



Smoking/Tobacco Use Policy Evaluation Report

A Summary of Work by the Smoking/Tobacco Use Sub-Committee

Report Compiled by:

**Gwyn Ashcom, MPH, CHES, Committee Chair
Nicole Janeba, PSU Graduate Student, MPH Program
Neetal Mistry, PSU Post-Baccalaureate Student
Rita Sumner, MS, MPH, Doctoral Candidate**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Executive Summary

B. Process

- B.1. Justification for review
- B.2. Overview of the smoking/tobacco evaluation process
 - B.2.a. Smoking/tobacco use policy committee
 - B.2.b. Background and significance
 - B.2.c. Survey Procedures
 - B.2.c.1. Survey development and data collection process
 - B.2.c.2. Analysis
 - B.2.c.3. Limitations
 - B.2.d. Results and discussion
 - B.2.d.1. Profile of the respondents
 - B.2.d.2. Physical response and perceived scope of issue on campus
 - B.2.d.3. Current smoking policy and its implementation
 - B.2.d.4. Future smoking policy and its implementation
 - B.2.d.5. Synthesis of open-ended (text) responses
- B.3. Committee Recommendations

C. Moving Forward

D. Appendices

- 1 – Oregon comparison
- 2 – Urban comparison
- 3 – Smoking Survey
- 4 – Additional comments and suggestions

Draft Report from the Smoking/Tobacco Use Committee

A. Executive Summary

In response to complaints and concerns expressed to the University Safety Committee in early 2006 from PSU community members in regard to smoking on campus, a Smoking/Tobacco Policy Committee was created as a subcommittee to engage in a focused exploration of the issue at PSU. Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President, Finance and Administration voiced support for the effort. The committee included faculty from both Community Health and Biology, managers representing Auxiliary Services including Residence Life, Environmental Health & Safety (EH&S) staff, Student Health & Counseling (SHAC) staff, students, as well as both smoking and non-smoking individuals.

The Smoking/Tobacco Policy Committee met eight times in 2006. The committee reviewed and discussed goals, public health research, other university policies and trends in both urban and non-urban settings, and data collection options to gain insight into the opinions of individuals composing other higher education communities. To tap into the opinions of the PSU community, the committee created and electronically distributed a survey to all faculty, staff, and students with valid Portland State University e-mail accounts using *WebSurveyor*. This report provides a summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations drawn from the synthesis of public health literature review, examination of other institutional policies and trends, and the PSU institutional survey culminating with an outline of recommendations for the content and initial process of implementation of a revised policy as follows:

1. Establish smoke-free campus zones in the outdoor environment

- a. Increase the distance that a person can smoke from 20 feet to 25 feet from all entrances, windows and air intakes. This setback standardizes LEED¹ certification requirements.
 - b. Assign smoke-free status to problem areas identified in the survey, e.g., high traffic walkways between SMSU and Neuberger Hall, SMSU and Cramer Hall; Millar Library entrance; balconies; and other problem areas.
- 2. Establish smoke-free zones in the indoor environment**
- a. Designate and sign PSU vehicles as smoke free/spit free.
 - b. Continue toward eliminating smoking in campus housing by setting and achieving incremental goals.
 - c. Set a goal to eliminate the use of actual tobacco products in PSU theater productions.
 - d. Provide acceptable accommodation for tobacco use in Native American ceremonies on campus.
 - e. Designate partial structures, such as parking garages, as smoke-free, as needed.
- 3. Actions to facilitate the implementation of a revised policy**
- a. Tactical
 - i. Remove all wall mounted ash receptacles. Move weather-resistant, free standing ash receptacles outside of the 25 feet zone and outside of the targeted smoke free areas. Add weather-resistant receptacles in high litter areas.
 - ii. Provide additional and visibility-enhanced signage to identify both smoking and smoke-free areas.
 - iii. Provide acceptable ground art or other marking strategy to separate smoking from smoke-free areas and improve identification.
 - iv. Add signage to encourage institutional pride by reducing litter.
 - v. Provide weather-resistant, specifically placed smoking shelters.
 - b. Strategic
 - i. Once a revised policy is drafted, a second electronic survey will be distributed to faculty, staff and students for comment through WebSurveyor.
 - ii. Recommend that the PSU President provide a campus-wide statement in support for the revised smoking policy.
 - iii. PSU administration to advise the committee where the revised smoking policy should reside.
 - iv. PSU administration to advise the committee on an enforcement strategy choice, e.g., Campus Public Safety, Environmental Health & Safety, peer-pressure, all faculty and staff, etc.

¹ The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System™ is a nationally accepted benchmark for the design, construction and operation of high performance green building. Several buildings on the PSU campus have achieved LEED status and several others are planned for LEED compliance as they are built or renovated.

- v. PSU administration to decide if on-campus sales of tobacco products are congruent with the mission of PSU as the only in-state institution with active sales.
- vi. The committee will develop a PSU education campaign regarding changes to the policy that will be launched prior to the effective date.
- vii. The committee will launch a PSU informational website on smoking/tobacco use, including a campus map with smoking and smoke-free areas marked.
- viii. PSU administration to advise the committee if resources may be dedicated for enhancement and promotion of smoking prevention and cessation programs for faculty, staff and students.
- ix. PSU administration to advise the committee if they would support a movement toward building a culture of wellness among faculty, staff, and students in line with the development of the new Recreation Center.

4. Evaluate PSU smoking policy and implementation annually. Re-visit smoke-free campus concept in 2009.

End of Executive Summary

B. Process

B.1. Justification for the Review

Recently, examining smoking/tobacco use policy has emerged as a high priority issue in colleges and universities. Universities have embraced the use of a formal evaluation process with a high degree of transparency and institutional community input. The PSU committee has followed this open policy evaluation process. While this is a time-intensive process, it subscribes to a comprehensive examination of the past, present, and future elements of a PSU policy that, hopefully, will enable the proposal of a more workable plan within the unique PSU environment.

The current PSU policy statement regarding smoking/tobacco use on campus is linked to the Facilities & Planning website <http://www.fap.pdx.edu/safety/policies/smoking.htm>. Historically, PSU, had in the past, created a policy infrastructure in the form of Internal Management Directives (IMDs) to guide the actions of the institutional community. However, the IMDs, over time, have been reduced in number and/or revised. The smoking policy was contained in one of the IMDs that had been eliminated. The current IMD 1.300 “Alcohol & Tobacco Policy” addresses tobacco only in the context of promotion and advertising on campus and at PSU sponsored events. (See link to IMDs- <http://www.fadm.pdx.edu/html/imd.htm>). The smoking/tobacco use policy was revised and streamlined from its IMD origin by Environmental Health & Safety in 1996 in an effort to respond to continuing PSU community complaints of exposure to sidestream² smoke, the increasing volume of evidence of both the adverse effects of sidestream smoke, the Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) requiring the elimination of

² "Sidestream smoke is created from the emissions of a smoldering cigarette. This type of smoke will suspend in the air longer because aerosol particles in the smoke are smaller than those in mainstream smoke. Smaller particles mean better absorption in human lungs. That, combined with the toxic chemical properties of this smoke make it more hazardous to breathe in than mainstream smoke."
<http://quitsmoking.about.com/cs/secondhandsmoke/g/sidestreamsmoke.htm>

mainstream and sidestream smoke inside of public buildings, and the trends at universities for increased distancing of smokers from building entrances and ventilation systems and, in some cases, even placing a complete ban of smoking on campus.

In addition, several other factors have emerged contributing to the decision to evaluate the current smoking policy, including:

- The appropriateness of placing the accountability for the institutional policy on Environmental Health & Safety and the University Safety Committee in the policy language.
- In order for future buildings at PSU to qualify for LEED³ certifications, PSU planners need to verify that for non-residential buildings (new student residence buildings would include additional requirements):
 - Smoking is prohibited anywhere inside the buildings, and
 - All exterior, designated smoking areas are located at least 25 feet away from entries, outdoor air intakes, and operable windows.

The LEED smoking setback requirements were recently revised in the latest 2.0 version. Setting a consistent non-smoking buffer zone, such as a 25 foot minimum for all campus buildings, would provide a more standardized and user friendly requirement.

- Institutional issues that have emerged regarding smoking/tobacco use on other campuses including smoking in university vehicles, the use of smoking devices in theater

³ The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System™ is a nationally accepted benchmark for the design, construction and operation of high performance green building.

performances, the inclusion of tobacco burning in Native American ceremonies, and the campus sales of tobacco products.

B.2. Overview of the Smoking/Tobacco Policy Evaluation Process

The PSU smoking/tobacco use policy evaluation process has included the creation of an ad hoc committee, the review of relevant literature to frame the significance of this effort, the development of an institutional survey, the composition of a report based on the survey findings and augmented by external policies, recommendations, research, and trends; the synthesis of recommendations for review by PSU executives; engagement of campus community in dialogue; and the development of a policy framework and implementation strategy.

B.2.a. Smoking/Tobacco Use Policy Committee

Several University Safety Committee members volunteered to participate in the evaluation process. Early in the process, a notification was sent to all department heads that the evaluation would take place in an attempt to generate interest from community members across the university. Several individuals expressed interest in the project. In addition, a listserv was set up for communication purposes. As new issues emerged additional, targeted invitations were sent to other potential stakeholders to ensure that various opinions and positions were heard both internal and external to the PSU campus. The following lists include both regular committee members and other internal and/or external stakeholders with an expressed interest in the process/outcome:

Committee Membership:

Gwyn Ashcom, SHAC, Chair

Chuck Cooper, Director, Environmental Health & Safety

Mark Kaplan, Faculty, Community Health

Julie North, Director, Auxiliary Services
Clare Quinn, University Studies
Philip Ratliff, AAUP, Library
Rita Sumner, Environmental Health & Safety
Ruben Torres, Environmental Health & Safety
Kristine Wise, University Market

Other Invited Stakeholders-Internal:

Carlos Crespo, Director, Community Health, Urban & Public Affairs
Scott DeSelle, Supervisor, Campus & Grounds, Facilities & Planning
Debbie Kaufman, Adjunct Faculty, University Studies
Corey Ray, Director, Residence Life
Luis Ruedas, Faculty, Biology
Jenny Sherman, Human Resources
Michael Soto, Director, Campus Public Safety Office

Other Invited Stakeholders-External:

Andrew Epstein, American Lung Association, PSU MPH Alumnus
Kylie Meiner, Multnomah County Health Department, PSU MPH Alumnus
Becky Wright, Native American Rehabilitation Association (NARA), PSU MPH Alumnus

B.2.b. Background and Significance

In order to make informed recommendations with regard to the Portland State University's tobacco policy, the committee reviewed the available literature as well as practices of other Universities and Colleges throughout the State of Oregon including other comparable Universities in other states (Appendix 1 and Appendix 2). A summary of findings is as follows:

- The largest cause of preventable mortality in the United States is tobacco use. Tobacco smoke can be classified as mainstream smoke and sidestream smoke. Smoke that is drawn through the mouthpiece of a cigarette and then exhaled by the smoker is called mainstream smoke, while the smoke that comes from the burning end of a cigarette between puffs is called sidestream smoke. Sidestream smoke is known by several names; Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS)⁴, passive smoking, and most commonly, second hand smoke. With ETS, non-

⁴ ETS, secondhand smoke, and sidestream smoke will be used interchangeably throughout this document.

smokers are exposed to the same harmful chemicals that are inhaled by smokers, the only difference being the intensity level.

- The adverse health effects of ETS are multifarious and can be classified as short-term and long-term. Short-term exposure to ETS can cause asthma attacks, aggravation of allergies and respiratory illnesses, eye, nose and throat irritation, nausea, and headaches. Long-term exposure to ETS can cause lung cancer, heart disease, increased frequency and severity of bronchitis, pneumonia, ear infections, colds, flu and other viral infections. Moreover, ETS is classified by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) as a Group 1 Carcinogen (classified as carcinogenic to humans) that contains more than 4,000 known chemicals, more than 50 of which are known to cause cancer. In addition, the National Toxicology Program (NTP) lists tobacco smoke under the classification “known to be a carcinogen”.
- Stanford University researchers have determined that someone outside can breathe in wisps of second hand smoke that is much more concentrated than background air pollution levels. They gave the example that “If you sit within 18 inches of a person who smokes two cigarettes over the course of an hour, your exposure to secondhand smoke could be the same as if you sat one hour inside a tavern with smokers.”
- Over the past decade, the prevalence of cigarette smoking among college students has increased dramatically. As a result, exposure to ETS continues to be a major problem on University and College campuses. The American College Health Association (ACHA) has given its support to the findings that any form of

tobacco use is a health hazard. Research has shown that promoting and implementing stricter tobacco use policies and restrictions in public places such as University campuses have been found to significantly lower individual exposure to nicotine and the other dangerous substances in ETS. Community interventions over the last 35 years aimed at implementing effective tobacco use policies and restrictions have consistently proven to be effective. These interventions have included, but are not limited to, changing the restrictions on how far away from a building smokers can congregate and smoke, designating limited smoking areas, as well as advocating for clean indoor air policies. These efforts are consistent in keeping with the mission of ACHA in promoting optimal wellness throughout the campus community.

- All Oregon Colleges and Universities, with the exception of PSU, as well as the urban Universities researched no longer sell tobacco products on their campuses or allow smoking inside of any of their campus buildings. In addition, university vehicles are designated as non smoking.
- Comprehensive cessation programs and/or resources significantly aid policy compliance as well as a community of support for smokers seeking to quit using tobacco products.

The urban location of PSU creates a very compact environment, putting those who traverse through the campus at a high risk for exposure to ETS. Since smokers tend to congregate in high-traffic areas on campus, walkways and building entrances are often infiltrated with cigarette smoke. Rainy weather often exacerbates the problem since covered outdoor areas that are more than 20 feet away from building entrances are difficult to find on-campus.

Initiating efforts to reduce exposure to ETS and restrict tobacco use on campus will benefit the health of all members of the PSU community.

B.2.c. Survey Procedures

The survey procedures included the survey development and formal institutional approval process, collection, and analysis of the data, noting the limitation of the survey process, and the results, discussion of the findings and compilation of a set of recommendations. These components are addressed as follows:

B.2.c.1. Survey development and data collection process

The committee reviewed surveys from other universities as well as other sources relevant to smoking. After numerous revisions, the committee agreed on a 20-question survey (plus sub-parts) created to probe PSU-specific issues (See Appendix 3). An application was submitted to and approved by the PSU Human Subjects Research Review Committee (HSRRC) as a waived review. The survey was set up and distributed electronically in *WebSurveyor* to all valid PSU email addresses. The distribution was facilitated by the office of Institutional Research and allowed only one response per email address.

Survey data was collected for a 27 day period from Tuesday, February 13, 2007 through Sunday March 11, 2007. Survey questions were aggregated under three main headings as follows:

- Demographics of the respondents,
- Opinions regarding the current PSU smoking policy content and its implementation, and
- Opinions regarding the future PSU policy content and its implementation.

Questions 11, 14, and 20, each positioned as the last question within heading areas, provided unlimited space for open-ended comments. The remaining questions were close-ended, requesting opinions regarding current and future smoking/tobacco use policy using Likert-type response options.

B.2.c.2 Analysis

The data collection included both quantitative and qualitative responses. Responses from the close-ended survey questions were downloaded from *WebSurveyor* and imported into SPSS version 15.0 to facilitate data cleaning and quantitative analysis for the project. Open-ended responses were separated from the close-ended data and formatted so that hand-coding could be done in an adjacent column to the text. Prominent themes were identified and compiled.

B.2.c.3 Limitations

There were limitations to this evaluation of note. The distribution of the survey using *WebSurveyor* was facilitated by the PSU Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP). The email lists were not necessarily current or in common use by all faculty, staff, and students at PSU. Therefore, some potential respondents were unintentionally excluded from receiving or responding to the survey within the time limit. The response rate was 8.7% based on successfully delivered surveys. For faculty and staff, there were 2,712 email addresses targeted. Of those targeted, 2,493 emails were successfully sent with 219 errors or unsuccessful hits. For the student population, there were 23,596 email addresses targeted. Of those targeted, 21,697 emails were successfully sent with 1,899 errors. Because of the lower response rate among faculty and staff, on March 2, faculty and staff were provided a second opportunity to respond to

the survey. In the second round, 2,712 emails were targeted, 2,496 emails were successful, and 216 were unsuccessful.

B.2.d. Results and Discussion

B.2.d.1 Profile of the Respondents (Report of Quantitative Data)

There were 2,104 surveys returned containing at least one response. Of the 2,101 respondents who identified their status within PSU, 1,479 (70.4%) were students, 332 identified as staff (15.8%), and 290 (13.8%) identified themselves as faculty. From the pool of 1,541 respondents who were enrolled in classes at PSU, 78 (3.8%) identified themselves as an international student. In regard to gender, 1,265 (60.3%) of respondents were female, 781 (37.2%) were male and 51 (2.4%) respondents preferred not to answer the question. There were 2,100 respondents to the query on age. The following table shows that 67.8% of respondents were represented by the sum of 2 age groups—18-24 and 25-34.

Table 1
Age ranges of respondents

Age group	Number of respondents	Percentage of total
17 years or less	3	0.1%
18-24 years	696	33.1%
25-34 years	728	34.7%
35-44 years	308	15.7%
45-54 years	228	10.9%
55-64 years	129	6.1%
65 or greater	8	0.4%
Total	2,100	100%

Two thousand ninety-nine (2,099) respondents reported their smoking status. One thousand three-hundred ninety-five (1,395; 66.5%) identified themselves as non smokers, 316

(15.1%) identified themselves as smokers, and 388 (18.5%) identified themselves as former smokers. Of the 2,096 respondents to the question regarding location of residence, 198 (9.4%) reported living on campus and the remainder--1,898 (90.6%)--reported not living on campus.

Thus, the majority of respondents were United States-born female, non-smoking students in the 18-34 year age range.

B.2.d.2 Physical response and perceived scope of the issue on campus

In regard to physiological response to tobacco, an average of 14.3% (299) of all respondents (n=2,094) reported the presence of an underlying medical condition (heart disease, etc.) which may be aggravated by exposure to sidestream smoke. A slightly greater percentage of female respondents (n=202; 16%) reported susceptibility to the effects of sidestream smoke compared to males (n=87; 11.2%). The 45-54 year and 55-64 year age groups reported the highest percentage of this type of response with n=54; 23.8% and n=29; 22.7%, respectively, compared to the overall average across all age groups of 14.3%. Over 15% (n=12) of international students (gender inclusive) reported an underlying medical condition aggravated by exposure. An average of 43.7% of all respondents reported having some degree of milder physiological response (allergy/sensitivity symptoms, e.g., sneezing, watery eyes, etc.) when exposed to sidestream smoke (n=2,098). The highest response rates for milder symptoms were reflected in both faculty and staff each group reporting greater than 50% of the respondents with one or more symptoms.

