regulations are seen by property managers as so complex and punitive that they assume such policies will be forbidden." This is not the case, as staff ascertained after researching the issue and providing documentation to one of the managers who raised the objection. A survey of owners/managers that the Sutter County Tobacco Education and Prevention Program (STEP) conducted revealed that one of the perceived barriers to providing smoke-free units and common spaces was: "...restrictions imposed by Housing and Urban Development (HUD)."

Policy enforcement. It's one thing to adopt a smoke-free policy in an apartment complex and another thing to make sure that tenants and employees respect and abide by its provisions. BREATHE California of the Bay Area reported manager feedback from two of the four MUHs in their project about stubborn tenants who refused to comply. One manager said, "We have just one tenant who says, 'I'm going to smoke where I'm going to smoke and if people don't like it they can move.' He purposively smokes on his balcony." Another manager had no trouble with his tenants but found the employees harder to control.

The CommuniCare TPP and the executive director of CHOC, a non-profit affordable housing development agency, signed an MOU stating that they would work together to promote smoke-free common areas at nine complexes managed by CHOC's subsidiary, SAMC. SAMC leadership underwrote this effort and doubled the number of MUHs involved to 18. In the end, all the common areas of all 18 MUHs officially became smoke free. The TPP's FER pointed out how

valuable this support from the top was but also observed, “MUH managers or case workers who lived or worked on-site [at these MUHs] were more likely to have concerns regarding new smoke-free policies. They often had closer relationships with residents and were worried about enforcement issues... Many MUH managers were smokers themselves...” The TPP felt that their careful education and training helped allay these reservations, saying that “...the presentation of the information in a way that was not fear-based or judgmental seemed to resonate with them.”

Through surveying a sample of \_\_\_ managers, the Sacramento County LLA identified *enforcement* as the single greatest concern voiced by complex management.

The four residents who took part in a focus group convened by the Sutter County STEP were dubious about smoke-free policies in general and compliance with the new rules in particular. As the STEP FER explained, “While those present said that they would comply if the landlord implemented a policy, they felt that a penalty would have to be in place to prompt those who smoke to comply...They questioned how enforcement of such a policy would occur: ‘Are we supposed to call [Landlord] at 6AM?’”

Misinformation. When Catholic Charities’ SFASD Project staff checked back with the group of manager/owners addressed during their educational intervention to see whether new written policies had been instituted, four managers said they had and five more said they were trying out “word of mouth” policies against smoking in common areas. However, the post-intervention observations turned up no new signage in any of these complexes, throwing some doubt on the validity of policy implementation. More disconcerting still, some managers who had told staff their complexes already had smoke-free policies the first time they were contacted had apparently forgotten this when the follow-up call came and said they had no such policies.

No information. The Catholic Charity SFASD Project ran into significant unwillingness on the part of some owner/managers to answer questions about MUH ownership and even more opposition to revealing information about present or future smoke-free policies applying to the complexes. Their FER described the problem: “MUH owners and managers were very reluctant to provide information on their current policies or reveal their intent to adopt new ones. SFASD staff needed to constantly adjust their outreach strategies to overcome gatekeepers and address concerns over privacy to gain access to the key MUH complex personnel.”

Manager sabotage. After three years of trying to gain an audience with the MUH managers in their target areas, In the Zone Tobacco Free Project staff were discouraged. Their FER expresses their frustration well: “We made many contacts, conducted many presentations with groups of managers/owners of MUHs, conducted surveys at their units (if allowed), showed them data, showed them our petition signatures collected at community events, etc., and still...nothing. Over the three years, what staff found is that many of the managers were themselves smokers...”

The Sutter County STEP was fortunate to learn up front that the lack of interest expressed by interviewees in two cases was due to “Owners that smoked themselves and who would not support such a policy.”

Other projects learned that many managers are also smokers but didn’t see this as an inevitable impediment to the passage of smoking restrictions. The Sacramento County LLA determined that 43% of the managers they surveyed were smokers, yet that group supported both smoke-free common areas and smoke-free apartments.

