



CENTER FOR EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

TOBACCO CONTROL EVALUATION CENTER

Combating Tobacco-related Litter in Public Places

A summary and analysis of eight Final Evaluation Reports
of California tobacco control programs addressing Communities of
Excellence Indicator 1.4.1 in the 2004-2007 funding cycle

Report prepared by
C. S. Lemp Consulting
P. O. Box 445
Columbia, CA 95310

December 2008

Commissioned on behalf of
The Tobacco Control Evaluation Center

UC Davis
Davis, CA

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

PREDICTORS OF SUCCESS IN MEETING INDICATOR 1.4.1 OBJECTIVES

Location

- An environmentally-conscious city or county with a flourishing economy and ample public services
- A comparatively affluent, well-educated population
- Nearby cities and counties with smoke-free policies in place
- A large and diverse roster of local community-based organizations

Operation

- Local lead agency staff that is stable, knowledgeable, creative, and highly motivated
- Active, well-connected coalition members
- A pool of potential volunteers, particularly young people
- Access to professional consultants and agencies
- A program with a comparatively low overall number of objectives and less optimistic goals for each objective
- An evaluator who is closely connected with the project from start to finish

CONTENTS

Predictors of success	2
Introduction	4
Methods	4
Intentions and outcomes	5
Activities	6
Ancillary Issues	17
Conclusions and Recommendations	19
References	21
Appendix A. List of Local Lead Agency Objectives	22

INTRODUCTION

Between the beginning of July 2004 and the end of June 2007, eight Local Lead Agencies (LLAs), representing eight county health departments in California, were funded by the California Department of Health Services, Tobacco Control Program, to address Communities of Excellence Indicator 1.4.1:

The amount of tobacco-related litter at public places including parks, playgrounds, beaches, fairgrounds, parks, parades, piers, playgrounds, sports stadiums, tot lots, and zoos.

OR

Proportion of communities with a policy that prohibits tobacco litter in public places including parks, playgrounds, beaches, fairgrounds, parks, parades, piers, playgrounds, sports stadiums, tot lots, and zoos.

The purpose of this report is to examine the efforts of all eight LLAs, to describe outcomes as presented in their Final Evaluation Reports (FERs), and to discuss some of the factors that appear to underlie successful and less successful attempts to achieve their stated goals. The report is primarily descriptive rather than analytical for reasons given in the Methods section below.

METHODS

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

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

In studying the eight FERs, it quickly became apparent that no set of shared variables was going to present itself to be used for convenient point-by-point comparisons. As is often the case when California counties undertake projects that have a single point in common—in this instance, Community of Excellence Indicator 1.4.1—the resulting final reports demonstrate a wide variation in content and in presentation. Reasons for this include:

- Differences among the counties. The counties included in this report vary geographically, economically, politically, and demographically.
- Differences in Local Lead Agencies and community coalitions. Reflecting the characteristics of their communities as well as their own individual capabilities, staffing varied in number, stability, and competence from one LLA to another and local coalitions varied in number, constituents, and degree of involvement.
- Differences in approach. LLAs and coalitions chose to pursue vastly different interventions, and to pursue them in ways unique to their individual settings and goals.

- Differences in evaluation. Six counties elected to hire outside evaluators while the other two conducted the evaluation internally. Trade-offs implicit in these choices include an objective, professional approach versus intimacy with the day-to-day evolution of the project, although in several cases the external evaluator did seem familiar with the details and nuances of the project. However, there are other issues that could impact the quality and accuracy of the evaluation, such as how professional the evaluator is, how well-versed s/he is in the strictures of tobacco control evaluation, and whether the evaluator or project director changed during the project.
- Differences in FERs. As documents, the FERs are a study in dissimilarity. Some are models of coherence and clarity, touching as closely as possible on the points addressed in the original plan and providing a wealth of detail; others are less complete and readable. None follow a single pattern of reporting activities and outcomes. And at least one suffered by comparison with the treatment its LLA gave to another objective. Given that all the LLAs had at least three objectives to report upon, all FERs may not be created equal.

Table 1 illustrates these last two points.

Table 1. Project evaluation and length of FERs across LLAs

COUNTY	EVALUATOR		EVALUATOR THE SAME THROUGHOUT ENTIRE CONTRACT PERIOD?*	LENGTH OF FER**
	Internal	External		
Del Norte		Yes	No	7 pages
Monterey	Yes		No	8 pages
San Luis Obispo		Yes	Yes	11 pages
San Mateo		Yes	Yes	50 pages
Santa Barbara		Yes	Not sure	16 pages
Siskiyou		Yes	Yes	11 pages
Ventura	Yes		Yes	10 pages
Yuba		Yes	Yes	10 pages

*Assertion based on comparing the name approved at the inception of the project to the author's name on the FER. In some cases—Santa Barbara County, for example—the authors of the FER may or may not be the evaluator.

**Page count includes cover page and text only, excluding attachments

It would be irresponsible to attempt to draw definitive conclusions from the limited information many FERs provided or to extrapolate from the intentions they expressed in their original work plans. Instead, this report limits itself to compiling information about activities and outcomes presented by the FERs themselves and making tentative observations based upon their assertions and upon apparent confluences among common efforts. The guiding rule of thumb in considering what to include in each section below was this: for the purposes of this report, if the LLAs didn't report it in their FER, they didn't do it.

INTENTIONS AND OUTCOMES

Of the eight LLAs that chose to tackle Indicator 1.4.1, five chose policy adoption and sought to have tobacco control policies enacted by local city councils, county boards of supervisors, college administrations, or event commissions. Three of these counties added implementation and further committed themselves to showing that, subsequent to policy enactment, tobacco litter would be reduced by a specified percentage from an established baseline.

The other three counties focused their efforts on reducing tobacco litter by some percentage through raising public awareness of the problem.

Table 2 shows how these efforts turned out. Note that LLAs in all three counties which were successful in meeting their objectives (Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and San Mateo Counties) in fact exceeded the goals they set for themselves. The LLA in Santa Barbara County met its goals in only four out of six of its target locations, but exceeded the expected percentage of litter reduction in the four areas where they did succeed. The remaining LLAs (in Del Norte, Siskiyou, Ventura, and Yuba Counties) were unable to meet their targeted goals.

Table 2. LLA plans and results of their efforts
(Those city/county LLAs which were successful in their efforts are shaded.)