Respondents were asked to report the degree to which they encountered sidestream smoke on campus. Of the 2,099 total responses, the highest response rates were for “sometimes” (n=699; 33.3%) and “often” (n=612; 29.2%) in the Likert-type categories provided. The 18-24

year age group (n=191; 27.4%) reported the highest response rate in the “always” category when asked about frequency of exposure to sidestream smoke on campus compared to an average of 20.5% across all age groups. Nonsmokers and former smokers reported the greatest frequency of exposure in both the “often” and “always” categories.

Across all status groups (faculty, staff, & students) an average of 66.7% expressed concern regarding environmental tobacco smoke. Similarly, 65.4% (n=51) of international students acknowledged that ETS was a concern. In regard to gender, females reported the highest level of concern at 70.6% (n=893) for ETS compared to males at 61.3% (n=479) and gender-withheld individuals at 51% (n=26).

B.2.d.3 Current Smoking Policy and Its Implementation

The PSU community was asked about their knowledge of the existence of the PSU smoking policy and their knowledge of the existence of the University Safety Committee, an institutional governance body with a currently stated role in addressing smoking concerns.

Table 2
Smoking policy awareness

	“This is the first time I have read the PSU Smoking Policy”	“Before reading the above policy, I was aware that there is a University Safety Committee”
Faculty	Agree: N=183; 64.2% Disagree: N= 102; 35.8%	Agree: N= 186; 65.3% Disagree: N=99; 34.7%
Staff	Agree: N=187; 56.8% Disagree: N=142; 43.2%	Agree: N= 212; 65% Disagree: N= 114; 35.0%
Students	Agree: N=1052; 71.6% Disagree: N=417; 28.4%	Agree: N=601; 41.2% Disagree: N= 856; 58.8%

As shown in the above table, slightly less than 72% of students, 64.2% of faculty, and 56.8% of staff reported that this was their first reading of the PSU smoking policy. This suggests that both

the visibility and communication of the policy could be improved across the entire PSU community.

The PSU community was asked about their awareness of the presence of the University Safety Committee. The committee serves as an institutional governance body with the designated role of reviewing risk-related policy, responding to community concerns, and making recommendations for improvement to institutional decision makers. As expected, more than half (58.8%; n=856) of the student respondents were not aware of the presence of the committee. However, greater than a third of faculty (34.7%; n=99) and staff (35%; n=114) were unaware of the University Safety Committee. This presents an impetus for creatively engaging administrators to support a PSU safety infrastructure enhancement project, since employee knowledge of the safety committee is an Oregon OSHA requirement. Further, safety infrastructure enhancement may add value in terms of enabling risk-averse decision making across the institution, thus, creating a context for more sustainable decisions.

The PSU community was asked to respond to a series of statements regarding the current smoking policy and its implementation. Table 3 below provides a summary of the responses. While there was a slightly greater percentage of respondents who strongly disagreed/disagreed (41.2%) than strongly agreed/agreed (37.8%) that the campus was clearly marked to identify smoking areas, more than 50% of respondents either strongly disagreed or disagreed that the current signage to identify smoking areas was adequate. Slightly more than half (51.2%) of respondents either strongly disagreed or disagreed that the current signage to identify non smoking areas was adequate. In regard to respect for the smoking signage, 65.6% of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed that there was adherence to the guiding content of the smoking-related signage. In regard to clear marking of ventilation system air intakes, windows,

and other vulnerable locations around the building envelope for smoke to enter, 52% of respondents either strongly disagreed or disagreed that signage clearly identified these locations.

Table 3
Current smoking policy and its implementation

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- Campus is clearly marked to identify smoking areas	N=224 10.7%	N=568 27.2%	N=432 20.7%	N=653 31.2%	N=214 10.2%
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- Current signage is adequate to identify Smoking areas	N=210 10%	N=401 19.2%	N=430 20.6%	N=730 34.9%	N=319 15.3%
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- Current signage is adequate to identify non smoking areas	N=210 10.1%	N=421 20.2%	N=387 18.5%	N=710 34%	N=359 17.2%
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- Smoking signage is respected on campus	N=72 3.5%	N=214 10.3%	N=431 20.7%	N=571 27.4%	N=797 38.2%
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- Air intakes, i.e., vents, windows, etc. affected by smoking are clearly marked	N=132 6.3%	N=301 14.5%	N=566 27.2%	N=709 34%	N=375 18%

B.2.d.4 Future Smoking Policy and Its Implementation

Respondents replied to a series of questions regarding the future content of the smoking policy, its implementation and the sales of tobacco products on campus. In regard to making no change to the current 20 foot separation between smokers and building entrances and air intakes, the average combined percentage of those who either strongly disagree or disagree (54.1%) was greater than the combined average for respondents who either agreed or strongly agreed (32%) that the current 20 foot rule should remain in effect across all status groups (faculty, staff, and

students). As would be expected, the responses to the question of the desirability of increasing the distance to greater than 20 feet distance elicited the predominance of agree and strongly agree responses averaged across all status groups (66%) versus those selecting disagree and strongly disagree responses (18.8%). These responses support a re-evaluation of the current 20 foot standard.

There was a strong response to the support for the addition of protective shelters for smokers as designated smoking areas. Across all status groups 69.5% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the addition of structures while 13.7% either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the smoking shelter proposition. Further, there was some level of agreement across all smoking status (non-smoker, smoker, and former smoker) groups regarding the provision of shelters specifically for smokers. Sixty-two percent (62%) or more of the respondents in each of the three groups, non-smokers, smokers, and former smokers, either agreed or strongly agreed that shelters should be provided. In contrast, 20% or less in each of the same groups either strongly disagreed or disagreed that shelters smokers should be provided on campus for smokers.

Table 4
Provide designated smoking shelters

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Faculty	N=80 27.9%	N=103 35.9%	N=49 17.1%	N=35 12.2%	N=20 7.0%
Staff	N=138 41.7%	N=99 29.9%	N=50 15.1%	N=25 7.6%	N=19 5.7%
Students	N=609 41.5%	N=432 29.4%	N=221 15.1%	N=102 6.9%	N=104 7.1%
Smokers	N=111 35.1%	N=87 27.5%	N=53 16.8%	N=27 8.5%	N=38 12%
Non Smokers	N=553 40%	N=432 31.3%	N=213 15.4%	N=106 7.7%	N=77 5.6%
Former Smokers	N=162 41.9%	N=115 29.7%	N=54 14%	N=29 7.5%	N=27 7%

Two questions were asked regarding residence facilities and smoking permission. One question asked respondent opinion as to allowing limited smoking in PSU residence facilities. Of the student respondents, 17.3% either agreed or strongly agreed while 62.28% either disagreed or strongly disagreed with limiting smoking areas in residence halls. In contrast, 69.4% of student respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with providing a totally smoke-free residential environment while 11.8% of student either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the smoke-free residence proposal. Seventy-seven international students responded to the question. Fifty-four percent (54.5%) of those respondents strongly agreed with smoke-free residential facilities on campus. This suggests that all student respondents strongly prefer a smoke-free campus residence facility over ones allowing limited smoking.

Respondents were asked their opinion regarding the following statement, “PSU should become a smoke-free campus.”

Table 5
PSU as a smoke free campus

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Faculty	108 37.63%	44 15.33%	59 20.55%	41 14.28%	35 12.19%	N=287
Staff	132 40.24%	56 17.7%	47 14.32%	50 15.24%	43 13.10%	N=328
Student	569 38.55%	176 11.9%	178 12.05%	188 1.2%	365 24.72%	N=1476
Total N	809	276	284	279	443	N=2091
Average%	38.81%	13.19%	13.58%	13.34%	16.67%	

Referring to the above table, greater than 1/3 of respondents across each status category of faculty, staff, and students strongly agreed with the smoke-free university concept for PSU.

When combining both strongly agree and agree percentages, greater than 50% of respondents,

including among international students, in each category supported a smoke-free campus. This was consistent across gender categories, as well.

The campus community was asked to provide opinions regarding specific areas on campus and smoking.

**Table 6
Smoking limitations**

	Smoking acceptable at 20 feet away from entrances	Smoking should be limited to designated areas	Smoking should not be allowed
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- (Outdoor walkways between buildings all floors)	N=510 24.4%	N=479 22.9%	N=1104 52.7%
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- (Balconies, landings, and decks)	N=477 22.9%	N=586 28.1%	N=1023 49%

The results in the above table suggest that certain outdoor areas present challenges in terms of sidestream smoke exposure. Nearly 53% of all respondents identified common walkways between buildings, e.g., Neuberger Hall—Smith Hall and Smith Hall—Cramer Hall as problem areas advocating for fully restricting the areas from smoking. Forty-nine percent (49%) of all respondents thought that congregating areas immediately adjacent to buildings (e.g., balconies, landings and decks as may be found at Smith Center, School of Business, Peter Stott Center and the Science Buildings) should prohibit smoking. More detail regarding site-specific problem areas regarding smoking were identified in the open-ended comments and will be addressed later.