Owner-manager disconnect. The In-the-Zone-Tobacco-Free-Project staff observed that convincing MUH owners that a smoke-free policy is a good idea does not guarantee that the target MUH will indeed adopt such a policy. If it happens that MUH managers are not in favor of restricting the use of tobacco for any reason—dreading confrontation with tenants who refuse to stop smoking, concern that smokers will leave and units will go unrented, the conviction that such a policy is unenforceable, even the fact that he or she is a smoker and doesn’t want to give it

up—there is a strong chance that the best-designed interventions will fail. As the In the Zone FER put it, “...even though an owner might be very interested, a manager might downplay any possibility of making a policy work. Most owners are off-site and don’t have a real idea of the day-to-day activities, and so they tend to believe and rely on what their manager is sharing with them.”

Manager-tenant discord. Be aware of possible personal conflicts between tenants and their landlords that occupy and skew the thinking of both parties. The Santa Cruz County LLA ran into such a case, which escalated to the point of causing a valued contact in management to decamp and virtually scuttle the project’s work to that point. Their FER advised, “Relationships between tenant and landlords may be complex and antagonistic, with multiple layers and history and conflict. These relationships also include many legally defined rights and responsibilities. It is important for tobacco control advocates to maintain a neutral position in order to continue to work effectively.”

There is reason behind blind, unreasoning resistance. Some FERs described instances when project staff found that a succession of apparently specious objections on the parts of managers and tenants masked very real concerns that individuals didn’t want to raise. Owners and managers who don’t want to admit that they are smokers are one example of this kind of resistance that we have already examined. The Santa Cruz Tobacco Free LGBT project encountered another hidden agenda during their campaign. Bolstered by logical assumptions about their community based upon their own knowledge and research that showed that “...68% of LGBT community members responded favorably to addressing the issue of drifting secondhand smoke in multi-unit housing,” staff were startled when they collided with fierce and unexpected resistance during their outreach to the few housing owners/managers whose complexes met the official TCP criteria for MUHs. Only two of eight owners/managers began restricting smoking within and around their units. Of the remaining six, one refused to meet with project staff because “...he does not support the designation of smoke-free units” and five owners/managers “...allow smoking and adamantly oppose designating smoke-free units.” As for the community itself, further survey work discovered that “...the majority of the community opposes a law banning smoking in multi-unit housing.”

Upon reflection, project staff realized that tobacco is not the only source of smoke. After a period of confusion at what seemed like conflicting responses on community surveys about smoke-free housing, they recognized the underlying issue: “A large number of respondents asked if questions about smoking referred to tobacco or marijuana smoke. They informally reported that they did not support smoking bans because they did not want to limit marijuana smoking in their homes. Unfortunately we did not anticipate respondents to have contradictory opinions about tobacco and marijuana smoke. We recommend that future surveys in Santa Cruz County distinguish between marijuana and tobacco smoke.” They also thought that anti-smoking advocates should continue to try to work with housing owners/managers to create (tobacco) smoke-free sections within individual complexes rather than shoot for community-wide anti-smoking laws.

Misapprehensions. BREATHE of Sacramento (BCSET), accustomed to working with college students, was confident that idealistic young adults would happily support the smoke-free housing movement. Indeed, responses to a 362-person public opinion survey showed that young apartment dwellers indicated problems with drifting second-hand smoke (50%) and a dislike of smoking in common areas (87% and 85%, respectively, in exercise and laundry rooms). But in the final analysis, staff found that smoke-free housing took a back seat to low-cost apartments, complexes that didn’t demand references or do credit checks, and complexes with no or short lease agreements. The support BESET counted on evaporated when countered with these realities.

Management staff turnover. Connections and continuity are broken, sometimes irretrievably, when staffing changes occur at the target locations. The Imperial County Tobacco Education Program (TEP), attempting to understand why the administration of one of the housing authority complexes where their efforts seemed to be proceeding smoothly ultimately decided not to enact

the voluntary policy for smoke-free common areas, put it down—at least in part—to internal staff turnover. They felt that their intensive work with sympathetic staff members was essentially lost.

Over time, and with infinite tact and patience, the Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Tobacco Education Program (TEP) staff developed a good working relationship with the skittish manager of a 74-unit MUH serving low-income seniors and disabled individuals, operated by a large nonprofit provider of affordable housing. Staff helped overcome the manager's concerns about the legality of smoke-free housing in subsidized housing and other issues and were preparing to carrying the discussion on to his supervisor when the manager and an outspoken tenant developed a personal animosity. In the ensuing conflict, the manager backed away from policy discussions and eventually departed. The new manager was pessimistic about ever establishing smoke-free units in the MUH and TEP staff discontinued contact, contenting themselves with an acid comment about the affair in their FER: "...the managers ultimately declined to address tenant concerns about smoking."

### **Reasons for developing/adopting smoke-free policies**

Many projects conducted surveys and key informer interviews with property owners and managers, both before and after smoke-free policy adoption. When asked why they would—or did—opt to control tobacco use at their MUH complex, the reasons the managers themselves gave and the number or names of projects that quoted them follow:

- Increased costs for maintenance and insurance (mentioned in 10 FERs) One manager said, "In one unit, we had to gut the whole apartment including all appliances because of brown stains and tobacco odor." The Fresno County EOC reported, "Over half of the respondents identified the costs of remediation from cigarette smoke as a significant burden on unit rental." The Plumas County TURP added, "The average cost, including materials and labor, of turning over a unit that was lived in by a smoker was estimated in 2006 dollars to be at least double the cost of a unit lived in by a non-smoker, according to most of the owners/managers. ...the maintenance department reported also anticipating shortened turnaround times between tenants in addition to less expensive steps that were routine when smokers moved out." The Santa Cruz Tobacco Free LGBT noted, "One owner/manager is adding non-smoking clauses to his lease in order to keep units clean..." From the Sutter County STEP came this: Three managers described the benefits of having smoke-free public areas and/or units: "...Savings in the areas of paint and carpeting...fewer repairs and saving on paint." According to a survey of MUH managers, the time it took managers to clean up smoking litter: an average of 1 hour and 15 minutes/week. Damage to units related to smoking: smoking damage to walls, burns, damage to window coverings, damage to carpets.
- Health hazards of exposure to secondhand smoke (mentioned in 9 FERs)
- Risk of fire from lighting and smoking cigarettes (mentioned in 3 FERs)
- "Opportunity to be leaders in their community"—CommuniCare
- "Avoid any liability from disability laws..."—CommuniCare
- "...there is no constitutional right to smoke (helps allay property owners'/managers' concerns about 'smokers' rights')." —ETR CAPP
- Complexes won't lose renters "...as a result of making the units smoke-free" since the majority of Californians don't smoke and "...even in the low-income rental population, 75% are non-smokers." —ETR CAPP
- To support HUD's interest in creating smoke-free housing—NCCWB Respiro Libre
- "Because all employees of the MUH complex were non-smokers..."—NCCWB Respiro Libre

### **Feedback after policy adoption**

Comments from property managers and tenants (offered by BREATHE of the Bay Area/San Jose and NCCWB Respiro Libre unless otherwise noted) who were asked for their experiences and opinions once the smoke-free policy is fully adopted:



### Property managers

- Positive feedback from tenants: “Occupancy increased since the complex went smoke-free; new tenants like the fact that it’s a smoke-free environment.”
- “Both complexes have had very positive responses from residents so far...”
- Support from tenants on policy adoption: “...neither [MUH] has experienced any problems with residents not adhering to the smoke-free policy...”
- Ease of adopting smoke-free policies
- Decrease in turnover costs since implementing policies
- The discovery that employees, not tenants, violate the policy: “Sometimes the employees smoke and don’t pay attention to the restricted areas. We have 12 employees and sometimes up to 50, and a quarter of them are smokers.”
- No trouble “...renting since the policies have been adopted.”

### Tenants

- 75% at one complex and 100% at the other strongly supported the new smoke-free policy.
- Although 8 of 9 tenants interviewed strongly supported the new policy, several had reservations:
  - “I appreciate people wanting a smoke-free environment, and that those who smoke can still do so. I personally have quit.”
  - I think I should be able to smoke in my home and on my deck. I don’t mind the smoke-free policies; they are there for the consideration of non-smokers.”
  - “It’s a good idea, as long as our rights re not violated to smoke in our home.”
  - “As long as families are not going to be thrown out because of a smoking issue, it is good. It is not a determining factor for me to live in a smoke-free place.”
- “The responses of residents as well as employees of the senior centers have been overwhelmingly positive, with many ‘thankful to not have to contend with cigarette smoke.’”
- Managers and board members of these complexes reported that complaints about smoking have far outweighed any complaints about actions to prohibit or limit where smoking was allowed.”—Plumas County TURP
- In a survey of MUHs managed by the Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation in Ventura County, researchers found that “...48% of responders felt that the smoke-free policy had been enforced ‘very effectively,’ with an additional 37% noting ‘somewhat effective’ enforcement.”—Ventura County LLA

### **From one owner/manager to another**

Asked how they would advise the property owner/manager of a similar MUH complex about adopting smoke-free policies now that they own shake-down period has successfully passed, managers made the following remarks:

- “I think they should go smoke-free most definitely. It’s a lot cleaner community if you don’t have smokers. Also, if they do it gradually then it’s not going to impact their business.”—BREATHE of the Bay Area/San Jose
- “I suggest other housing camps use the smoking policy contract during the beginning of the application process, so the residents understand from the beginning that smoking is not allowed, and if they violate the policy they could lose their tenancy.”—BREATHE of the Bay Area/San Jose
- “Hire non-smoking employees.”—BREATHE of the Bay Area/San Jose

- “The Center for Well-Being will give you the support you need to do this, including a presentation for residents that helps them feel positive about the change. do it, fast! It will save you money. Jump on the bandwagon.”—NCCWB Respiro Libre

### **In closing...**

This main body of this report focuses on the project elements that, when optimized, are most likely to lead to a positive outcome. In general, we assume that the positive outcome that counts is attaining the smoke-free policy described in the project's stated objective. This is a satisfactory measure of success in most cases, but as several FERs attempt to explain, it is not always perfectly clear that the project is responsible for the outcome.

Measurement of success. In some cases, it was difficult for the LLA or Competitive grantee to provide a numerical measure of success. For example, the ALA of Sacramento/RESPECT acknowledged the difficulty of tracing the effects of their trainings, technical assistance, and educational material from influence to concrete outcomes. Their initial objective was to cause a minimum of eight developers to designate at least one of their MUHs as “smoking restricted.” In their FER, RESPECT staff admitted that they needed a different measure, which they said “...came in the form of the most important asses to this project: personal contact. RESPECT staff and consultants collected experiential data based on personal relationship[s] built with apartment owners, managers, and association leadership.” The FER went on to assert boldly, “At the end of the grant period, RESPECT could account for new smoke-free policies in 49 complexes consisting of over 3,700 smoke-free units since intervention activities began in 2004.” You have to admire that statement for pure cojones.

Another project reporting blurred lines between intervention and policy changes was ALA of the Bay Area/BCSET, whose FER noted the problem of establishing cause and effect when information on smoke-free living is widely distributed. “To help create a ‘buzz’ about smoke-free housing, staff mailed the *Resource Guide to Easy & Affordable Smoke-Free Apartments* to...over 350 apartment complexes...” Subsequently, project staff realized that “...once owners or managers learned about the process and legalities of policy adoption, many changed policies on their own, not requesting the project’s assistance, which made tracking policies difficult.”

BREATHE California of the Bay Area established relationships with staff members of the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara, a large property management firm, and advocated for smoke-free housing for two years. Later they learned from one of their contacts who had moved to another post that the Housing Authority had imposed a no-smoking policy on its affordable housing units. The FER observed, “Although the Housing Authority did not credit BREATHE California with this decision, it seems clear to the advocates that the project’s efforts had some influence on the management’s decision to adopt a comprehensive smoke free policy.”

The Yolo County TPP finished the grant period without being able to claim that their intervention activities were directly responsible for a single smoke-free-policy adoption. However, their outreach efforts to local owners/managers—one-on-one meetings, phone calls, a luncheon seminar—and particularly their connection with the Davis Rental Managers Association, certainly placed the necessary information within reach of the managers who took seven properties smoke-free during the 2004-7 program period.