COUNTY <i>STATUS</i>	PLAN		RESULT	
	Enact policy at	Reduce litter by	Enacted policy at	Reduced litter by
Del Norte	1 beach + 1 park	30%	<i>[unsuccessful]</i>	<i>[unsuccessful]</i>
Monterey	3 city beaches	30%	4 city beaches	46%
San Luis Obispo	1 city beach/pier	-	2 city beaches	-
San Mateo	3 outdoor/ community venues	-	1 city's beaches & pier, 2 events, and 38 farmer's markets	
Santa Barbara <i>(Partly successful)</i>	-	50% in 6 areas	-	64-95% in 4 areas
Siskiyou	-	60% in all tot lots	-	3% average
Ventura	2 campuses	50% in 4-6 locations	<i>[unsuccessful]</i>	<i>[unsuccessful]</i>
Yuba	-	40% in outdoor recreation areas	-	<i>[unsuccessful]</i>

Having determined which LLAs were successful and to what degree, we examined the FERs for factors that might help illuminate how some LLAs were able to make their way to a successful outcome. First we looked at their activities and how the staff accomplished them through the:

- Scope of work undertaken
- Collection and use of local data
- Extension of staff capacity

Then we considered the ancillary issues that had a positive or negative effect upon project outcomes such as:

- Conditions intrinsic to the setting
- Local factors that benefited or hindered the project
- Effect of influential individuals or groups

ACTIVITIES

In this section, we will describe and compare—to the extent possible given the variations among the FERs—the decisions made by the LLAs as they designed and implemented their projects.

Scope of work undertaken

Of the eight LLAs in this set, three decided to work on three major objectives that addressed various indicators over the 2004-2007 period, two elected to address four, and three targeted five, as shown in

Table 3. Several FERs described the process through which the LLAs and their coalitions decided to address CX 1.4.1, but none explained how they determined just how extensive their goal or goals should be.

It seems logical that there might be a correlation between ultimate success and how ambitious LLAs and their local coalitions were in committing themselves to a higher number of objectives and/or to a project with far-reaching goals. Table 3 examines this possibility, presenting the LLAs in order of the number of objectives they selected.

Table 3. LLA goals for their 1.4.1 projects and the total number of objectives undertaken
(Those city/county LLAs which were successful in their efforts are shaded.)

COUNTY	NATURE OF GOALS FOR 1.4.1 PROJECT	TOTAL NO. OBJECTIVES
San Luis Obispo	Enact tobacco control policy at 1 city beach or pier	3
San Mateo	Enact tobacco control policy in 3 outdoor venues	3
Ventura	Enact tobacco control policy at 2 campuses + reduce litter by 50%	3
Santa Barbara <i>(Partly successful)</i>	Reduce litter by 50% in 6 areas	4
Siskiyou	Reduce litter by 60% within 25 ft of all tot lots/ playgrounds in county	4
Del Norte	Enact policies prohibiting litter within 25 ft of parks, playgrounds, tot lots + reduce litter on beaches by 30%	5
Monterey	Enact tobacco control policies at 3 beaches + reduce litter by 30%	5
Yuba	Reduce litter in all parks, playgrounds, campgrounds, and beaches in county by 40%	5

As Table 3 shows, the three successful LLAs (San Luis Obispo, San Mateo and Monterey Counties) limited their 1.4.1 aspirations to policies for individual venues or locations. Three of the unsuccessful LLAs (Del Norte, Siskiyou, and Yuba Counties) appeared to be attempting to conduct their interventions county-wide, although part of the way through each of the projects narrowed its focus to some extent.

With regard to the overall number of objectives undertaken, two of the three LLAs that took on three objectives met their 1.4.1 goals while only one of the LLAs that tackled five objectives was able to succeed. Of those which took on four objectives, one was partially successful and the other unsuccessful.

While there are many factors that can affect whether or not a policy objective is successful (such as the economic or political climate in the jurisdiction, the timing of project activities or outside events, and even the personal beliefs and/or preferences of decision makers), this rough comparison suggests that limiting the number of objectives undertaken in a three-year period and setting goals at a more readily attainable level enhances the probability of success. Given that all but one of the LLAs in this set received the same amount of total funding for their 2004-2007 efforts—in other words, that taking on three objectives paid the same as taking on five—this might be a good strategy to consider (when TCP funding requirements allow).

Collection and use of data

All of the FERs reported considerable activity in gathering information through research, public polls and/or observations, and through key informant interviews. LLAs typically used the data they obtained to promote their interventions through presentations and in educational campaigns.

Preliminary background work. Prior to setting out to create change in their localities, LLAs typically collected public health and environmental information on the hazards of tobacco litter in order to develop fact sheets, researched tobacco control policies in other jurisdictions to have current approaches at their fingertips, and investigated attitudes toward and statutes pertaining to prohibiting tobacco use in their own areas in order to chart the angle and direction of their efforts. FERs rarely described these efforts directly but all of them alluded to conducting educational activities that depended, at least to some degree, upon doing their homework.

Surveys and observations. All but two of the counties which selected Indicator 1.4.1 conducted one or more public opinion polls, and all of the polls provided support for controlling the use of tobacco, particularly where children are concerned. In some counties, LLA staff conducted the surveys; in others, volunteers or outside evaluators did the work. Table 4 offers a glimpse of the sorts of questions asked and responses received.

Table 4. Overview of public opinion polls conducted by LLAs
(Those city/county LLAs which were successful in their efforts are shaded.)

COUNTY	NO. OF POLLS	PEOPLE POLLED	QUESTIONS POSED		
			Ban tobacco use in beaches/parks/near playgrounds/tot lots?	Restrict smoking at public events/ in public areas?	Protect youth from tobacco/smoke/ litter?
Del Norte	1	203	Yes—71%	Yes—79%	Yes—87%
Monterey	no mention	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	1	240	Yes—62%	Yes—61%	--not asked--
San Mateo	2	135 200	Yes—94% --not asked--	--not asked— Yes—91%	Yes—86% --not asked--
Santa Barbara <i>(Partly successful)</i>	1	251	Questions concerned media campaign recognition: 63% said it had some effect on their behavior (82% of smokers acknowledged an effect on their behavior)		
Siskiyou	no mention	-	-	-	-
Ventura	1	322	Questions concerned perceptions about smoking on Ventura college campus: 94% supported not smoking in public places; 74% supported smoking only in campus parking lots		
Yuba	1		Yes—89%	Yes—84%	--not asked--

In addition, all FERs reported performing at least one tobacco litter cleanup and/or observation of smokers at their targeted sites, with Del Norte, Monterey, Santa Barbara, and Siskiyou County LLAs doing follow-up collections and observations to demonstrate reductions in litter. Volunteers, usually including youth groups, were trained and supervised in collecting tobacco litter. Table 5 provides some details of their operations.

Table 5. Description of tobacco litter clean-ups and observations conducted by LLAs

COUNTY	NUMBER OF CLEAN-UPS	NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS	WHEN PERFORMED		
			Baseline	During	Follow-up
Del Norte	4 @ 2 locations	no mention	Feb.-May 2006	no mention	no mention
Monterey	2 @ 4 locations	no mention	Sept. 2004	no mention	Nov. 2004
San Luis Obispo ¹	no mention	2 @ 2 locations	Sept. 2004	no mention	March 2007
San Mateo: 2 projects ²	I. unspecified II. 1 @ 1 location	I. no mention II. no mention	I. unspecified II. May 2005	I. no mention II. no mention	I. no mention II. no mention
Santa Barbara ³	3 @ 9 locations	no mention	"2004/05"	"2005/06"	"2006-07"
Siskiyou ⁴	3 @ 16 locations	3 @ 16 locations	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007
Ventura ⁵	1 @ 15 locations	no mention	Aug/Sept 2005	none	none
Yuba ⁶	2 @ 15 locations	no mention	"2005"	"2006"	couldn't be done

¹The first observations were at Avila and Pismo Beaches, the second at Morro Bay and Pismo Beaches; only the two Pismo Beach activities are actually comparable.

²For Project 1, the extent of the clean-up area is undefined. The contractor "...decided to pick up...litter at key locations, such as local beaches [and were] able to find literally thousands of...butts on the beaches and in the immediate areas..."

³Each collection took 3 days; the FER said they took place at about the same time each year without specifying a month.

⁴Sixteen tot lots and playgrounds observed in Spring 2006, 10 in Fall 2006, 16 in Spring 2007.

⁵Baseline sites surveyed at two colleges: 7 at Ventura College and 8 at Oxnard College.

⁶Staff collected litter at 12 parks in 2005; youth *observed* litter in 6 parks in 2006 (but only 3 of those overlapped the previous 12), and in 2007 the sites were newly covered with mulch and no collection was possible, whereupon staff observed litter at 5 outdoor events instead. Unusual evaluative techniques.

All FERs but Yuba County's reported that the LLAs which gathered opinions, measured tobacco litter, and made observations compiled the information into presentations and used these data to support their appeal to local policy- or decision-makers. Several commented that local officials found direct information compelling; the Monterey County FER reported, "Gathering public opinion as part of the baseline is an effective way to share community concern with elected officials—*more* effective than media support..."

Key informant interviews. Whenever they were held—at the beginning, the middle, or the end of the projects—key informant interviews provided the opportunity for a useful exchange of information and for establishing closer, more trusting relationships with policy makers. The four LLAs which conducted them (Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties) were consistent in noting that they found these interviews helpful. Table 6 describes this activity.

Table 6. Description of key informant interviews as reported

COUNTY/ PROJECT GOAL	NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS/ WITH WHOM	HOW CONDUCTED	WHEN CONDUCTED
Monterey (3 beaches will adopt no-smoking policies)	22 of 28 contacted (18 government officials, 3 business people, and 1 law enforcement officer)	Telephone	Post-policy
San Luis Obispo (1 beach/pier will adopt/ implement smoke-free outdoor area policy)	6 at Morro Bay (3 city officials, youth coalition chair, school principal, parent/business owner) 3 at Avila Beach (harbor commissioner, staff member, retailer)	In person	Pre-policy Pre-policy

COUNTY/ PROJECT GOAL	NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS/ WITH WHOM	HOW CONDUCTED	WHEN CONDUCTED
Santa Barbara (Raise public awareness and reduce litter)	37 of 190 contacted (facilities/maintenance staff from private and public sectors)	Online	Midway through media campaign
Ventura (2 colleges will adopt no-smoking policies and reduce litter)	8 at Ventura and Oxnard colleges (college advocates, administrators, coalition members)	In person	End of project

- In Monterey County, members of the city councils and staffs declined the interviews the LLA had counted on for their baseline. In their post-policy conversations, however, respondents said that they were satisfied with the new policies and believed that they can help change smoking habits in their respective areas.
- The San Luis Obispo County FER reported that the pre-policy discussions they held accurately predicted the outcomes: those held in Morro Bay were cheering—respondents were unanimously supportive of the campaign—while the conversations at Avila Beach were more tepid, and in fact Avila Beach did not adopt the proposed policy.
- The Santa Barbara County LLA used the survey to educate potential respondents about the tobacco litter issues and to obtain their opinions about staff time/costs in dealing with the litter and about the visibility of the media campaign. (The FER doesn't say whether this information was used to further shape or retarget the campaign.)
- The Ventura County LLA came away with the strong feeling that their policy advocates were extremely frustrated that their efforts had been in vain—especially at Ventura College, where they tried very hard—and that the college administrators were disinterested in the issue. These findings were central to the decision to invest LLA and coalition resources elsewhere in the future.

Presentations to policymakers. Six FERs described efforts made to educate and convince local policymakers to enact tobacco control ordinances, as summarized below in Table 7. (The Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo County FERs offered little information about interactions with local officials. The press conference that kicked off Santa Barbara County's campaign to reduce tobacco litter on beaches included speeches from city and county officials, implying some educational work among local policy makers, but the FER gives no details. Similarly, although the San Luis Obispo County LLA credits the strong advocacy of two youth groups with local city councils for policy adoption in Morro Bay and Pismo Beach, the FER doesn't describe the interaction between the youth and the policy makers.)

Table 7. LLA presentations to decision-making entities
(Those city/county LLAs which were successful in their efforts are shaded.)