Currently, PSU Auxiliary Services sells cigarettes in the Smith Center store. The product is sold as a low profile, unadvertised item stored out of sight from general customers. PSU is the

only higher education institution in Oregon to sell tobacco products on campus (See Table 1: “Oregon Universities/Colleges Side-By-Side Comparison”). Respondents were asked to complete a statement regarding the sales of tobacco products on campus.

Table 7
“The sale of tobacco products in campus stores and on campus property...”

	Should be allowed	Should be prohibited	No opinion	Total
Faculty	63 21.72%	156 53.79%	71 24.48%	290
Staff	76 23.03%	157 47.57%	97 29.39%	330
Student	447 30.26%	659 44.61%	371 25.11%	1,477
Total Average%	586 27.94%	972 46.35%	539 25.70%	2,097

Referring to the above table, slightly more than 25% of respondents averaged across all categories thought that the tobacco sales on campus should be allowed. Approximately 25% of respondents had no opinion on the sales. An average of 46.4% of respondents thought that sales should be prohibited.

The campus community was asked to respond with their level of agreement or disagreement to a series of statements regarding the content of a future smoking policy for PSU. Prior to initiation of this smoking policy evaluation, the University Safety Committee received numerous complaints regarding the lack of adherence to no smoking signage, lack of smoking policy enforcement, and problem campus areas in regard to involuntary exposure to secondhand smoke. As reflected in Table 8, approximately 36% of respondents across all groups either strongly agreed or agreed and 47% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the policy should be based on an honor system and self-policing. In regard to enforcement and disciplinary action

against smoking policy violators, approximately 57% either strongly agreed or agreed and 25% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that this mechanism of control should be increased.

Table 8
Future PSU smoking policy

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- Base policy on an honor system and self-policing	N=278 13.3%	N=472 22.6%	N=356 17.0%	N=597 28.6%	N=385 18.4%
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- Place increased emphasis on enforcement and disciplinary action	N=532 25.4%	N=666 31.8%	N=365 17.4%	N=317 15.2%	N=212 10.1%
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- Provide easily accessed resources for smoking prevention and cessation.	N=931 44.5%	N=758 36.2%	N=310 14.8%	N=62 3.0%	N=32 1.5%
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- Policy should be linked to a larger institutional program of wellness.	N=772 37.0%	N=735 35.3%	N=435 20.9%	N=88 4.2%	N=54 2.6%
Faculty, Staff, Student average across all groups- There should be an increased emphasis on communicating the policy to the PSU community.	N=851 40.6%	N=804 38.4%	N=329 15.7%	N=77 3.7%	N=34 1.6%

When asked to provide an opinion regarding positive, health oriented, and supportive institutional programs, more than 80% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the provision of adequate resources for smoking prevention and cessation to the PSU community. Greater than 72% of all respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that smoking should be part of a larger wellness program at PSU. In regard to communication of the smoking policy, 79% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that better communication should be emphasized

with the revision. Even among students greater than 54% either agreed or strongly agreed with the need for increased communication regarding the policy.

B.2.d.5. Synthesis of Open-ended Responses (Report of qualitative data)

As stated previously, the survey included three open-ended questions. The intention of the open-ended questions was to elicit information from PSU students, staff, and faculty about their position towards sidestream smoke in general, the current PSU smoking policy, and opinions or recommendations for PSU smoking policy reform and implementation.

Several recurring themes were present in the open-ended responses and the data was grouped accordingly. The qualitative responses were categorized according to the following themes: concern regarding the level of sidestream smoke on the PSU campus; no concern about the level of sidestream smoke on the PSU campus; cigarette-related litter; ashtray placement; comments pertaining to the current smoking policy and signage; areas where sidestream smoke is very problematic; recommendations for policy reform; and appreciation for raising awareness of the issue.

A total of 2,104 open-ended responses were obtained; however, many comments contained more than one theme resulting in a total of 3,050 “themed” comments. Twenty-four and nine-tenths percent (24.9%) of the responses indicated a direct concern about the levels of sidestream smoke on the PSU campus, whereas, 12.1% of the responses implied that the level of smoke on campus was not concerning or there were other issues that were of greater concern (see Table 9). Twenty-one and nine tenths percent (21.9%) of the comments were recommendations for policy reform and implementation. Responses regarding the current smoking policy and signage on campus accounted for 21.2% of the total comments, and 14.0% of the comments

identified areas on campus that have particularly high levels of secondhand smoke. Three and one tenth percent (3.1%) of the comments pertained to the amount of cigarette-related litter that is present on campus; 2.1% of the responses voiced appreciation for the survey; and 0.7% of the responses pertained to appropriate and inappropriate ashtray placement on campus.

<i>Theme</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Concerned	758	24.9%
Not Concerned	370	12.1%
Policy recommendations	669	21.9%
Current policy/signage	647	21.2%
Problem areas	426	14.0%
Litter	95	3.1%
Appreciation for survey	63	2.1%
Ashtray placement	22	0.7%

Of the 669 comments recommending courses of action for policy reform, 213 suggested completely banning the sale and use of tobacco products anywhere on campus; whereas, 245 comments were not in favor of a campus-wide smoking ban. The respondents in favor of a campus-wide smoking ban passionately described the detrimental affects that sidestream smoke has on one's health and well-being. One respondent quoted, “[p]lease ban smoking on campus. It is not fair that other people’s habit causes my cancer and heart disease risk to increase.” Another felt that “PSU should not allow smoking at all on campus” and that they should not “have to suffer and get cancer because other people choose to kill themselves.” Several respondents cited their wish for PSU “to lead by example in becoming a smoke-free campus” and “to be a trail-blazer for state-wide smoking reform.”

Of the 245 comments from respondents who were opposed to a complete smoking ban, the majority did think that smoking needed to be contained to a few specific areas. As one

respondent wrote, “I don't think that the rights of smokers should be infringed upon any more than the rights of us non-smokers. I think that there should be adequate set-aside spaces for smokers to congregate and enjoy their choices. As a non-smoker, I would simply appreciate the opportunity to breath without inhaling tobacco fumes.” This sentiment was widely held by this portion of respondents, many of whom felt that “providing covered areas away from foot-traffic would help mitigate second-hand exposure.” Additionally, several respondents felt that a complete smoking ban would raise too much controversy for the University: “I believe that PSU needs to be very careful about considering a smoke free campus policy. Another option might be smoking kiosks-multiple covered areas away from buildings that non-smokers/people with health risks can easily avoid.” Many respondents advocated for a “liberal environment” where “people aren't harassed for smoking, but those who mind aren't bothered.” Again, the majority of those not in favor of a complete ban shared the common sentiment of containing smoking to a few, indirect areas where shelters were provided as incentive for policy adherence.

Many respondents discussed their concerns about enforcement of any smoking policy. The primary concern was that the current policy is not enforced; therefore, instituting a stricter policy would not result in curbing sidestream smoke due to lack of enforcement. It was voiced that “it really sucks that nobody is taking any action on those smokers smoking in non-smoking areas...I've been complaining about this issue dozens of times, and no results.” One respondent inquired, “What's it going to take to get Campus Security to enforce the 20 foot rule?” Overall, the belief is widely held that “there is no enforcement of the PSU smoking policy.” The majority of the respondents would like to see restrictions on smoking; however, they also feel that “if there's no teeth, there's no solution.”

The majority of the comments pertaining to the current smoking policy and smoking signage were related to the lack of enforcement of the “20 ft. rule.” Many respondents felt that “smokers pay no heed to the signs” nor do they “observe the 20 ft. ordinance.” Although most of the respondents felt the level of signage is adequate, “people are always smoking on campus, even under posted no smoking signs with no repercussion.” The lack of enforcement of the non-smoking benches was also viewed as a large problem. As one respondent observed, “For the love of God, look at the area between Cramer Hall and Smith Union - all of the benches say "No Smoking" and yet, it is impossible to walk through that area without breathing in smoke - you would think that PSU would crack down on ‘No Smoking Areas’.”

Fourteen percent of the comments received pertained to particularly problematic areas with high levels of sidestream smoke. Almost all of these comments were directed at the walkways that connect Neuberger Hall, Smith Memorial Student Union, and Cramer Hall, as well as the areas directly outside Millar Library. Respondents observed that “smoking is continuous between Neuberger and Smith,” and “the areas in between buildings like Cramer and Smith are always filled with smokers so it is impossible to pass from class to class without getting secondhand smoke exposure.” This problem is not only confined to the doorways, but “air intakes are also a big problem...it is clear when someone outside is smoking.” The areas directly outside the library were also a major concern among respondents: “Although smokers may be adhering to the 20' away from the entrance rule, the smokers in front of the Library create a wall of smoke at the top of the steps through which one must walk to get to/from the Library.”

The last issue that several respondents identified as problematic is the amount of cigarette related litter present on campus as well as the placement of ashtrays. Those identifying this as an

issue claimed to be “tired of dodging cigarette butts on the ground” and felt that “it makes the campus look filthy and disgusting.” Regarding the placement of ashtrays, some respondents felt that the university should provide more ashtrays around campus to combat the litter problem. An equal proportion of respondents were confused by the placement of ashtrays directly outside doorways since this seems contradictory to the “20 ft. rule.” One respondent commented, “There is also an ashtray right outside our office door. Why would the university put an ashtray there, if people are not supposed to smoke close to the building?”

To view additional comments, please see Appendix 4.

B.3. Committee Recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee reviewed the literature, web-based survey responses from the campus community, along with the policies, procedures, and trends in other Oregon state colleges and universities, including a sample of five urban institutions in other states. Based on evidence from the survey, the committee agreed that the policy is not working in its current form. Through the evaluation process many gaps have been identified that need to be addressed. Further, in examining other institutional policies, the trend has been toward a more comprehensive approach to smoking policy revisions which will be pursued by the committee. There were several factors the smoking committee included in its discussion of a policy revision, these were, reducing involuntary secondhand smoke exposure, accessibility for community members who have reported one or more underlying medical exacerbated by ETS exposure [14% or 299 of 2,094 respondents] or less severe physiological responses [44% or 917 of 2098 respondents] to

exposure to secondhand smoke, the necessity of a support system for cessation, and consideration for the needs of smokers.

Arguments for a 100% smoke-free campus were brought to the table in light of current trends among college campuses (including OHSU) to embrace a public health model for promoting healthy behaviors among the campus community members as well as the opportunity to demonstrate leadership among OUS institutions as the first University to adopt a smoke-free campus policy. In addition, recent research suggests that restrictive policies, i.e., a smoke-free campus, can discourage smoking onset or facilitate cessation efforts among students (Thompson, et al., 2006⁵). The arguments against this choice of action included, the current policy is so minimal and not enforced that to jump from nothing to the end of the spectrum is too dramatic without an adequate infrastructure and dedicated resources to support the shift, and the use of an incremental approach may provide a more acceptable movement along a continuum toward a smoke-free campus in the future. In any case, the policy should be revisited annually.

Based on the data collected and the conversations held, the committee members agreed to put forth the following recommendations:

Establish smoke-free and designated campus zones in the outdoor environment

- The main campus areas of concern as reported in the PSU survey include, the overpass walkways/balconies, the walkways between Neuberger Hall, Smith Memorial Student Union, and Cramer Hall, and the entrance to the Library. These areas were identified as

⁵ Thompson, et al., (2006). *Preferred smoking policies at 30 Northwest colleges*, Public Health Reports, v.121, pp. 586-595.

problematic because they are under overhangs or walkways where the smoke becomes trapped and/or they are in the area of high foot traffic with a mixing of smokers and non smokers. Because of the reported problems on the PSU campus, the mounting research evidence regarding the harmful effects of concentrated exposure to secondhand smoke⁶, and the current trends toward a more restrictive campus policy, the committee recommends increasing the distance that a person can smoke from entrances, air intakes, and windows from 20 feet to 25 feet. This increase would assist the University in meeting LEED status requirements. In addition, the State of Washington Initiative 901 sets 25 feet as standard distancing of smokers from entrances, exits, windows that open, and ventilation intakes. In contrast, Oregon Senate Bill 571 uses 10 feet for required separation of smokers from entrances, exits, windows that open, and ventilation intakes of public buildings including educational facilities. On the Federal level, Executive Order 13058 (E.O. 13058) mandates that federal employees and their visitors be protected from the health risks of ETS. While a distance was not stated in the E.O., federal agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH), use a 25 foot separation similar to the State of Washington. A study by Repace⁷ (2005) on the University of Maryland Baltimore Campus (UMBC) found that the level of smoke (fine particles or carcinogens) approach background levels at 23 feet away from no more than 1 or 2 smokers. Twenty-five feet would provide a protective distance based on this data. If city property falls

⁶ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, (2006). *The health consequences of involuntary exposure to tobacco smoke: A report of the Surgeon General—Executive summary*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Coordinating Center for Health Promotion, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health. Online. <http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco>.

⁷ Repace, J., (2005). *Measurements of outdoor air pollution from secondhand smoke on the UMBC campus*. Online. <http://www.repace.com>.

within the 25 foot zone, then it would be exempt from this policy unless the City of Portland moves to restrict smoking within public park areas such as the Park Blocks.

- All wall mounted ash receptacles should be removed and all free standing ash receptacles should be moved outside of the 25 foot zone. In the past when ash receptacles have been relocated they were found later to have been moved back to the original location. Therefore, the committee would like to see new, weather-resistant ash receptacles added to keep pools of water from collecting in them as well as have the ability to be permanently attached to the ground.

- It is very difficult to determine what is considered the “smoke-free zone” when referring to entrances and air intake vents. To assist students, staff, faculty and visitors in identifying the correct distance a colorful mural or painted demarcation line should be put outside the main problem areas on campus. The committee also suggests adding covered designated shelters near the problem vicinities but well outside high traffic areas. In some instances there are already existing benches that could be modified to have a protective cover placed over them. The designated areas should be clearly identified via appropriate signage, which will also include information on quitting resources.
 - Smoking shelters are available through various vendors. Example photos are below and more can be found at:
 - Duo-Gard www.duo-gard.com
 - Handi-Hut www.handi-hut.com/index.php



- All balconies and overpasses that fall within the 25 feet zone, and should be clearly marked as smoke-free.

Establish smoke-free and designated zones in the indoor environment

The evidence supporting the adverse effects of secondhand smoke in confined places compelled the committee to make the following recommendations in regards to state vehicles and residence life:

- All PSU vehicles should be smoke (and spit) free. This would make PSU in compliance with Department of Administrative Services rule as published in the Oregon Administrative Rules [OAR 125-155-0500 (5)(f)] for state vehicle use. A no smoking decal should be applied inside every vehicle to inform the driver and passengers of this rule. Managers and supervisors would provide oversight of staff and student workers to ensure education and compliance as well as lead by example. Faculty members are responsible for education and compliance of their students using PSU vehicles.

- Residence Life has already proposed a 3-year phased plan to make all campus housing smoke-free except for the Parkway building. The committee supports their proposal but would like to add the opinions expressed by on campus residents to the survey whereby sixty-six percent (66%; n=131) of the resident respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that campus housing should be completely non smoking while 22% (n=44) either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the non smoking housing premise. The remainder of respondents (n=23) took a neutral position.
- Currently Portland State is the only institution in the State of Oregon selling tobacco products on campus. There is disagreement within the committee regarding the sales of tobacco products. One position sees the sales in conflict with the PSU vision to be recognized as an urban institution known for environmental sustainability and quality of life. Another position sees the sales as providing a service to an adult population who are free to make a choice. The University Market currently receives 6% of its annual revenue from the sales of tobacco, which equals \$43,565. The entire committee acknowledges the adverse financial impact that elimination of this revenue-generating source would cause without an alternative revenue source. Therefore, the committee looks to the PSU administration for advice on a position to take in a revised policy.
- Some faculty within Theater Arts use tobacco products for artistic performances (for brief periods). The committee recommends a complete transition to alternative props to eliminate tobacco use in all productions.

- Native American ceremonies should be the only exception to allow smoking tobacco products indoors. The committee understands the cultural significance of tobacco use during specific ceremonial occasions. Therefore, the policy should be written to take this into consideration.

Implementation Considerations

- As reported by other institutions in telephone interviews, compliance and enforcement are the most problematic areas of implementing a smoking policy. PSU Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) has been invited to attend a committee meeting. Although CPSO has been unable to attend, Mike Soto did request that he be informed of any recommendation involving his department. Other universities interviewed for this project, reported various strategies for gaining acceptable compliance of a smoking policy. While administrative support and a comprehensive educational process are the first critical steps, some type of reinforcing voice on a day to day basis is important, as well. Other universities report a variety of daily education and compliance strategies such as assigning Public Safety Officers, Environmental Health & Safety (EH&S) staff, all faculty and staff, and student peer pressure. Universities relying on EH&S staff or all faculty and staff (non-uniformed) reported a sense of vulnerability when conversations become confrontational.

Understanding that Public Safety has limited resources, the committee is proposing that CPSO officers notify violators of the policy while they are doing their normal patrols of campus. Since PSU is an urban institution there are many visitors to campus, it could be

unsafe to expose staff and faculty to a potentially volatile situation and the most prudent would be to have trained officers deliver the message. However, triaging and responding to complaints will need to be addressed, as well.

- A comprehensive education campaign should be launched to not only create awareness of the policy, but to inform all PSU community members of the expectations of behavior, supporting research data, and cessation information including availability. This would include, but not be limited to, information cards, brochures, and a website. The University should explore options to provide smoking cessation assistance to all members of the campus community. This would include support groups for behavior modification as well as nicotine replacement therapy products.

Moving Forward

Upon review, discussion, and approval of the recommendations by PSU administrative staff, the committee recommends a work group be appointed to formally re-write the policy and discuss the educational campaign and tobacco cessation resources. While the revised policy should be reviewed annually, two to three years after the policy goes into effect, a more in depth evaluation should be conducted to determine the effectiveness of the new policy and decide what (if any) changes should be made. The subsequent evaluation could include revisiting the idea of a 100% tobacco-free campus.

The committee views this policy change as the start of a larger healthy and sustainable campus initiative. This policy could be the beginning of a culture change at PSU, one that embraces and promotes healthy living, healthy choices, and unimpeded access for everyone.

PSU is the largest academic institution in the State of Oregon. This new initiative would not only have the ability to spark change at other Oregon Universities, but would enable PSU to demonstrate leadership for other diverse urban Universities across the country.

We look forward to your comments. We are always available for further discussion of this proposal.

PRIMARY RESOURCES

American College Health Association (ACHA). (2005). Position statement on tobacco on colleges and university campuses. Retrieved November 6, 2005 from http://www.acha.org/info_resources/guidelines.cfm

Brownson, R., Eriksen, M., Davis, R., & Warner, K. (1997). Environmental tobacco smoke: Health effects and policies to reduce exposure. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 18, 163-185.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (1994). Setting the record straight: Secondhand smoke is a preventable health risk. Retrieved November 6, 2005, from <http://www.epa.gov/iaq/ets/pubs/strsfs.html>

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (2005). Health effects of exposure to secondhand smoke. Retrieved November 6, 2005, from <http://www.epa.gov/smokefree/healtheffects.html>

Hopkins, D., Briss, P., Ricard, C., Husten, C., Carande-Kulis, V., Fielding, J., et al. (2001). Reviews of evidence regarding interventions to reduce tobacco use and exposure to environmental tobacco smoke. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 20(2S), 16-65.

Jaakkola, M.S., & Jaakkola, J.J.K. (1997). Assessment of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke. *European Respiratory Journal*, 10, 2384-2397.

Leaderer, B. (1990). Assessing exposure to environmental tobacco smoke. *Risk Analysis*, 10(1), 19-26.

Ott, C., Cashin, S., & Altekruze, M. (2005). Development and validation of the college tobacco survey. *Journal of American College Health*, 53(5), 231-238.

Shwartz, M. (2007). Exposure to secondhand tobacco smoke in outdoor settings a risk, study shows. Retrieved May 14th, 2007 from <http://newsservice.stanford.edu/news/2007/may9/smoking-050907.html>

Wechsler, H., Kelley, K., Seibring, M., Kuo, M., & Rigotti, N. (2001). College smoking policies and smoking cessation programs: Results of a survey of college health center directors. *Journal of American College Health*, 49, 205-212.

WEB RESOURCES

TTAC- College Tobacco Prevention Resource

<http://www.ttac.org/college/>

“The College Tobacco Prevention Resource (CTPR) aims to provide practical information, ideas, and guidance to assist college leaders with planning, implementing, and evaluating effective campus tobacco policies and programs.”

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2006). “2006 Surgeon General’s Report—The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke”.

http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/sgr/sgr_2006/index.htm#full

Appendix 1

Oregon Universities/Colleges Side-by-Side Comparison

Institution	Smoking Policy	Tobacco Sales on Campus	Advertising in Campus Publications Policy	Promotional Activities Policy
Art Institute of Portland	The balcony of the student lounge is the designated outdoor smoking area.	Student Services stated there were no tobacco sales on campus.	N/A	N/A
Concordia University	No smoking in residence halls or other campus facilities; Smoking allowed only in designated areas outdoors.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Tobacco advertising is not accepted by campus papers.	Tobacco companies not permitted to hold promotional activities on campus.
Lewis & Clark College	Smoking is not permitted inside or within 25 feet of any college building, inside any college vehicle and in other designated non-smoking areas.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Campus has never been approached for advertising and will discuss what they would do if it should happen.	The campus does not permit the distribution of literature or printed materials of any kind, selling of merchandise, solicitation for financial contributions for any other cause, or conduct any activity on college property that is not specifically authorized and directly related to college business.
Mt. Hood Community College	No smoking indoors. Smoking is allowed in uncovered outdoor areas and shelters, 30 feet away from buildings.	No tobacco sales on campus.	N/A	N/A

Institution	Smoking Policy	Tobacco Sales on Campus	Advertising in Campus Publications Policy	Promotional Activities Policy
National College of Natural Medicine	Tobacco free campus, no smoking outside at all or in their parking lots. Smoking area is under a foot bridge that is not part of their grounds.	No tobacco sales on campus.	No Advertising.	No Promotions.
Oregon College of Oriental Medicine	Tobacco free campus. Smoking is not allowed on their grounds at all.	No tobacco sales on campus.	No Advertising.	No Promotions.
Oregon Health and Sciences University	Smoking in designated outdoor areas only. Beginning September 2007 they will be going completely tobacco free. Effective immediately, OHSU is expanding its services to offer full tobacco cessation support. Options available include: -Prescription medications -Over-the-counter nicotine replacement therapies (NRTs) -Health coaching - Web-based cessation program - Self-guided program	No tobacco sales on campus.	Examples of unacceptable ads include promotions for any kind of product or activity not viewed as supporting a healthy lifestyle.	N/A

Institution	Smoking Policy	Tobacco Sales on Campus	Advertising in Campus Publications Policy	Promotional Activities Policy
Oregon State University	Policy can not be found on the OSU website but can be found here: http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_500/OAR_576/576_040.html . Smoking is prohibited indoors and within 10 feet of any building. Smoking is also prohibited in state vehicles.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Not addressed in their policy.	Not addressed in their policy.
Pacific Northwest College of Art	Smoke can not enter the building. No smoking by entrances of the school. Smoking allowed only at the designated area on the loading dock (Johnson St, off 13th St.).	No tobacco sales on campus.	N/A	No written policy. They don't allow it happen however people try to sneak in and put fliers in student boxes and people also ask if they can post. The school is receptive to policy work on this issue.
Portland Community College (All Campuses)	Smoking is allowed in designated smoking areas only. Designated areas must be at least 20 feet away from entryways, windows and vents and not in any well traveled pathways to college facilities. As of May 2007 their tobacco committee proposed all PCC campuses to be tobacco free. This is currently being discussed.	No tobacco sales on all campus.		

Institution	Smoking Policy	Tobacco Sales on Campus	Advertising in Campus Publications Policy	Promotional Activities Policy
Portland State University	Smoking is prohibited indoors and also within 20 feet of any door, window, or air intake vents.	Tobacco products are sold in the University Market located in SMSU.	Alcohol and tobacco advertising in university publications is prohibited.	Alcohol and tobacco companies may not promote their products through the sponsorship of University events (social, intramural, athletic or other). This includes logos, endorsements, visual displays or other recognizable advertisement. Alcohol and tobacco advertising at athletic events conducted on University property is prohibited, as is the sale of alcohol at athletic events on University property.

Institution	Smoking Policy	Tobacco Sales on Campus	Advertising in Campus Publications Policy	Promotional Activities Policy
Reed College	Smoking is prohibited indoors and also within 30 feet of buildings (however there is no enforcement). Smoking of any substance is not permitted in the residence halls. Smoking tobacco products is permitted on residence balconies. It is expected that a request to discontinue smoking on a balcony will be honored. Students will be charged a \$100 fee for additional cleaning upon moving out of their room if there is significant evidence of smoking in the room.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Not addressed in their policy.	Promotions don't happen on campus: "In the interest of every student's right to health, safety, and general privacy, Reed College prohibits solicitation or sales on college-owned property except with the specific written permission of the college."
Southern Oregon University	Smoking is prohibited indoors and also within 10 feet of any door, window, or air intake vents. Smoking is also prohibited in state vehicles.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Not addressed in their policy.	Not addressed in their policy.
University of Oregon	Smoking is prohibited indoors and also within 10 feet of any door, window, or air intake vents. Smoking is also prohibited in state vehicles.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Not addressed in their policy.	Not addressed in their policy.

Institution	Smoking Policy	Tobacco Sales on Campus	Advertising in Campus Publications Policy	Promotional Activities Policy
University of Portland	Prohibited in all campus buildings and within 50 feet of buildings.	No tobacco sales on campus.	No Advertising.	No Promotions.

Warner Pacific College	Entire campus is considered a smoke free environment.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Language will be added to the policy prohibiting tobacco advertising.	Language will be added to the policy prohibiting tobacco promotion.
Western Seminary	No written policy; defacto smoke free.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Tobacco advertising not permitted (de facto policy)	Tobacco promotions not permitted (de facto policy)
Western States Chiropractic College	Smoke free campus; administrative policy.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Tobacco advertising not permitted (de facto policy)	Tobacco promotions not permitted (de facto policy)
Western University	No formal policy. One building on campus that you can not smoke within 40 feet of the building. Otherwise smoking is allowed anywhere outside. No smoking in housing allowed.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Not addressed in their policy.	Not addressed in their policy.
Willamette University	Smoking is prohibited indoors. No smoking within 10 feet of building entrances, windows, intakes. Smoking is allowed in outdoor designated areas. The rights of the non-smoker take precedence over the rights of the smoker.	No tobacco sales on campus.	Not addressed in their policy.	Not addressed in their policy.

Appendix 2

Urban Universities Comparison

Institution	Smoking Policy	Tobacco Sales on Campus	Additional Notes
Boise State University	<p>“The approved policy provides for the designation of “smoke-free-entrances” to permanent campus buildings. The intent of this policy is to provide a smoke-free environment at the primary accessible entrance to campus buildings. Smoking is prohibited within 30 feet of smoke-free entrances. In support of this effort, Facilities Operations & Maintenance has moved or provided cigarette receptacles 30 feet from the smoke-free entrances.” Policy can be found at: http://www.boisestate.edu/healthservices/info/tobacco/ They have clearly marked designated smoking zones and are planning on moving smoke free eventually</p>	No Tobacco Sales on campus.	<p>This school also has a tobacco cessation program available for students/staff that they coordinate with local hospitals and the state, they don’t run it themselves. Services are free. \$10 fee for NRT, free membership for YMCA. Website regarding tobacco cessation services: http://www.boisestate.edu/healthservices/info/tobacco/</p>
Cleveland State University	<p>“CSU is a smoke-free campus. CSU policy prohibits smoking inside all University buildings except for private rooms in residence halls.” Smoking is prohibited within 20 feet of all buildings. Policy can be found at: http://www.csuohio.edu/conferenceservices/procedures.html#25</p>	No Tobacco Sales on campus.	<p>Ohio passed a smoke free ban in all public places enacted September 7th of 2006. Dept. of Health had to establish rules and regulations. Compliance began May 4th 2007. Although the campus claims to be smoke free they still have designated outdoor smoking areas. Enforcement is expected to be the responsibility of all staff and faculty.</p>

Institution	Smoking Policy	Tobacco Sales on Campus	Additional Notes
Indiana University - Purdue	<p>"Smoking is prohibited on university owned and operated property within 30 feet of building entrances, exits, partially or fully enclosed walkways and ventilation systems. All buildings, doorways, and fully or partially enclosed walkways connecting buildings will be smoke free. Exceptions may be granted for specific auxiliary enterprises. Smoking is not permitted in university owned, leased, or operated licensed vehicles." Policy can be found at: http://www.iupuc.edu/admissions/other/smoke.asp</p>	<p>"Advertising, sale, or promotion of tobacco products and the sponsoring of campus events by tobacco companies or tobacco-promoting organizations for the purpose of promoting tobacco related products is not permitted."</p>	<p>Updated as July 1, 2006 as a smoke free campus, however they still have an open sided building with cover (smoking hut) as the only designated smoking area. Faculty/Staff asks people to smoke only in the hut, everyone is expected to enforce all the policies on campus. Enforcement is the most difficult thing since it's just "asking" them to move. Have to deal with abusive language etc. but so far nothing too confrontational.</p>

California State University-Dominguez Hills	<p>"Specifically, smoking is prohibited in all campus buildings, including classrooms, lecture halls, laboratories, offices, work areas, study areas, reception areas, meeting rooms, lobbies, hallways, stairwells, elevators, eating areas, lounges, and restrooms, and within twenty-five (25) feet of an exit, entrance, or operable window of any campus building. Smoking is also prohibited in all partially enclosed areas such as covered walkways, breezeways, walkways between sections of buildings, bus-stop shelters, exterior walkways and landings, all State vehicles, including electric and golf carts... Smoking is permitted in outside ground areas twenty-five (25) feet beyond any exit, entrance or operable window of a campus building." Policy can be found at: http://www.csudh.edu/srr/smoking.htm</p>	<p>No Tobacco Sales on campus.</p>	<p>Enforced by their campus police (fully academy trained police officers), inform a violator of the policy and request them to move. If the interaction turns hostile, the police can issue citations as well as arrest the individual. Most problems have been with campus staff/faculty, in that case the officers can inform the employee's department director for further disciplinary action.</p>
---	--	------------------------------------	--

Institution	Smoking Policy	Tobacco Sales on Campus	Additional Notes
San Francisco State University	Smoking is prohibited in all buildings and on August 1, 2003, as president I issued University Executive Order #03-31, extending the prohibition on outdoor smoking from 20 feet to within 30 feet of a campus building or ground level air intake structure. Policy can be found at: http://www.sfsu.edu/~news/announce/smokingpolicy.htm	SFSU prohibits sales of any tobacco products	States they are a Smoke Free Campus, however they do have designated smoking areas.

Appendix 3

Portland State University Smoking/Tobacco Policy Survey

This is a survey for faculty, staff, and students of Portland State University to help determine the direction the University should take in revising the current smoking policy that will best serve the campus community as a whole. Your participation will be very helpful to the University in determining priorities for a smoking policy. We would therefore, greatly appreciate your participation.

The survey is both voluntary and anonymous. Your submission of this survey will be considered an indication of your willingness to participate. The survey has been reviewed and approved by a Portland State University Human Subjects Committee. If you have questions or concerns regarding the survey you can reach the researcher, Gwyn Ashcom, MPH at (503) 725-5123 or the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects at (503) 725-4288.

I hope you will take this opportunity to help make PSU a great University!

Section A.

First, we would like to collect some general information about you.

1. Please identify your primary status at PSU? (Please check one).

Faculty Staff Student

2. Are you an international student? (Please check one).

Yes No Not applicable to me

3. What is your gender? (Please check one).

Female Male Prefer not to answer

4. What is your chronological age range? (Please check one).

17 Years or less
 18-24 Years
 25-34 Years
 35-44 Years
 45-54 Years
 55-64 Years
 65 Years or more

5. In which of the following categories would you place yourself?
(Please check one).

Non Smoker
 Smoker
 Former Smoker

6. Do you currently live in PSU campus housing? (Please check one).

Yes No

7. Do you have any allergy/sensitivity symptoms (sneezing, watery eyes, etc.) that may be triggered by exposure secondhand smoke? (Please check one).

Yes No

8. Do you suffer from one or more underlying health conditions (heart disease, etc) that may be aggravated by exposure to secondhand smoke? (Please check one).

Yes No

9. When I walk through the PSU campus, I am exposed to secondhand smoke:

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

10. Is secondhand smoke on campus a concern/annoyance for you?

Yes, a concern/annoyance Not a concern/annoyance No opinion

11. Please add any comments:

Section B.

Second, we would like to ask you some questions about the current PSU Smoking Policy.

The current PSU Smoking Policy states:

“Portland State University prohibits smoking of any kind in any university building. Additionally, smoking is prohibited within 20 feet of any doorway or marked air intake.

The goal of the policy is to provide a smoke free environment for University staff and students. When there are concerns about the effectiveness or appropriateness of this policy, they may be brought to the attention of the University Safety Committee and Safety Director for review and interpretation.”

Last Revised 6/24/04

12. The following questions refer to the current smoking policy and its contents as stated above. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. (Please check one answer for each statement).

	Agree	Disagree
a. This is the first time I have read the PSU Smoking Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Before reading the above policy, I was aware that there is a University Safety Committee.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. The following questions, also, refer to the current smoking policy as stated above. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement that best represents your opinion. (Please check one answer for each statement).

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. The campus is clearly marked to identify smoking areas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Current signage is adequate to identify smoking areas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Current signage is adequate to identify non smoking areas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- d. Smoking signage is respected on campus. () () () () ()
- e. Air intakes, i.e., vents, windows, etc. () () () () ()
affected by smoking are clearly marked.

14. Please add any comments:

Section C.

Third, we would like to ask you your opinion on the future content of the smoking policy and its implementation, and university policy regarding the sales of tobacco on the PSU campus.

15. Please indicate the level of agreement or disagreement that best represents your opinion. (Please check one answer for each statement).

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. There should be no changes to the current smoking policy, i.e., 20 feet from building entrances and air intakes.	()	()	()	()	()
b. Designated smoking areas should be more than 20 feet from building entrances.	()	()	()	()	()
c. There should be designated shelters for smokers away from buildings.	()	()	()	()	()
d. The PSU Residence Halls should allow limited smoking.	()	()	()	()	()
e. The PSU Residence Halls should be smoke-free	()	()	()	()	()
f. PSU should be a smoke-free campus.	()	()	()	()	()

Please complete the following statements with the answer that best represents your opinion (Please check one answer for each statement).

16. On the outdoor walkways between buildings on all floors (e.g., Neuberger-Smith and Smith-Cramer)...

- () Smoking is acceptable 20 feet away from entrances
- () Smoking should be limited to designated areas
- () Smoking should not be allowed

17. On PSU building balconies, landings, and decks such as Smith Center, School of Business, Peter Stott Center, the Science Buildings, and others...

- () Smoking is acceptable 20 feet away from entrances
- () Smoking should be limited to designated areas
- () Smoking should not be allowed

18. The sale of tobacco products in campus stores and on campus property...

- Should be allowed
- Should be prohibited

19. Please indicate the level of agreement or disagreement that best represents your opinion. (Please check one answer in each statement).

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. The PSU Smoking Policy should be based on the honor system, with an emphasis on self-policing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The PSU Smoking Policy should place increased emphasis on enforcement and disciplinary action for non-compliance with the policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. PSU should provide easily accessed resources for smoking prevention and cessation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The PSU Smoking Policy should be linked to a larger institutional program of wellness.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The University should place increased emphasis on communicating the smoking policy to the campus community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

20. Please add any final comments:

Thank you for participating in this survey. As the PSU Smoking Policy Sub-Committee moves forward, we will make a draft of the revised policy available for comments from the campus community.