Unintended consequences. On occasion, the ripples caused by project staff’s hard work affect areas and individuals they have not targeted. Still, if they had not attended that health fair, given that interview, made that presentation, taken part in that meeting or conference, helped that tenant or landlord who has now moved on but not forgotten—in short, if they had not done their best to present their case at every opportunity—an occurrence that looks like serendipity but is really the indistinct result of cause and effect would not have happened. Several examples of this

distant relationship were presented in this set of FERs and are offered here as reminders that we cannot anticipate how important our actions may be to others.

1. Gaining greater visibility and legitimacy within the apartment rental industry in pursuit of one set of objectives can lead to unexpected opportunities to expand smoke-free housing in other community sectors. For example, ALA of the Bay Area/BCSET's focus was on young adults, but their FER reports that the project was contacted by 12 senior complexes "...for assistance and education on how to go about adopting smoke-free policies. Because of the staff's relationship with the Rental Housing Association, the increased interest in smoke-free living, and the project's presence in the apartment community, staff are becoming known and sought for assistance..."

2. When BREATHE California of the Bay Area set up their Second-hand Smoke Helpline, they hoped to provide callers with both information and appropriate referrals in the event of smoking-related problems. And they did that for over 275 callers. Their activism took them to the San Jose City Council and set off a chain of events that eventually resulted in the city's smoke-free parks ordinance.

3. The Northern California Center for Well-Being's Respiro Libre Project targeted MUH complexes that were home to at least 70% low-SES Latino tenants, planning to get four MUHs to adopt and implement smoke-free policies. The owners and managers of the chosen MUHs were very resistant and Respiro Libre Project staff were unable to meet their goal. But their hard work still paid off. Their intensive bilingual media effort, work with local youth, and participation in health fairs resulted in "...over five calls from tenants suffering from secondhand smoke and educated many more..." Another of their activities, their Secondhand Smoke Forum, actually resulted in smoke-free living for residents at two MUH complexes in their county, though not for their target population: "...nearly twenty-five owners/managers participated, and two landlords decided to adopt smoke-free policies... [M]any others showed interest in adopting smoke-free policies in the near future pending buy-in from the property management company they worked for."

4. The Sutter County STEP designed a project that focused the intervention on four MUHs and identified two other, similar MUHs to serve as a control group. During their initial investigation of the feasibility of this approach, STEP staff interviewed managers at all six sites. One of the managers at a control location expressed personal support for the smoke-free concept but was quite certain that the MUH at which she worked would not look favorably upon adopting a policy at that time. Before the project timed out, this manager approached STEP staff to let them know that she was now managing another MUH "...and clearly intended to advance the idea of smoke-free common areas, and looked to the STEP program for support." They said, "Nah." No they didn't; just kidding. The FER reports, "This is a very positive outcome of the effort."

#### The value of celebration

Many projects, upon successfully meeting their objectives, treated the people involved in making the restrictive smoking policy a reality to a celebration as a fitting reward for their hard work. The reception at Sojourner Truth Manor (STM), put on by ALA of the East Bay/EBSFH Project, celebrated the smoke-free status of the 87-unit complex by bringing together the STM residents and staff, the EBSFH Project staff, the firefighters who helped rescue residents during the 2004 fire and who conduct fire safety trainings, a City of Oakland councilmember, and administrators from the management team at Christian Church Homes. In addition to being fun for all the participants, the net effect of the reception was to reinforce the sense of accomplishment and to further legitimize the new smoke-free policy.

It is worth noting, however, that not all MUHs welcomed the publicity that might naturally accompany the celebration of successfully implementing smoke-free policies for their tenants. BREATHE California of the Bay Area reported, "The most difficult media activity turned out to be one that had been predicted to be easy: giving an apartment complex publicity in the form of

kudos for going smoke free. No one wanted this publicity! Each group that had gone smoke-free declined...It seems that the very large apartment complexes were all concerned that the ad would affect their occupancy rates.” In one case, a manager backed out after an ad was actually placed, leaving project staff stuck for the cost of the ad—but fortunately a very small apartment complex that had previously gone smoke-free agreed to the ad.

It is unfortunate that the work that the 21 projects did over their funding periods, which provided far more information than a report of this kind can begin to extract and present usefully, cannot be properly acknowledged here. More important, however, is the fact that the incalculable value of their contact with policy makers, housing industry representatives, and the residents of MUH complexes will continue to percolate through the communities of California, bringing greater awareness of the dangers of secondhand smoke and a greater acceptance of efforts to curtail it even to benighted rural areas like Tuolumne County.

## Appendix B. List of Local Lead Agency/Competitive Grantee objectives

- (1) ALA of the East Bay/East Bay Smoke Free Housing (EBSFH) Project, Emeryville : *By July 31, 2007, a minimum of two multi-unit housing units (MUH) for low income seniors—one each in Alameda and Contra Costa counties—will adopt and enforce a voluntary policy that designates common outdoor and indoor areas as smoke-free and protects residents from drifting secondhand smoke between units (Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12).*
- (2) ALA of Sacramento/RESPECT (Resources and Education Supporting People Everywhere Controlling Tobacco): *By June 30, 2007, as a result of an intensive educational intervention with at least 30 local building permitting authorities in California, a minimum of 8 multi-unit housing developers and/or contractors will each construct or designate at least one multi-unit housing complex (market rate or subsidized) as a “smoking restricted” property comprised of at least 50% non-smoking units and 100% smoke-free indoor and outdoor common areas (Indicators 2.2.11, 2.2.12, and 2.2.13).*
- (3) BREATHE California of Sacramento-Emigrant Trails (BCSET): *By June 30, 2008, at least five (5) multi-unit apartment complexes in Sacramento County with predominantly young adults (ages 18-29) residents will adopt smoke-free policies governing indoor private living spaces, indoor common areas and/or outdoor common areas (Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12).*
- (4) BREATHE California of the Bay Area: *By June 30, 2008, a minimum of four lower SES area multi-dwelling housing units in Santa Clara and San Benito Counties will adopt and implement written policies to reduce exposure to SHS that designate common indoor and/or outdoor areas smoke-free, or protect residents from drifting SHS between units (Indicator 2.2.12).*
- (5) Catholic Charities Diocese of San Diego’s New Smoke-free for All San Diegans (SFASD) Project: *By June 30, 2008, 20% of the managers or owners of multiple housing complexes (representing 1000-1500 low-income units located in at least 3 Low SES communities in San Diego County) approached that do not currently have policies on smoke-free common areas will adopt policies that designate common indoor and outdoor areas as smoke free (Indicator 2.2.12).*  
*N.b.: This objective also addresses Indicator 2.2.11, so I charted it that way in Table 1, but it’s my impression that they only succeeded with 2.2.12 goals*
- (6) CommuniCare Health Centers: *By June 30, 2008, a minimum of 3 low-income MUH properties located in Woodland, Davis, and/or West Sacramento, will adopt and implement policies restricting the exposure to secondhand smoke (e.g., indoor and/or outdoor exposure in common areas and/or policies that protect residents from drifting secondhand smoke between units) (Indicator 2.2.12).* *N.b.: This objective also addresses Indicator 2.2.11, so I charted it that way in Table 1. In fact, they went way beyond the usual expectations for common areas.*
- (7) California’s Clean air Project (CCAP): *By June 30, 2008, as a result of an intensive educational intervention with at least 15 city and/or county governments in California, a minimum of 5 cities and/or counties will adopt mandatory policies requiring a minimum of 50% of the units of market-rate and/or subsidized housing within their jurisdictions to be designated and operated as non-smoking units (Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12).* *This actually sounds more like 2.2.13, since they speak of “units” rather than “common areas,” but never mind.*
- (8) Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission (EOC) Rural Tobacco Education Program (RTEP): *By June 30, 2008, a minimum of 15 multi-unit housing complexes in rural Fresno County will adopt a comprehensive policy reducing Secondhand Smoke (SHS) through smoke-free units, smoke-free buildings, smoke-free common areas (indoors and outdoors), and/or reducing cigarette litter (Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12)..* *And it looks to me as though they too should claim 2.2.13; same reasoning as above.*

(9) Imperial County Tobacco Education Program (TEP): By June 30, 2007, a minimum of 10 low-income housing complexes out of a total of 41 in Imperial County will have implemented smoke-free common areas as determined by a voluntary policy (Indicator 2.2.12).

(10) Northern California Center for Well-Being (NCCWB): By June 3, 2008, four multiple unit housing (MUH) complexes with at least 70% low socio-economic status (SES) Latino population in the Boyes Hot Springs and Roseland areas of Sonoma County, will adopt and implement policies protecting residents from drifting secondhand smoke exposure between units or from common areas such as playground, swimming pool areas and entrances (Indicators 2.2.13 and 2.2.11).

(11) Pasadena Tobacco Prevention Coalition (PTPC): By June 30, 2007, at least three multi-unit housing complexes in Pasadena will adopt a formal policy to protect residents from drifting second hand smoke between units by requiring at least one-third of contiguous sections of the building or the entire building to be smoke-free (Indicator 2.2.13).

(12) PHFE In the Zone: By June 30, 2008, a minimum of 6 low income multiple housing units (MHUs) and at least one city in San Bernardino and/or Riverside Counties will adopt and implement policies restricting the exposure to secondhand smoke (e.g. indoor and/or outdoor exposure in common areas and/or policies that protect residents from drifting secondhand smoke between units) (Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12).

(13) Plumas County Public Health Agency Tobacco Use Reduction Program: By June 30, 2007, at least two Multi-unit housing complexes in Plumas County will adopt voluntary policies designating outdoor or indoor common areas a smoke free (Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12).

(14) Central Valley Regional Advocates Countering Tobacco Project (REACT): By 06/30/10, a minimum of six (6) multi-housing units in Kern, Kings and Tulare Counties with a predominant low SES tenant population will adopt and implement a policy that designates smoke-free apartments and/or common outdoor areas (e.g. playground and swimming pool areas) and common-use indoor areas (e.g. laundry-rooms, lobby areas, and hallways) as smoke-free (Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12).

(15) Sacramento County Tobacco Education Program: By June 30, 2007, a minimum of four new or existing apartment complexes with predominantly priority population residents in Sacramento County will allocate all or a portion of the units as smoke-free as documented in property rental agreements. (Indicator 2.2.13).

(16) San Francisco Tobacco Free Project: By June 30, 2007, San Francisco will adopt [one of the following two policies] to reduce exposure to secondhand smoke: Policy impacting multi-unit housing complexes (e.g., apartment owners, condo associations and public housing boards) that protects residents from drifting secondhand smoke between units and incorporates enforcement/compliance remedies such as smoke between units and incorporates enforcement/compliance remedies such as including secondhand smoke exposure in nuisance abatement statutes (Indicator 2.2.13.) **The other policy referred to here addressed Indicator #2.2.4.**

(17) The Santa Cruz Tobacco Free LGBT: By June 30, 2008, a minimum of 5 multi-unit housing complexes occupied by at least 10% identified lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) tenants in Santa Cruz County will adopt and implement a policy to make all or a portion of their units smoke-free, as documented in property rental agreements (Indicator 2.2.13).

(18) Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Tobacco Education Program (TEP): By June 30, 2007, at least 3 multi-unit housing complexes in Santa Cruz county will adopt a policy restricting smoking in common areas (laundry room, court yards [six], recreation areas, walkways), and at least 2 (either of the 3 or additional) multi-unit housing complexes will set aside a minimum of 25% of their units as smoke-free (Indicators 2.2.12 and 2.2.13).

(19) Sutter County Tobacco Education and Prevention Program (STEP): STEP's FER doesn't seem to have the usual formal statement of intent. Instead, it indicates the project's intentions with these words: *The Sutter County Tobacco Education and Prevention Program has undertaken several activities to promote the adoption of policies that support smoke-free public spaces within multi-family housing units in Sutter County...To this end, the STEP project will provide support in the adoption of smoke-free policies for at least four comparable multi-family housing complexes (This seems to conform, more or less, to Indicators 2.2.11 and 2.2.12).*

(20) Ventura County Public Health, Tobacco Education Program/Local Lead Agency: *By June 30, 2007, at least one local housing authority, city, or city housing department in Ventura County will adopt a policy that creates nonsmoking sections or buildings in subsidized and/or market-rate housing (Indicator 2.2.13). (This objective also addresses Indicator 2.2.1.)*

(21) Yolo County Tobacco Prevention Program (TPP): *By June 30, 2007, at least 3 apartment complexes housing UC Davis students will adopt a written policy designating at least 25% of the apartments as smoke-free (Indicator 2.2.13).*