COUNTY	MATERIALS PRESENTED				PRESENTED TO
	Model policies	Survey results	Clean-up results	Educational packet	
Del Norte	yes	yes	no mention	no mention	city councils, county board of supervisors
Monterey	yes	yes	yes	yes	city councils
San Luis Obispo	no mention	no mention	no mention	no mention	city councils
San Mateo:	I. yes	I. yes	I. yes	I. yes	I. city councils, county board of supervisors
2 projects	II. no mention	II. no mention	II. no mention	II. no mention	II. Festival board

COUNTY	MATERIALS PRESENTED				PRESENTED TO
	Model policies	Survey results	Clean-up results	Educational packet	
Santa Barbara <i>(Partly successful)</i>	no mention	no mention	no mention	no mention	hard to tell
Siskiyou	no mention	no mention	no mention	yes	city officials, parks & recreation dept., law enforcement
Ventura	no mention	no mention	no mention	yes	"key decision-making bodies"
Yuba	no mention	no mention	no mention	yes	city councils, public works, parks & rec. dept., recreation areas

In most cases, FERs describe coordinated attempts to persuade local officials to adopt new anti-tobacco policies or to enforce existing state laws. For example, the Monterey County LLA and members of their coalition attended multiple meetings of the city councils and subcommittees of four cities, beginning in late 2004 and continuing until all four cities passed ordinances prohibiting tobacco use on city beaches. They brought along clear containers of tobacco litter collected from beaches to vividly reinforce their arguments. The contractors who carried two of San Mateo County's projects forward created comprehensive PowerPoint presentations and devoted hours to meeting with local officials, answering questions, and providing technical assistance in framing policies. They also found that displaying cigarette butts in glass containers made a compelling impact in winning policy changes in their target areas. Especially effective was the bird's nest made entirely of cigarette butts that one contractor presented.

It would be a pleasure to report that hard work with policymakers always repaid the effort expended, but this was not the case. For example, the Ventura County LLA's arguments failed to move college administration in the face of a local union's threat to file a grievance if any tobacco control policy was introduced. The project director in Siskiyou County struggled to get signs posted and tobacco urns placed (materials the LLA provided) in Yreka, but ran into disinterest that served as a de facto refusal. The Yuba County FER reported a similar experience, with the added issue that two cities "expressed concerns about the excessive signage already present and overburdening law enforcement with phone calls due to the signage."

The Monterey and San Mateo County FERs which reported presenting local officials with sample policies and the outcomes of surveys and cleanups made a point of saying how well those tools worked. Other LLAs may have used them also and not mentioned the fact in their FERs, but if not, it would be a strategy worth trying.

Educational efforts. Plans to reach out to local communities and officials were as varied as the interactions themselves. The most frequently used strategies are summarized below.

Use of media. All eight LLAs budgeted amounts ranging from San Mateo County's \$6,000 to Santa Barbara County's \$25,230 for media (figures provided for comparison only; note that this budget item covers the whole 2004-2007 period and for the entire Scope of Work they addressed). Santa Barbara's whole project was an elaborate educational campaign designed to reach county residents, tourists, and public officials with their professionally designed "No Butts Left Behind" logo and slogan. They pulled out all the stops—launching the campaign with a press conference that included speeches from local and state officials and following that up with a deluge of print, radio, TV ads; bus and mall boards; posters; and more, presented in both English and Spanish. The ads ran for the whole three years, strategically timed to coincide with periods of heightened beach traffic, and were bolstered with presentations to schools and service clubs.

Other LLAs used media to a lesser degree in conjunction with their specific goals. The Monterey County LLA commissioned a TV PSA on tobacco-free beaches from a local advertising firm and aired it to correspond with its city-by-city efforts. They also got KION-TV interested enough to follow them around to city council meetings. In addition, LLA staffers wrote articles for city newsletters to help educate local communities. The Del Norte County FER reported getting coverage in the local newspaper for their clean-up surveys. San Mateo County events and policy activity received considerable coverage in several major newspapers. (San Luis Obispo, Siskiyou, and Ventura County FERs made no specific mention of media coverage.)

Use of local presentations. Most of the FERs mentioned educational packets developed to present to local officials, which were usually comprised of the results of recent surveys and observations, information about the effects of tobacco litter on public health and the environment, and model tobacco control policies from similar locales. Beyond working with city and county decision makers, the Santa Barbara LLA and coalition partnered with local CBOs to bring information into the schools and colleges. The Ventura County LLA trained and equipped college advocates and students to address their peers on selected topics.

Getting in the door wasn't always easy. The Yuba City FER reported that "it took substantial effort to arrange [educational presentations to local officials]" and the Santa Barbara FER noted that it could be difficult to interest entities in a presentation: service organizations in particular were a surprisingly tough sell. Young people have the advantage there: San Mateo County's intense youth coalition was able to complete a series of presentations to local organizations, hospitals, dentists, and other health professionals.

Use of signage. Siskiyou and Yuba Counties FERs treated signage and placement of tobacco urns as public education activities, though both experienced some difficulty in obtaining permission to deploy them as they had hoped. In San Mateo County, the LLA provided signs for cities to install. As municipalities passed smoke-free ordinances in Monterey County, the project provided signage for the entrances of all city beaches (with the City of Monterey contributing funds towards the cost—an example of a growing partnership in the effort to control cigarette litter).

Use of public events. Sponsoring or taking part in public clean-up efforts helped the Monterey and San Mateo County LLAs promote public awareness of the tobacco litter problem on the beaches. The Santa Barbara County LLA made an appearance at Carpinteria's Kick Butts Day, annual Earth Days, and sponsored a float in the Santa Barbara Solstice Day Parade and Festival. The Del Norte County LLA sponsored park and beach clean-up efforts. Ventura County's student peer educators worked at a total of 18 "tabling events" at three colleges, and Del Norte and Santa Barbara County LLAs staffed information tables and booths at several community events.

These efforts appear to have paid off in the amount of post-policy cigarette litter. The Santa Barbara County LLA found that litter decreased dramatically at two intervention sites—beach and high school—by 64-95% by the end of the project (though it increased by 17% at the retail site). After the Carpinteria City Council passed a no-smoking policy at all city parks and beaches in July 2004, the amount of tobacco litter went from a Year One baseline of 571 to 146 pieces in Year Two and 27 at the final pickup in Year Three. The Siskiyou County LLA reported that the amount of tobacco litter after no-smoking signs were posted fell by roughly 50%, and the Monterey County LLA saw reductions of 56%, 80%, and 89% at three beaches.

Extension of staff capacity

Since the success of these interventions depended so strongly upon the abilities of LLAs to perform all the necessary activities swiftly and thoroughly, it seems potentially useful to look at the number and composition of the staff in the eight counties. The Budget Section of the work plans provides job titles for

each individual funded in full or in part by the California Tobacco Control Program. Table 8 gives the percentage of the total funding granted to each LLA for personnel costs (including both salaries and fringe benefits). (Note: these figures represent the entire 2004-2007 contract undertaken by the LLAs— all three to five major objectives— and not just the effort to control tobacco litter.)

Table 8. LLA staff funding for entire 2004-2007 contract period

All positions are full time unless otherwise noted.

(Those city/county LLAs which were successful in their efforts are shaded.)

COUNTY	% FUNDS FOR STAFFING	STAFF TITLES			
		Director	Coordinator	Clerical	Other
Del Norte	46%	Project Director* (.75 FTE)	Health Educator* (.50 FTE)	Office Assistant* (.25 FTE)	-
Monterey	60%	Chronic Disease Prevention Coordinator*	Health Program Coordinator*	Office Assistant III	-
San Luis Obispo	69%	Project Director	Project Coordinator /Health Educator*	[Clerical staff funded by MSA]	-
San Mateo	66%	Project Director (.75-.70 FTE)	Health Educator (.30 FTE)	-	Add'l Health Educator (.25-.50 FTE, last 6 mo.)
Santa Barbara <i>(Partly successful)</i>	67%	Health Educator (.75 FTE)	Program Administrator	Senior Office Assistant	Evaluation Outreach Worker, EDP System Program Analyst, IT Data Entry Supervisor
Siskiyou	58%	Project Director (.85 FTE)	Project Coordinator (.50 FTE)	-	-
Ventura	68%	Public Health Program Coord.	-	Office Assistant III (.05-.25 FTE)	-
Yuba**	62%	Health Education Specialist A (1.0-.60 FTE)	Health Education Specialist B (.40 FTE)	Office Specialist (.35-.50 FTE) Extra Help Office Assistant (.10 FTE) Program Aide (.15 FTE)	Health Education Specialist C (.30-.15-.25 FTE) Health Education Specialist D (.40 FTE)

*Noted as replaced during project—information drawn from revisions in Budget Section.

**Massively complicated interlocking of Health Education Specialists.

Table 8 demonstrates that there is probably *not* a direct correlation between funds expended, staff on board, and project success.

All of the LLAs found various ways to extend the capacity of their basic staffing: by involving active coalition members, by recruiting and training volunteers, and/or by hiring groups and individuals to accomplish a variety of functions. In addition, some mentioned being able to enlarge their efforts by obtaining grants from other funders or by leveraging services from partners.

Table 9. Strategies for extending staff capacity
(Those city/county LLAs which were successful in their efforts are shaded.)

COUNTY	STRATEGIES FOR EXTENDING STAFF CAPACITY				
	Coalition involvement	Volunteers	CBO partners	Hired pros	Other funders
Del Norte	No mention	Youth from 2 groups picked up litter	No mention	Evaluator	No mention
Monterey	Chose objective, attended meetings, beach clean-ups	Youth/adults: several beach clean-ups	Several mentioned	Ad. firm for TV PSA	City of Monterey produced signs
San Luis Obispo	No mention	Polls/observations, presentations to local officials	No mention	Evaluator, media consultant	MSA helped with ads
San Mateo: 2 projects	Chose objective, made decisions throughout project	I. Students: polls and clean-ups II. Youth coalition ran project	3 CBOs contracted to conduct activities	Evaluator, media consultant	No mention
Santa Barbara (Partly successful)	Chose objective, worked on project design, attended events	Youth/adults: several beach clean-ups	More than a dozen	Evaluator, ad firm for media campaign, facilitator	MSA, local Park & Rec. Dept.
Siskiyou	No mention	4 adults/youth: cleanups and observations	No mention	Evaluator	No mention
Ventura	Chose objective, attended meetings	54 college students acted as peer educators	No mention	College liaison consultants	No mention
Yuba	No mention	Mini-grants to 5 youth groups for litter tallies	No mention	Evaluator	No mention

Getting help from coalition members. The mandatory community coalitions created to assist LLAs in their tobacco control efforts are not created equal across this set of counties. Half of the FERs described close working relationships between LLAs and their coalition members and half of the FERs didn't even mention their coalitions (Del Norte, San Luis Obispo, Siskiyou, and Yuba Counties—the ones, perhaps coincidentally, which did not succeed, fully or at all, in reaching their goals). A sample of coalition activities follows.

- The Coalition for a Tobacco-Free Monterey County and the Monterey County LLA identified tobacco-free beaches as “an issue of great importance.” Then, beginning in November 2004, coalition members joined LLA staffers in attending city council and sub-committee meetings at all four targeted jurisdictions until all four passed ordinances prohibiting tobacco on city beaches. They also worked along with LLA staff and volunteers on beach clean-ups.
- As described by the San Mateo FER, the County’s Tobacco Education Coalition (TEC) played a vital, active, and constant role in every aspect of the three-pronged effort to address Indicators 1.4.1 and 2.2.16. Not only was it instrumental in determining the LLA’s objectives, it also worked with the CBOs selected to train and orient their staff. However, the FER intimated but avoided saying directly that a strong coalition can be a liability as well as an asset as it tiptoed through a description of the 18-month battle among TEC members over how media funds should be allocated, which kept all projects from receiving the benefit of media exposure for that period.

- The Santa Barbara County coalition, CEASE, helped the LLA decide to take on the problem of cigarette butt litter. Its members took part in local Earth Day events annually, encouraged the Central Coast Earth Day Festival to promote that event as smoke-free, and helped develop the creative aspects of the project. The FER later mentioned that “partners” [which included coalition members] lost enthusiasm for the project when it came to door-to-door distribution of materials to local businesses, as did the LLA itself.
- Ventura County’s Tobacco Education and Prevention Coalition selected the focus of the LLA’s efforts and helped establish the direction of the project. The FER hints that coalition members may have had some involvement in meetings with college decision makers.

The energetic efforts that committed coalition members made in at least three of the cases above not only helped the LLAs accomplish many of its activities, it also showed policy- and decision makers that there was significant community support for anti-tobacco ordinances in their jurisdictions. There is no way to measure the importance of their participation in securing passage of policies and in obtaining buy-in from local officials, but the three counties with the most active coalitions did succeed in reaching their goals.

Using volunteers. Every FER mentioned recruiting and training volunteers to help carry out some of the project activities: All of the LLAs deployed their volunteers to collect and measure tobacco litter and/or to observe the smokers in selected areas, and all involved local youth to some degree. How teams were organized—whether there were adult leaders and youth workers, whether participating adults were staff and/or coalition members—was never mentioned. A description of the various approaches to working with volunteers follows.

- Del Norte and Monterey County LLAs each worked with members of two local youth groups to clean up and record amounts of tobacco litter. The Siskiyou County FER reported that two teenaged and two adult volunteers observed smokers, litter, and signage at 16 sites.
- The San Luis Obispo County FER didn’t specify whether clean-up volunteers were youth or adults but did say that two youth coalitions were “instrumental in supporting passage of policies in both communities [Morro Bay and Pismo Beach].”
- Both CBOs which tackled projects for San Mateo County brought youth on board in different ways. The FER noted that an educational presentation made by the director of the first project at the College of San Mateo helped recruit students to take part in tobacco litter collection and “other activities,” [which included public opinion polls, the FER revealed later], but didn’t describe the extent of their involvement. The second project began by forming a youth coalition which not only collected cigarette butts at the target site and conducted a public opinion survey but also developed an educational packet, made about 20 presentations to decision makers and community organizations, wrote letters and a press release, and even appealed to the police department to enforce the policy once it had passed.
- In Santa Barbara County, youth and adults took part in cleaning the beaches and in painting murals, and then testified at the press conference that launched the media campaign. They also created a float and costumes for a Santa Barbara parade and took part in the parade itself.
- The Ventura County LLA and coalition worked “college advocates” to sign up and deploy 54 students as peer educators at three community colleges. The students conducted 18 “educational tabling events” at various campus functions, among other unspecified activities.
- The Yuba County FER notes that five youth groups were given mini-grants to take part in litter collections, around which the LLA planned a colorful media event. This event could not take place,

however, because someone voiced a concern about the health dangers implicit in tobacco litter collection and raised the specter of insurance issues. So LLA staff did the initial clean-up and brought the youth back during the project to perform some undisclosed function involving the litter ("Volume and number of pieces were not collected, although many photographs were taken.")

Training volunteers. Although all LLAs must have trained their volunteers to perform various tasks, the Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and Yuba County FERs make no mention of it. The Del Norte County FER said only that their volunteers were trained to collect and measure tobacco litter (without going into detail), but the Siskiyou County FER made a point of having volunteers evaluate the training they received (they liked it). The San Mateo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura County LLAs went further: The San Mateo LLA assembled all interested CBOs and their cadres of volunteers for a comprehensive training session in strategies for achieving success, an activity which placed them all on an even playing field with respect to the work expected of them. The agency which created the Santa Barbara County media extravaganza also produced a "No Butts Left Behind" training video to be used by team leaders to train volunteers in observation and clean-up activities. Ventura County's 54 student peer educators were trained by the college consultants who had received 46 hours of technical assistance through the LLA.

Rewarding volunteers. Reporting about how volunteers were recompensed was spotty. According to the budget section of the work plans, the Santa Barbara, Siskiyou, Ventura, and Yuba County LLAs budgeted for gift cards and certificates to reward the volunteers for various activities, which presumably they did. In addition, the Ventura County LLA was able to offer students extra class credit. The Santa Barbara LLA dressed their volunteers in t-shirts and caps with the "No Butts Left Behind" logo, and Monterey County volunteers wore "Butt Buster" t-shirts.

Partnering with CBOs. Several FERs noted that LLAs were working closely with a number of local non-profits and chapters of national organizations with similar interests and goals during particular phases of their projects. For example, the Monterey County LLAs partnered with the Tide Pool Association, Surfriders Association, and the Ocean Conservancy, among others, during their advocacy phase. Although the Santa Barbara County FER expressed disappointment that the expected numbers of environmental partners didn't materialize during the course of the media campaign, it acknowledged a long list of community agencies and programs that did lend support to the project. The San Mateo County FER described the most integrated LLA/CBO combination in this set wherein the LLA contracted with CBOs to undertake most of the activities associated with reaching two goals through a competitive mini-grant procedure. The CBOs chosen mounted comprehensive interventions that each lasted longer than a year and were more than successful. Another non-profit that contributed to San Mateo County's success was the local Youth Leadership Institute, which gave all the CBOs and their volunteers in-depth training prior to launching their endeavors.

Aligning with CBOs with similar orientations for mutual benefit paid off not only in extending staff capacity but also in forging community bonds that promised to be helpful in future endeavors. The San Mateo County FER made a point of acknowledging this: "One ancillary consequence of the collaborative work on this objective was an enormous increase in community participation, cooperation, and unity among key CBO advocacy groups—which had previously only operated in isolation."

Hiring groups and individuals. LLAs most often sought professional assistance from evaluators and advertising specialists. Six LLAs contracted with professional evaluators. The Santa Barbara County LLA contracted out their entire media campaign and public opinion polling to a local advertising firm, hired a facilitator to conduct two "summit" meetings, and also budgeted funds to pay for miscellaneous project support from selected individuals. The Monterey County LLA retained an ad agency to create a TV PSA. The San Mateo LLA and coalition hired a media consultant but still experienced internal difficulties in deciding how they wanted to invest funds earmarked for that purpose.

Investing in specialists such as these freed LLA staff to pursue the myriad of other tasks required of them in the relative confidence that the products they commissioned from these professionals would be first class.

Using support from other sources. Some FERs mentioned obtaining additional funding and in-kind support from a variety of sources. Santa Barbara County's FER reported that their media campaign and promotional items owed a great deal to funding from the Masters Settlement Agreement (MSA). MSA also funded grantees who took the "No Butts Left Behind" message into local schools and colleges, reaching an estimated 7,000 children and young adults. Another grant from the Santa Maria Recreation and Parks Department supported a teen effort to develop a TV PSA. San Luis Obispo County's budget section acknowledged that their clerical assistance was MSA-supported. Ventura County's LLA didn't receive direct funding from other entities but found their efforts enhanced by the resources of the California Youth Advocacy Network (29 conferences/teleconferences). No other FERs made direct mention of monetary or in-kind assistance from other entities.

Overall, it appears that those LLAs which made the greatest use of opportunities to augment their own time, energy, and abilities also tended to be the more successful in reaching their goals.

ANCILLARY ISSUES

In every project there are elements which are entirely outside the control of the best organized and motivated LLAs but which nonetheless have a powerful influence on the outcome of their efforts. Although some of these factors can be anticipated and, to some degree, incorporated into the project's design, others simply fall into the categories of good and bad luck.

Conditions intrinsic to the setting

The four LLAs that failed to meet any of their goals—Del Norte, Siskiyou, Ventura, and Yuba—have one factor in common: the setting in which they are working is resource-deficient. The rural counties of Del Norte, Siskiyou, and Yuba are poor and public services there are severely strained. Conditions in Ventura County's community college system, the venue within which this objective was undertaken, are similar. The rural officials and the college administrators share a situation in which they find themselves chronically over-committed and under-funded, forcing them to establish priorities among a host of competing crises in which tobacco litter tends to fall rather low. The Yuba County FER reported that law enforcement is "uncooperative [even] in higher-priority areas" and is unlikely to enforce new policies.

The rural counties have other points in common: their populations are comparatively small, live in scattered communities, and have a demographic profile that historically supports a culture of smoking. The approaches taken by the LLAs in these communities tend to emphasize the public health aspect of tobacco-related litter rather than its environmental impact, but to little avail. It appears that the cards are truly stacked against the LLAs in these counties.

By contrast, the four coastal counties in which LLAs were successful or mostly successful—Monterey, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, and Santa Barbara Counties—are all more wealthy with more and larger urban centers. Tourism flourishes, public services are better supported, community-based organizations abound, and institutions of higher learning are located throughout the region—there are 13 in Monterey County alone. Monterey and San Mateo County FERs reported that an environmental approach was very successful in obtaining the adoption of tobacco control policies. The whole atmosphere in these counties is more favorable to anti-tobacco campaigns.

Local factors that affected the project

Several FERs noted local events, occurrences, and conditions that benefited or hindered their efforts. Among these were:

Positive factors

- The Monterey County FER related that Santa Cruz County, just months earlier, had received considerable media attention for declaring that its beaches would be smoke-free, and so the LLA and coalition agreed that the timing was right for Monterey County to follow suit. They were correct.
- The LLA and coalition in San Luis Obispo County counted on the local tradition of making tobacco control history to help support their effort to get one beach and/or pier designated as smoke-free. (In 1990, the City of San Luis Obispo became the first in the country to ban indoor smoking in public places and in 2003 it passed "the strongest and most comprehensive tobacco retail ordinance in the state.") The project exceeded its goal by getting two beaches to go smoke-free.

Negative factors

- In Ventura County, the LLA looked forward to riding on the coattails of their immensely successful effort to establish a smoke-free policy on the Moorpark College campus and implementing similar measures at the other two community colleges in the system, Ventura and Oxnard. However, this work was derailed by a small group of smokers at Ventura College which got the Classified Employees Union to threaten to file a grievance if one more college adopted a restrictive smoking policy. College administrators, apathetic about the tobacco litter issue to begin with, instantly caved in response to the threat.
- When the Yuba County LLA went out to conduct their conclusive litter collection in 2007, they found "[t]o their dismay, the Parks Department had covered the entire area they had previously sampled with fresh bark chips (or gravel, depending on the park). This had apparently happened so recently that there was no litter in view, even though in an informal observation several days earlier there had been plenty of litter and no fresh bark."
- In a number of cases (Del Norte, Santa Barbara, and Siskiyou County), delays in data collection were a factor to contend with. For some projects, staffing issues or implementation timing caused the delay; for others it was cold and wet weather (when fewer people frequent parks and beaches). Whatever the reason, LLAs had to decide whether to hold the clean-ups as planned and risk skewing the results because of lighter traffic or to reschedule the events for a later date and mitigating the comparability of the results with differing timeframes. Either way, the credibility of the data was diminished to some degree because of this.

Effect of influential individuals or groups

Remarkably, major interventions or even an entire project can trace success or failure to the assistance or opposition of a very small group or even of a single individual. Some examples follow of champions and adversaries and how they affected the outcome of the projects.

Champions

Champions tend to be well-placed individuals, such as a member of the decision-making body or a respected community member, or small groups with particular appeal, such as a group of earnest young people. In fact, one FER declared that, "The most crucial component of a successful smoke-free beach/pier policy effort has proven to be a strong champion."

- The San Luis Obispo County LLA found or cultivated several champions who did the heavy lifting—two separate youth groups whose support for smoke-free policies helped convince the Morro Bay and Pismo Beach City Councils to pass ordinances to that effect, who were aided in the latter effort by another champion, a dedicated member of the Pismo Beach City Council.
- One of the San Mateo County LLA’s projects was implemented by a tireless youth coalition whose multi-faceted, well-designed campaign to convince the board of the Fil-Am Friendship Celebration to hold a smoke-free festival succeeded by securing a unanimous vote to adopt the policy, 15-0.
- The project director who headed San Mateo County’s other tobacco litter-related project was a respected environmentalist with close ties to local decision makers. She succeeded in persuading not only the targeted city council but also the county board of supervisors to pass tobacco-free beach policies.

Adversaries

The presence of a champion doesn’t guarantee success in the face of obstructive individuals or groups. LLAs thus afflicted did, after the fact, recommend ways to combat the issues that defeated them at the time.

- The San Luis Obispo LLA had a champion—a Commission member—in their effort to persuade the Avila Beach Harbor Commission to pass a no-tobacco policy, but the resistance of a key staff member delayed action until the issue was finally dropped. Avila Beach was not one of the LLA’s successes.
- There was an active champion at Ventura College, but that person’s influence couldn’t trump the small group of smokers in the Classified Employee Union which threatened to file a grievance if another district college went smoke-free. The entire project collapsed in the face of this insurmountable obstacle.
- The Siskiyou County LLA was able to have anti-litter signage placed in 9 of 10 parks and playgrounds in various communities throughout the county, and tried repeatedly to accomplish the same thing in the 6 targeted locations in Yreka, the largest city. The FER reports in wounded tones that Yreka’s signs were right there leaning against the wall in the maintenance yard but the woman in charge of having them posted refused to respond in any way to the project director’s pleas.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A reliable set of Best Practices cannot be constructed from eight Final Evaluation Reports as diverse as these have proven to be. The following list is drawn from the observations and recommendations of the eight FERs—strategies that worked this time around, things they would do differently next time—and from a comparative analysis, so far as that is possible given the limited and varied nature of the source material, of the eight reports as a whole. Points below are not ranked in order of effectiveness, since their applicability is local and situational.

Working with local officials

- Educational packets for city councils and county boards of supervisors should contain at least one model tobacco control policy that has been successfully enacted in a similar jurisdiction.
- Working with local policymakers and their staff to tailor a standard policy to local conditions helps build trust, establishes important connections, and keeps the process moving.

- Well-trained, strongly-motivated youth groups can be a formidable tool in convincing policymakers to consider enacting tobacco control measures.
- Identifying or cultivating a champion—a member of the decision-making body or a prominent community member—who believes in the need to reduce tobacco litter and will support the campaign is extremely helpful.
- Appealing to civic pride by citing past public health or environmental accomplishments can be a motivating factor to local decision-making bodies, as can pointing out the achievements of a neighboring jurisdiction.
- Enticing local officials to visit the target area to see tobacco litter for themselves can be persuasive, especially if the occasion can also serve as a photo opportunity for local media.
- City councils and county boards of supervisors have the power to declare a “Tobacco Litter Awareness Week” and may only need to be asked to do so.
- Vivid, evocative visual aids, such as clear glass containers filled with cigarette butts labeled by site, are useful adjuncts to presentations.
- Local officials tend to be impressed by the results of public opinion polls that demonstrate strong support for tobacco control policies. Media like that sort of precise information, too.

Raising public awareness

- Posters which feature small children on beaches or playgrounds poised in the act of handling cigarette butts are powerful attention grabbers.
- Sponsoring or contributing to a highly visible public event—a Coastal Clean-up Day or a float in a parade—attracts media attention and increases public awareness of the issue.
- Well-illustrated tables and booths with plenty of motivational giveaways can be effective at local events such as fairs, festivals, or any place where large numbers of people flow past.

Optimizing outcomes

- Tobacco litter collection events are best scheduled during peak use of the target areas, avoiding colder, wetter seasons.
- Forging collaborative partnerships with local organizations and agencies that have similar goals offers a variety of mutual benefits, including financial and in-kind support.
- It is sometimes possible to circumvent individuals or groups that are particularly resistant to tobacco-free policies by devising alternate strategies: e.g., negotiating compromises, going past obstructive workers to their supervisors, etc.

REFERENCES

Dunn, D.M. and Pugh, L. 2007. *No Butts Left Behind Final Evaluation Report, Santa Barbara County, 2004-2007*. California: Santa Barbara County Tobacco Prevention Settlement Program.

Forst, M. 2007. *Final Evaluation Report: Special Events Objective*. California: San Mateo County Tobacco Prevention Program.

House, M. and Lidtke, H. 2007. *Final Evaluation Report, Objective 1: Tobacco Retail Licensing, Monterey County 2004-2007*. California: Monterey County Tobacco Prevention Program.

Hughes, S.K. and Keifer, T. 2007. *Smoke-free Beaches, Final Evaluation Report*. California: San Luis Obispo County Tobacco Control Program.

Hurt, C. 2007. *Final Evaluation Report, Countering Pro-Tobacco Influences: Decreasing the Amount of Tobacco Litter in Tot Lots in Siskiyou County*. California: Siskiyou County Tobacco Education Program.

McCubbrey, J.P. 2007. *Litter-free Del Norte County Parks & Beaches Final Evaluation Report*. California: Del Norte County Tobacco Use Prevention Program.

McDonald, A. 2007. *Smoke-Free Parks in Yuba County*. California: Yuba County Tobacco Education Program.

Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee for California. 2006. *Confronting a Relentless Adversary: A Plan for Success. Toward a Tobacco-Free California, 2006-2008*. <http://www.cdph.ca.gov/services/boards/teroc/Documents/TEROCMasterPlan06-08.pdf>.

Waltman, N. 2007. *Final Evaluation Report, Tobacco Retailer Licensing Objective*. California: Ventura County Tobacco Education Program.

APPENDIX A. LIST OF LOCAL LEAD AGENCY OBJECTIVES

Del Norte County: *The Del Norte County Board of Supervisors and/or Crescent City Council will enact policies that prohibit tobacco litter within 25 feet of parks, public playgrounds, tot lots and restricting tobacco litter on beaches, reducing the amount of litter 30% from a Spring 2005 baseline. They focused on Beachfront Park and South Beach.*

Monterey County: *By June 30, 2007, at least three beaches in Monterey County will adopt a policy prohibiting all tobacco use on the beach, and tobacco litter will be reduced by 30% from baseline measurements taken in June 2004.*

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

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

II. Project Blueprint (PB) Objective: *By October 31, 2005 [later extended to June 2006], at least one city or jurisdiction will adopt and implement a policy designating a portion or all of an outdoor area within beaches as smoke-free and at least one resolution will be passed urging California State Parks to designate State beaches in San Mateo County as smoke-free.*

III. Pilipino Bananihan Resource Center (PBRC) Objective A: *By January 21, 2006, the Pilipino Bananihan Resource Center will develop and train a Pilipino Youth Coalition (PYC) with 8-10 Tobacco Peer Educators from Jefferson and Westmoor High Schools in Daly City to prepare them for policy development.*

Objective B: *By June 30, 2006, PBRC's Pilipino Youth Coalition will work with the Coordinating Committee of the Fil-Am Friendship Celebration to adopt and implement a tobacco control policy designating a portion or all of the outdoor event as smoke free.*

Santa Barbara County: *By May 31, 2007, the amount of cigarette-related litter found in 6 key survey areas in Santa Barbara county will be reduced by 50% from the 2004 baseline. Main emphasis: to raise public awareness about harmful effects of tobacco litter.*

Siskiyou County: *By June 30, 2007, the amount of tobacco related litter found within 25 feet of public smoke-free tot lots/playgrounds in Siskiyou County will be reduced by 60% of the Spring 2004 baseline.*

Ventura County: *By June 30, 2007, at least 2 Ventura County college campuses will demonstrate a 50% decrease in cigarette litter in 4-6 problem locations identified in a Fall 2004 baseline observation. This change will follow adoption of a campus smoking policy more stringent than the requirements of Government Code/AB 846.*

Yuba County: *By June 30, 2007, the amount of cigarette-related litter found in Yuba County parks, playgrounds, campgrounds and beaches will be reduced by 40% from a 2004 Fall baseline.*