Appendix 4

Additional comments and suggestions summarized from the open-ended responses

Responses concerned with level of sidestream smoke

- I find the amount of smokers on campus disgusting. You can't walk two feet w/out breathing their secondhand smoke!
- It is very annoying to walk out of a building and into/through a cloud of smoke from the group of smokers assembled.
- It should be a crime to expose people to their second-hand smoke. Smoking kills people period! Get smoke off this campus for good.
- I have asthma and I have to walk through smoke to get the building I work in. It is really a problem! ;(
- I compare public smokers to hummer drivers. Neither have any concern for air quality, the environment, and the health of the people around them.
- The smoke is very hard to avoid... and it's not merely an annoyance, it's a serious health concern!
- It's horrible to go outside to get a breath of fresh air only to be suffocated by an unconcerned smoker at every entrance, bus stop, and walkway.
- It is well known and documented, that secondhand smoke can lead to major health conditions. It is not only an annoyance, but deadly to my health!!
- I am tired of walking through clouds of smoke! The damn smokers have no regard for any posted signs and smoke right next to the door and fresh air vents for the buildings and on the sky bridges.
- I feel like my cancer risk increases every time I come to school. Its awful. Completely awful.
- I have asthma (not a result of being a former smoker), congestive allergies during winter, and upper respiratory allergies during spring. In order to remain civil in my response I'll just say smoking bothers me a lot.
- I don't want to take in second hand smoke. It will effect me just like the smoke effects the smoker. I'm not going to get ill from something related to second hand smoke intake because someone else decided to be unhealthy.

Responses not concerned with level of sidestream smoke

- I think the chemicals in the psu air-conditioning system are a bit worse...
- I just feel like smokers are now a discriminated class and regardless of smoking policy outdoors I will continue to do so and I will pay any fines levied as a second class citizen
- Since it's kept outside, I'm never bothered by it.
- I appreciate the concerns about smoking in and around campus, however, I also think that regulating a "vice" or "habit" of this sort in a university environment is uncalled for. There are plenty of ways to avoid second hand smoke around campus. This takes the university to levels of moral legislation which I am not an advocate of.
- As smoking is permitted only outdoors, the secondhand smoke issue seems not a concern at this time.

- I find the recent tide of anti secondhand-smoke somewhat laughable. We live in a city, breathing in car pollution all day long and no one is complaining about the effects of air pollution on public health. Of course, smoking indoors is another matter altogether...

Policy Recommendations

- In favor of a campus-wide ban
 - Please prohibit smoking on the PSU campus. Please enforce the policy.
 - This should be a no-brainer. No smoking on this campus.
 - To allow smoking on any institution of higher education is an oxymoron. The only way to stop the spread of this deadly haze is to stop it. If a child pees at the other end of the pool you are still tasting his pee. If a smoker smokes 20 feet away you are still smoking his tobacco.
 - Smoking should be OUTLAWED on Campus
- Against a campus-wide ban
 - I don't think we should be 100% smoke free, people are adults and we should treat them as such, they can make choices. However, the policy should be to protect those that don't want smoke around them, but something that is enforceable and reasonable... banning smoking in the residence halls is hampering those individuals that want to smoke.. let's not go to either extreme.. let's make it comfortable for the common good.
 - Smokers have enough limitations and restrictions. Passing by a smoker and inhaling second-hand smoke for a few seconds is a nuisance at its worst. We don't need any new policies to regulate tobacco smoking on campus.
 - While I do believe in the free rights of individuals to make their own choices, smoking is a health hazard to those around users. I would prefer covered areas provided for smokers which discourage, but do not prevent smokers from smoking and decrease the amount of opportunities for me, as a non-smoker to encounter secondhand smoke.
 - I feel that a smoking ban would be futile with the campus's integration into downtown. How would one know where one could/n't smoke, and how would it be implemented to non-PSU pedestrians?
- Regarding tobacco product sales
 - Buying tobacco products is a freedom of choice issue. We are not going to limit Plaid Pantry or 7/11 from selling them and so we should not limit the student store either.
 - Smokers should be punished for their apathetic views toward their non-smoking peers. The policy needs to be changed and PSU should in no way support the terrible tobacco industry by selling their cancer sticks.
 - I marked that the school should not sell tobacco products, however, like every policy, this should be weighed with the benefits. For instance, if tuition would go up if tobacco was not available on campus, sales should continue. If however, the tobacco sales on campus do not go to any real positive interests except corporate profit, we should not sell it on campus.

- Regarding incorporation of a wellness plan
 - We need a wellness plan. We should subsidize smoking cessation products and counseling for faculty/staff and students. Smoking on causeways, balconies and bridges drives non-smokers away.
 - I like the idea of linking the PSU smoking policy to a larger campaign of promoting health and wellness.
 - I like the idea of PSU taking a stronger anti-smoking position by actively helping people quit smoking and integrating it into a general health and wellness policy or program
- Regarding policy enforcement
 - If you can charge \$2 per hour to park on campus and parking tickets can be so outlandish, and parking passes so expensive, I see no reason why not the university can't make a little extra income ticketing smokers for violations of the smoking policy
 - I think citations should be given for smokers who smoke in areas they shouldn't. There's nothing worse than walking out of a building - the library - for instance and walking right into a smoke cloud.
 - Sounds like a job for campus security & Faculty to ask smokers to move out of non smoking areas, and provide some kind of penalty to smokers who are being rude and thoughtless.
 - While I would prefer the honor system ... I do not think that will work until there is a culture shift ... which I think requires increased enforcement initially.
- Regarding housing
 - I've lived in dorms and I firmly believe that shared housing, like dorms, should be entirely smoke-free.
 - It really sucks that nobody is taking any action on those smokers smoking in non-smoking areas. I hate it that someone is smoking all the time in the campus housing non-smoking floor. I've been complaining about this issue dozens of times, and no results.
 - In the dorms they don't enforce the no smoking policy- both the non smoking floors are often filled with smoke and often no ventilation and the RA is passive about it.
 - Smoking in dorms should be allowed if it does not migrate into public areas or cause damage. Alternatively, smoking residence buildings should be an option if one could be filled with smokers and nonsmoking residence buildings should also be available.
 - Although smoking is prohibited in Broadway Housing, people still smoke in their rooms and we are all exposed to the smoke -- it's pretty awful to pay rent in a no smoking building but still be exposed to the horrible smell and terrible health effects of second-hand smoke.

Responses pertaining to the current policy/signage

- I am deeply concerned about the quantity of second-hand smoke at PSU and the complete lack of enforcement of smoking policy. I see people smoking directly in front of entrances each and every day that I am at PSU.
- I am discouraged by the lack of enforcement of the 20 foot rule by the doors of the buildings.
- This is a great thing to ask about. However, the current 20-feet-away policy is not enforced. If PSU decides to make a change in smoking policy (and I hope they do!) it would be beneficial if part of the plan involved how to enforce no-smoking rules.
- I am concerned that fellow students do not respect the restricted smoking areas.
- Although areas for smoking are clearly identified, one still can't escape the smoke when walking past.
- I see the signs that say no smoking here with people standing in front smoking so either the signs are not adequate or that fact that no one enforces the no smoking is the problem
- I have never noticed any signs. I figured there was a policy about smoking in doorways, but it is definitely not enforced!
- Even if the signage were adequate, it seems to be generally ignored. I only recently noticed that the benches near Smith between Smith and Cramer have No Smoking signs on them, since they are used by smokers
- Sometimes it is hard to tell where and where not to smoke.
- While I have seen signs that say to not smoke by a doorway, I see it continually ignored.

Responses addressing problem areas

- Walking between buildings is the worst (ex: Smith and Neuberger or Cramer and Smith) since you either have to walk out of your way or face the gauntlet of smokers.
- The smoking between Smith and Cramer is atrocious! Even when the smokers aren't there, the stench lingers.
- The largest trouble spots are the entrances to the library, Smith and Neuberger halls. No matter what, I am subjected to LARGE amounts of secondhand smoke- and people are clearly not obeying the "20 foot" rule as well. I go to the library, etc. at least twice a day- this is a lot of exposure to carcinogens, and I shouldn't have to be subjected to it!
- I work in the Library. The copper "awning" over the walkway along the curve traps the cigarette smoke, making walking through secondhand smoke an extremely common occurrence.
- People sit and smoke on the stairwell in NH which draft right up to my office. When I teach in Shattuck the smell from cigarettes is so strong that students complain during class. Every time I go from building to building I have to hold my breath.
- We need to find a way to stop all smoking BETWEEN PSU buildings (i.e. between smith and cramer and between NH and SMC). It is impossible to simply pass through these buildings without an overwhelming amount of smoke

Pertaining to cigarette-related litter

- I get really tired of dodging the butts and ashes of people too lazy to look for an ashtray.
- The butts of cigarettes is more of a concern to me than smoke because they are all over the grounds of the school
- I think the large number of cigarette butts on the ground and in the landscaping is an eyesore.

Appreciation for survey

- Thank you for addressing this situation. You'll never get everyone to agree on a policy or its enforcement, but I appreciate the efforts anyway.
- Thank you for taking on this important issue related to the health of all of us here at Portland State.

Regarding ashtray placement

- The worst problem regarding second hand smoke comes from those black ash tray containers just outside the building. They are those long black tube things outside the doors of many PSU buildings (eg FAB). The problem is that when the cigarette is put in them they fall to the bottom of the black tube and fall into a pile of sand but this doesn't put them out. Instead they sit there still lit and fume out the top of the tube for hours at a time resulting in unnecessary and excess second hand smoke. My proposed solution is to fill those black tube containers with about 4-6 inches of water so the cigarettes will extinguish easily. While those black tubes might help keep all the butts off the ground they have a very negative impact in regards to second hand smoke, especially when people are waiting outside the doors for a ride.
- The clear mark of a smoking area is an ashtray, correct? On that note, why the hell are there ashtrays right next to non-smoking benches outside of Cramer?