

Smoking Debate Forum *March 3, 2014*

Transcribed by Jennifer Fortune and Sofia Prado

Parenthesis indicates referenced time on recording

Seth Lueck- So my name is Seth Lueck. I am a graduate medical assistant at the Evergreen State College Health Care Center. I am also a full time student, um, and we have come here today to talk about the tobacco policy on the Evergreen State College campus; including, whether or whether not to become a completely tobacco-free campus. Now, what I am not here to do is tell you to quit smoking. Smoking is a personal choice and whether or whether not you smoke should be up to you. As an Evergreen student and as someone who smoked for almost 10 years I support your ability to make a free and personal choice. But I think that as someone who has smoked for so long and really started to understand more about the social implications of smoking, the more I learned the harder it became for me to reconcile my own values and my own beliefs, with the fact that I still smoked cigarettes. I think it's really important that we as a community consider the social implications of smoking. I think is it really important that we as a community ask ourselves some really tough questions. So Evergreen is a progressive institution, we pride ourselves on enacting policies that are socially just, we want to be forward thinking, but I think that sometimes when we consider our current tobacco use policies, we don't really have those same values. As a school that increases awareness of privilege, race, gender identity, sexual orientation, as a school who has those values, can we really be supplying Phillip Morris and Reynolds America with lifelong customers, when those same organizations predatorily target youth, minorities, low income people, people on the lower socio economic status? We pride ourselves on becoming environmentally friendly, but can we still call ourselves environmentally friendly when we actively promote a product like tobacco? When every year 200,000 hectares of forest are cleared for tobacco cultivation and those same tobacco plants are treated with fungicides and pesticides, things we know cause soil degradation, environmental destruction. They kill animals, they harm livestock, they pollute rivers. Every year, 27,000,000 pounds of pesticide is used to be, is used to treat tobacco. We call ourselves socially just, but can we still do so if we support the use of and the vending of a product that is sourced using child labor both domestically and abroad? In North Carolina, 13 year old children pick and harvest tobacco for up to 12 hours a day, for less than the minimum wage because tobacco farms only exist in states that allow something called peace pay, where you are paid for an activity done for a tobacco plot, for a tobacco flower pit, and this essentially allows them to pay their workers, often times children, immigrants, much less that the minimum wage legally. And it's even worse abroad. 1.4 million children, ages 5 to 14, pick green tobacco every year. Those same children are exposed up to 50, exposed to, up to 50 cigarettes worth of nicotine every day. Can we still pride ourselves on our cultural sensitivity when we support the use of and increase the vending of a product that relies on cultural appropriation, because if you don't know, American Spirit is not owned by any first peoples or first nations organizations. American Spirit is owned by Reynolds America. In fact, right this instant, right know in Albuquerque, New Mexico, lawyers have filed suit against Reynolds America for illegal and unfair marketing practices with support by the Indian county news and local tribal leadership. American

Spirits, no matter how much people want you to believe it, are not a Native American cigarette. Organic tobacco isn't shown to be any less harmful than other tobaccos with additives, and in fact, because of the way the USDA regulates organic tobacco farms, those same organic, additive-free tobaccos have trace elements that are commonly classified as additives and found in other cigarettes across the board. Can we maintain our stance as pro labor, can we produce students who go on to contribute and be heads of major labor organizations when the number of tobacco farms and the percentage of people who are part of unions and the percentage of populations involved in unions is directly inversely related? So, at the end of the day, people may say being able to smoke is about freedom of choice. But if we know all of the impacts of tobacco, can we continue to sell a product like this? Can we continue to allow the use of a product like tobacco on our campus? The answer, of course, is yes. We absolutely can. We can continue to support tobacco. An industry that stands in the very opposition of the things we value here at Evergreen. Multinational corporations that target minorities, youth, children, undermine the labor movement, yes we can support that, but we do so at the risk of undermining our own ideals. We do so at the risk of becoming hypocrites, a community of people who give only lip service to our values, who pick and choose what practices to adopt, based not on right, based not on what is right or what is just, but based instead on what is convenient. Thank you for your time.

(7:01) **Basil Wendel**- Sure. Testing 1, 2, 3, alright. Thank you for having me here. My name is Basil Wendel. I am currently a senior here at the college. Um, having been a part of the discussion that is going on here on campus about tobacco policy has been fascinating because you can really see the intersection between our ideas of identity and social justice. I want to talk about a little bit about what it means to be an individual who is not only an individual, but who is one as a part of a larger whole, in this case, our community. It's not uncommon to hear that banning smoking on campus infringes upon our identity to our basic human rights, be able to do what we want to our own bodies. But I believe it is actually our identity at risk, if we let our campus harbor, nurture, future and ongoing smokers. Because ultimately, tobacco use in our country is shadowed by pollution, disease, child labor, abuse and predation. And when we are aware of these things and we chose to ignore them, that choice to become a bystander becomes part of our identity. This issue can be talked about from many angles, but one of the most compelling ways to address it is by talking about how it implicates children. The United States, currently through Phillips Morris National and British American Tobacco, purchases the majority of tobacco, tobacco used in making cigarettes, from Malawi. 40% of its labor force is coming from children between the ages of 7 and 15. That's roughly 80,000 children who are often denied education, especially during harvest season, while picking, drying, and pulling tobacco, while exposed to all hazards of the activity. But there is also another way of looking at it. What would it be like to live in a world where we destined 7 year olds in our own community to work full-time until lack of forms and expose them to the hazards and deny their education? I don't think such a thing would happen in our community, but in Malawi, where 37% of the children in that country were involved in some kind of labor in 2004. They are exploited to conditions that we wouldn't tolerate in our own community. As a result, Malawi is a community that is shaken by poverty. A community that is, uh, has a compromised education. It's a community that the lack of law enforcement has allowed the opportunity for foreign industries to turn their community into an apparatus that uses child labor to produce tobacco, a product that is, that causes habitual and addicted behavior that is destructive to your lungs. The tobacco industry is not only

involved in child labor predation where it has created the systematic advertising campaign rated 2 to 2.5 times more likely to smoke if you are gay, uh, transgender, or homosexual male and not a heterosexual male, 1.5 to 2 times more likely to smoke if you are lesbian, transgender, or bisexual woman and not heterosexual. Identity, not desire, shapes likelihood. So, this notion that tobacco is being sold under the freedom of choice needs to be contextualized, because often this freedom exists within the confines of heavy predatory marketing. And the people in this room who are likely attending college or may have graduated or have had some kind of formal/informal education might now have the ability to duck and dive around these kind of predation mechanisms, but not everybody has that opportunity to develop those skills, especially the freshman classes coming into our community. R.G. Reynolds, who founded the R.G. Reynolds Tobacco Company, the second largest tobacco company in the United States, its brand names including Winston, Kool, Camel, he said, "We don't smoke that shit. We reserve that right for the young, the poor, the black, and the stupid." So, this discussion allows us to talk about what it means to have the space where, um, we don't let the members of our own community vulnerable to the attacks by people like R.G. Reynolds. Recently, I've also been trying to say something about the issue of smoking on campus. Not as an issue of an infringement of our rights to do what we want to our own bodies, but as an issue of social policies that have huge biological consequences to our health as a community. Because we do have an identity as individuals, but we also have an identity as a community and we let industries take advantage of our identity as a community as we let industries take advantage of our identity as individuals, the positive aspects of our community are nonetheless implicated. In the conscious of this discussion, um, our health as a community is being implicated. And it's often easier to describe this when comparing it to human disease, hyper tension, um, or high blood pressure is often the reflection of the health of the community of cells. Which is a few cells contributing to hyper tension, doctors, nurses, even the patient might not notice. But when 25% of cells are contributing to hyper tension, there's risk of heart disease, aneurisms, risk of stroke. If the same individual has 75% of those cells contributing to hyper tension, it's most likely a problem that needs treating because of serious risk of heart attack. The patient might experience things like stress, or headaches. And treatment costs money. It's things that require prescriptions, doctor visits, consultations. And tobacco use in our country implicates our community in very similar ways. We have just a few smokers in a community, the effects on the community are minimal, almost negligible. The safety of 25% of members of the community that are smoking, you have impacts that are far reaching beyond the individual self. You have things like an increased demand for treating diseases like lung cancer. You have things like a demand for infrastructure for things like hospital beds, an increased demand for members of the community to become health care workers like doctors and nurses, when those people could be contributing to other aspects of society that are hopeful. I think that most people already understand that when a large enough number of people in a community are involved in an activity regularly enough, the community is impacted in the less in one way or another. But when we talk about tobacco, somehow the conversation becomes distorted around the infringement of our human rights, when really human rights violations that are occurring are those of the children of Malawi. Members of our own community who are being targeted, and everyone in this room, is in one way or another implicated as a member of this community. And having been at this college for nearly four years now, it's become obvious how much artistic talent there is, whether individual arts or in music and how effective our integrative learning methods are for students across all disciplines. But I don't believe that these are

things which flourish in a community where you are more likely to acquire a disease; where you don't pay attention to your contributions to child labor; and where you let members of your own community be targeted by people like R.G. Reynolds; and where we don't take a stance against these kinds of issues. So, for those of you who share these sentiments, I kindly encourage you to use your wisdom and judgment to help us move forward. Thank you.

(13:31) **NO NAME GIVEN**- So, first of all, I'm a little confused because I was told this was going to be an impartial place for discussion and I've just seen a presentation, which went over three minutes per person, uh, which is very biased in favor of, in favor of a position. Uh, and so I'm a little confused about that. But, um... exactly my point. It's not an impartial environment if it starts with, "In my opinion," if it starts with a very, very biased presentation. