

**Report to PCC's Educational Advisory Council
From the Smoking Policy Task Force
Prepared by Kendi Esary and Brooke Gondara, Co-Chairs**

After careful study and input from the college community, and for the reasons outlined below, the Smoking Policy Task Force recommends that Portland Community College adopt a 100% tobacco-free campus policy and promote it as the PCC Tobacco-Free Initiative. Even though the majority of the survey respondents did not support a tobacco-free approach, the committee considered other concerns and preferences reflected in the survey responses, the cost of implementing three possible policies, and our extensive research of other colleges and universities who are dealing with these same issues. The health and safety of all PCC staff, faculty, and students was an important factor.

PCC is committed to providing a safe and healthy environment for its employees, students and visitors. In light of findings of the U.S. Surgeon General that exposure to secondhand tobacco smoke and use of tobacco are significant health hazards, it was a nearly unanimous recommendation that PCC establish a tobacco-free environment. This would prohibit use, distribution, or sale of tobacco, including any smoking device, or carrying of any lighted smoking instrument, in College buildings or on College premises without exception, at events on College premises, or in College-owned, rented or leased vehicles.

Smoking Policy Task Force

- The task force--representing classified, faculty, administrators, and students --was formed in early April, 2006.
- The task force goals set by the EAC were:
 - Review the current policy and determine if it can be enforced.
 - Gather input from the entire college community.
 - Hold campus forums (all campuses, all employee and student groups).
 - Address the issue of enforcement no matter what the policy.
 - Provide a recommendation to the EAC regarding the issue.
- The current policy was reviewed and the problems with the policy were identified.
- The task force, in partnership with Institutional Research developed a survey which was approved by both unions, human resources, ASPCC district wide, and the Presidents Cabinet prior to distribution. The survey was completed by 4025 unduplicated individuals.
- Based on the survey findings, the task force researched the pros and cons of designated smoking areas and a smoking ban.
- The survey results included these findings:

The following 3 items were asked of Non-Smokers only:

- 92% of staff and 89% of students feel that second-hand smoke is a concern for them.
- 77% of all respondents stated that they are concerned about the effects of second-hand smoke they breathe at PCC.
- 36% of staff and 31% of students stated they experience immediate health effects from second-hand smoke they breathe at PCC.

The following 5 items were asked of all respondents:

- 58% of staff and 49% of students agree that reducing smoking areas is important to PCC's mission as a community college. However, 42% (staff) and 47% (students) disagreed this was important to the mission.
 - 34% state that a smoking ban is important to PCC's Mission as a Community college, while 24% were neutral.
 - 90% of staff and 83% of students agree that a better and more visible smoking policy signs and communication should be developed.
 - 78% of staff and 68% of students think that PCC's smoking policy should be enforced by PCC Public Safety Officers.
 - 61% of staff and 55% of students agree that fines for policy violators should be in place.
-
- Cost estimates for (1) designated smoking areas (shelters), (2) smoking in parking lots only, and (3) a smoking ban were developed. The high cost of designated areas was a major factor in our decision.
 - Other documents including U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and a Survey of Tobacco Free Colleges were reviewed.
 - Input from Clark College and several other colleges in our situation, OHSU, and the American Lung Association of Oregon, college safety committees, physical plant personnel, grounds personnel, Public Safety, and Risk Management helped to guide our decision.
 - At least 40 colleges and universities across the country have gone completely smoke-free, according to the American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation (up from 20 in January, 2006). This is a national trend.
 - The trend toward tobacco-free areas in Oregon includes Oregon School District Policy 2.06, prohibiting "the use of tobacco products in all District buildings and on all District-owned property", a statewide campaign for hospitals to become tobacco-free, and a smoke-free Pioneer Courthouse Square.
 - Risk Management and campus safety committees state that 90% of complaints to the safety committees are regarding second-hand smoke, including threats of lawsuits over people smoking near building entrances.
 - Other concerns include: garbage can fires, bark dust fires, the unsightly appearance of cigarette butts in receptacles, walks, and planted and paved areas, and the direct expense to the College in cleaning up the cigarette butts, which Darrel Kraxberger estimated at \$150,000 per year, not including the pressure washing needed to clean burn marks (July 23, 2003 memo).
 - Second-hand smoke is a safety issue for employees, and students.
 - Second-hand smoke and tobacco use is also a concern for minors on PCC Campuses.
 - 100% Tobacco Free provides the maximum level of protection from second-hand smoke (Surgeon General report 2006).
 - 100% Tobacco Free provides a more accessible environment for all people (Surgeon General report 2006).
 - There is no evidence that a 100% Tobacco Free policy affects enrollment (Clark College and Ozarks Technical College).

ESTIMATED COSTS OF SMOKING POLICY CHANGES

COSTS	Designated Smoking Shelters based on 12 x 10	Smoking Permitted in Parking Lots Only	Tobacco Free College
<p>Shelters</p> <p>5' x 8' accommodates 6-8 people (Brasco standard size, suggest a barrel roof) \$5500 each</p> <p>7' x 16' accommodates 10-15 people (Brasco standard size) \$8500 each</p>	<p>No Butts Co.: \$4995 per shelter. Gilmore-Kramer Co.: \$10,042 per shelter Handi Hut: \$6670 per shelter (does not include shipping and handling, benches, ashtrays, lighting, fans, doors, or heaters). Brasco: \$8000 per shelter.</p> <p>*30 shelters based on 1 per bldg, and the one minute rule (smokers will walk one minute before they light a cigarette).</p> <p>TOTAL COSTS (I used the middle cost of \$6670.) \$6670 x 30 shelters = \$200,100 \$6670 x 20 shelters = \$133,400</p>	<p>8 Shelters Estimate is based on two shelters per campus in designated smoking parking lots.</p> <p>\$6670 x 8 = \$53,360.00</p> <p>If existing shelters can be moved, this cost could be avoided.</p>	<p>\$0</p>
<p>4 inch cement slab</p>	<p>\$4300 each slab per Physical Plant estimates. \$4300 x 30 = \$129,000 \$4300 x 20 = \$86,000</p>	<p>8 slabs. Estimate based on two shelters per campus in designated smoking parking lots. \$4300x 8 = 34,400 If existing shelters can be moved, or appropriate cement areas are available, this cost could go down.</p>	<p>\$0</p>
<p>Installation costs</p>	<p>\$55 per hour for 8 hours x two people per shelter = \$880 per shelter (Physical Plant estimate). \$880 x 30 = \$26,400 \$880 x 20 = \$17,600</p>	<p>\$55 per hour for 8 hours x two people per shelter = \$880 per shelter. \$880 x 8 = \$7040</p>	<p>\$880 per shelter to remove current shelters. 4 at SYL 3 at CA 1 at RC 2 at SE</p> <p>10 shelters x \$8800</p>
<p>Ashtrays</p>	<p>\$264 each ground type (No Butts Co.) \$230 wall mounted type (Gilmore Kramer) \$92 (Handi Hut) \$230 x 30 ashtrays = \$6900 \$230 x 20 ashtrays = \$4600</p>	<p>\$264 each ground type (No Butts Co.) \$230 wall mounted type (Gilmore Kramer) \$92 (Handi Hut) \$230 x 8 = \$1840</p>	<p>\$0</p>

<p>Signage Based on 30 bldgs, 20 signs per bldg was used as an average. The CC bldg at SYL has 42 signs.</p>	<p>X Smoking signage at SE would cost \$6000 (Kraxberger's memo 7/23/03).</p> <p>\$50 each per sign (estimate from Tony George, Print Center Manager).</p> <p>\$30,000 for new signage.</p> <p>\$55 per hr for removal/installation averaged at ½ hour per sign. \$55 x 300 hours = \$16,500</p> <p>Total: \$46500</p>	<p>Per Darrell Kraxberger's memo dated 7/23/2003 Smoking signage at SE would cost \$6000 (Kraxberger's memo 7/23/03).</p> <p>\$50 each per sign (estimate from Tony George, Print Center Manager).</p> <p>\$30,000 for new signage.</p> <p>\$55 per hr for removal/installation averaged at ½ hour per sign. \$55 x 300 hours = \$16,500</p> <p>Total: \$46500</p>	<p>\$0 (paid for by ALA)</p> <p>\$55 per hr for removal/installation averaged at ½ hour per sign. \$55 x 300 hours = \$16,500</p>
<p>Enforcement</p>	<p>\$25,000 per year (Ken Goodwin estimate).</p>	<p>\$25,000 per year (Ken Goodwin estimate).</p>	<p>Less then \$25,000 per Ken Goodwin.</p>
<p>Clean up costs</p>	<p>\$150,000 annually (Kraxberger's memo 7/23/2003).</p>	<p>\$150,000 annually (Kraxberger's memo 7/23/2003).</p>	<p>\$0</p>
<p>Cessation Programs</p>	<p>Price unknown</p>	<p>Price unknown</p>	<p>Price unknown</p>
<p>TOTAL COSTS</p>	<p>\$561,400 based on 30 shelters</p>	<p>\$243,140 based on 8 shelters</p>	<p>\$50,300</p>
	<p>\$440,600 based on 20 shelters</p>		

Comparison of College Policies: Designated Areas vs. 100% Tobacco-Free

	Designated Smoking Areas (including parking lot only policy)	100% Tobacco-Free Policy
Health and safety for students, staff, and visitors	Reduces secondhand smoke entering buildings. Prevents those leaving and entering buildings from having to walk through clouds of smoke (if areas are at least 25 feet away from entryways, windows, air intakes). People may be exposed to secondhand smoke when walking past or through designated areas. ¹	When actively enforced, provides maximum level of protection from secondhand smoke exposure on campus. ² There is no safe level of exposure to secondhand smoke. ³
Accessibility	May improve accessibility for people with asthma or other chronic lung or heart conditions that require avoiding exposure to secondhand smoke. Areas designated for smoking (such as parking lots) may become less accessible to people who must avoid secondhand smoke.	Provides a more accessible environment for people with asthma or other chronic lung or heart conditions that require avoiding exposure to secondhand smoke. ⁴
Enrollment	No evidence that tobacco policy has an impact on enrollment.	No evidence that tobacco policy has an impact on enrollment. ^{5, 6}
Student Success	Prepares students for a workforce in which it is becoming more common for employers to restrict or prohibit tobacco use on company premises.	Prepares students for a workforce where it is becoming more common for employers to restrict or prohibit tobacco use on company premises.
Impact on tobacco use and quit attempts	Unknown.	Tobacco-free policies have been associated with reductions in the number of people who start using tobacco, reduction in tobacco consumption among current users, and increase in successful attempts to quit smoking and all forms of tobacco use. ^{7, 8}
Litter and maintenance	Reduces litter near buildings; requires ongoing cleaning of designated areas.	Reduces cigarette butt litter and reduces cleaning and maintenance expenses. ⁹
Education	Education is easier with designated areas than with a distance rule (e.g. no smoking within 20 feet of building entrances). Requires intensive educational plan.	Requires intensive initial education but easier in the long-term with completely tobacco-free campus.
Enforcement	Enforcement more manageable than with distance rules, but may be difficult to encourage campus community to utilize designated areas during bad weather or if located in inconvenient locations.	Enforcement is simplest because there is no ambiguity about where tobacco use is or is not allowed. ¹⁰
Legal compliance	Designated areas at least 25 feet from entryways meet or exceed current Oregon state law and county ordinances.	Eliminates risk of being out of compliance with stronger laws or rules that may be adopted in the future.
Legal liability	Potential liability under the Americans with Disabilities Act if people with conditions such as asthma suffer health effects from secondhand smoke exposure on campus.	If actively enforced, shows due diligence by the college to provide a safe environment for students and employees.
Expenses	College may incur costs if outdoor shelters are constructed. Clear signage needed.	Clear signage needed. The American Lung Association of Oregon will provide free signs for Oregon community colleges adopting 100% tobacco-free policy
Recommended by health organizations	Restricting tobacco use on college campuses is recommended by numerous health organizations.	100% tobacco-free college policy is recommended by local, state, and national health organizations. ¹¹
Consistency with trends	An increasing number of colleges and employers are restricting or prohibiting smoking on campus grounds.	Consistent with Oregon statewide requirement for 100% tobacco-free K-12 schools. ¹² Oregon hospitals are adopting smoke-free grounds policies through their Step Up! Campaign. ¹³ At least 12 states have colleges with 100% tobacco-free campus policies, including neighboring California and Washington. ¹⁴

¹ “When establishing policies regarding tobacco use on-campus, it is worthwhile to note that restricting tobacco use near the entrance and exit of campus buildings will likely result in its increased use and visibility on sidewalks and benches and in parking lots and neighboring areas, which only increases exposure to secondhand smoke and bolsters the impression that a greater number of students use tobacco than actually do. Such a policy is of minimal benefit to the individuals who live, learn, and work on the campus; therefore a complete ban of tobacco use throughout the university is highly recommended.” – Dr. Beti Thompson, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. Personal correspondence, 2/22/07

² “Designated areas do not eliminate secondhand smoke exposure and we have found nothing short of complete prohibition of tobacco use on campus is workable.” – Ty Patterson, Vice President of Student Services and Director of the Center of Excellence for Tobacco-Free Campus Policy at Ozarks Technical College, Springfield Missouri. Personal correspondence, 1/26/07.

³ “Scientific evidence indicates that there is no risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke. Breathing even a little secondhand smoke can be harmful to your health.... Secondhand smoke is a known human carcinogen and contains more than 50 chemicals that can cause cancer.” The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke: A Report of the Surgeon General, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2006), <http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/secondhandsmoke/factsheets/factsheet7.html>

⁴ “Persons who already have asthma or other respiratory conditions are at especially high risk for being affected by secondhand smoke, and should take special precautions to avoid secondhand smoke exposure... Persons who already have heart disease are at especially high risk of suffering adverse affects from breathing secondhand smoke, and should take special precautions to avoid even brief exposure.” Surgeon General Report (2006).

⁵ “We have seen no negative effect on enrollment here. And, in my discussion with those at other colleges which have adopted a similar [tobacco-free] policy there are none who report a decrease in enrollment.” – Ty Patterson

⁶ “Institutions that have recently gone tobacco-free cited a concern regarding the potential backlash from students and parents who might view a tobacco-free campus as paternalistic. However, the overriding sentiment was that a tobacco-free campus would enable the institution(s) to be a leader among schools that they benchmarked themselves against and to become more competitive... Demonstrating that health is a priority has greatly enhanced these tobacco-free institutions’ appeal to prospective students and their parents.” – Beti Thompson

⁷ The data that we are writing up now (cross-sectional data on ~15,000 students at 30 4-year colleges in the NW) show that all comprehensive smoke-free policies (indoors, outdoors and in student housing) are independently associated with significantly reduced student cigarette smoking prevalence (and lower consumption among those who smoke). We saw a similar effect with policies that prohibit all tobacco product promotions (ie, on campus sales, advertising and sponsorship of events). There was also a significant reduction of initiation among students on campuses that had complete outdoor bans (which was also associated with the lowest prevalence and consumption rates)...comprehensive outdoor policy predicted lower initiation and higher cessation...There was also a trend towards higher initiation on campuses that allowed tobacco promotions (sale, advertising or sponsorships). - Dr Abigail Halperin, personal communication, December 23, 2007.

⁸ Although cigarette smoking constitutes the majority of college tobacco use on campuses, other forms of tobacco are also a cause for concern: smokeless tobacco use rates are about 3.7% among college students (Rigotti, 2000). The perception that smokeless tobacco is a safe alternative to smoking is indisputably misguided; one “dip” delivers the same amount of nicotine as three to four cigarettes and stays in the bloodstream longer. Eight to ten “dips” of smokeless tobacco per day contains the same amount of nicotine as 30-40 cigarettes (OCF). Unfortunately, smokeless tobacco rates are increasing among young people in general (National Cancer Institute [NCI], 2003) and while the harms associated with its use appear limited to the user, the fact remains that health-related behaviors are influenced by one’s peers, environment, and community. College campuses function as distinct communities and its ‘residents’ are influenced by an array of factors; therefore one of the most important elements of a comprehensive tobacco control program is addressing the environment in which students make decisions about tobacco use. – Beti Thompson

⁹ “Allowing the use of tobacco products creates direct expense for the College.... I am not advocating that we reduce staff to save the cost. I think the best solution would be to eliminate smoking, keep the present staff and review carefully the need for additional staff as new facilities come on line. It appears that we may need three less positions if the need to clean up after smokers is eliminated. With benefits to our health, enhanced visual attractiveness at our facilities and a proposition that could save the College an estimate \$150,000.00 annually such an initiative must be considered. Memo from Darrel O. W. Kraxberger, A.I.A., Managing Architect, Portland Community College, July 23, 2003, <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/eac/smoking-policy/documents/memoonbutts.pdf>

¹⁰ “To many people’s surprise, enforcement has gone smoothly...It is now an accepted and respect community norm that tobacco use is not allowed on our campus. And we have no doubt that enforcement and compliance would have been much less had we decided to allow designated areas.” Ty Patterson

¹¹ Among the organizations recommending 100% tobacco-free college policy are: American College Health Association, Fred Hutchison Cancer Research Center (Seattle, WA), American Lung Association of Oregon, Oregon Public Health Division, and Oregon Multicultural Tobacco Prevention & Education Council.

¹² Oregon Administrative Rule 581-021-0110 Tobacco Free Schools.
http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_500/OAR_581/581_021.html

¹³ Step Up! is a statewide partnership to improve health by supporting hospitals to: make the hospital campus tobacco-free; provide effective stop-smoking benefits for all employees; ask, advise, and assist all patients to quit tobacco; and lead other local businesses to curb tobacco use. http://www.oahhs.org/news/stepup_campaign_01_25_07.php

¹⁴ See <http://www.lungoregon.org/tobacco/College.html> for a sample of tobacco-free colleges in the United States.

TO: EAC

During the course of ongoing discussions about the issues of smoking on campus, Dr. Pulliams asked what the issues are with the current policy, which reads (<http://www.pcc.edu/about/policy/student-rights/smoking.html>):

Smoking is prohibited within all Portland Community College-owned or operated facilities and vehicles. Smoking is permitted only in exterior, designated smoking areas.

Designated smoking areas are designated by signs depicting a cigarette enclosed with a green circle, with the text "Smoking Permitted."

Smoking is not permitted closer than 20 feet from any door, window, ventilation vent or air conditioning unit.

Smoking is not permitted in or by any well-traveled passage or pathway to a college facility that may cause non-smokers undue exposure to secondhand smoke.

Fireproof and rainproof receptacles are available for cigarette ashes and butts throughout the exterior of the college.

Compliance and Enforcement

All college employees, students, visitors, vendors and contractors are required to comply with this policy. Public Safety and staff will enforce this policy. For Oregon laws about smoking, see <http://www.leg.state.or.us>.

Last June, members of the Smoking Task Force identified ongoing issues after members conducted a visual review on each campus.

- Signs are missing; confusing, hand-made by staff (e.g., Cascade has lots of hand-made signs in windows that say "Don't smoke here"). The round green signs described in the policy below are absent on some campuses. These signs are in stock in the print center. Cascade has signs on smoking shelters that say "designated smoking area," but they are rectangular gray signs; there are no signs near the MAHB.

- There is confusion about who decides where these designated areas are and assures that the correct signs are posted.

- There is confusion about whether people can smoke only in designated areas, or anywhere that is at least 20 feet away from buildings and walkways.

- There are receptacles within 20 feet of buildings, near entrances, near ventilation shafts, etc. At Rock Creek, 5 out of 26 receptacles were found within 8 and 16 feet from the door. All but one were movable concrete ashtrays vs. "fixed cigarette stoppers."

- "Smoking permitted" signs are placed closer than 20 feet from the entrance or ventilation (reported by Sylvania).

- There are too few smoking shelters. Sylvania has four and they leak on rainy days; one is 18 feet from the door of the CT Building.

Rock Creek has one, but it is not near a main pathway. Cascade has three smoking shelters.

- Enforcement of the current policy is not occurring on any of the PCC properties.

Until the Smoking Policy Committee completes its process for exploring whether PCC should be totally smoke free, we would like recommend that the campus presidents, Public Safety staff, and Physical Plant staff take steps to assure that the current policy is clarified, applied and enforced consistently.

As the dissenting voice on the Smoking Policy Task Force, Sheila Brown, Cascade faculty, was invited to write her reasons for voting against 100% Tobacco Free at PCC. Her statement follows.

As an institution of higher learning, we want students of all kinds to be drawn to us and feel welcome as they work to improve their lives.
The idea of a tobacco ban is classist and exclusionary.

Who We Serve

First, tobacco use is highest among minorities, working class students, and those recovering from addiction. We need to take into consideration who we are asking to give up smoking. I once told a student that we could be taking the cigarettes away from some poor, recovering heroin addict, and she informed me that she was a recovering heroin addict. Nicotine patches are readily available--to those with health insurance. We should be conscious of our demographics. Our main mission is to give underserved students a leg up; adding unnecessary obstacles only hurts the most needy.

Health Hazards

Health hazard claims about outdoor smoke in an open air environment are highly exaggerated. I have heard claims that cigarette smoke can be "detected" at a distance of 25 feet, although detection is not tantamount to a health hazard. I have heard claims that toxins in a smoker's clothes can be a health hazard to nonsmokers, making me wonder if smokers shouldn't strip and shower before entering campus. We know that science can be used perniciously. At what point are these concerns realistic, and at what point are they demonizing a group of people?

When people exit their homes and enter the larger world, they encounter a number of pollutants, from carbon monoxide to pesticides. While tobacco is not harmless, the focus on a group of people being hazardous to others, even if they are outdoors and at some distance, seems disproportionate and misplaced.

The Poll

Among NON-TOBACCO USERS, banning tobacco use everywhere on PCC property was the personal favorite selection of only 37% of student respondents, while 64% [sic] supported other solutions. In terms of what option would work best for PCC, only 13% of non-tobacco users favored a ban, while 88% [sic] thought other solutions would work best.

The Cost

Certainly, second-hand smoke is a concern. Smokers began crowding around building doors when indoor smoking lounges were eliminated. They look for an overhang for protection from the weather. Shelters more appropriately placed and in greater numbers would mitigate the problem. This is the cost of teaching compromise and making room for people with diverse needs.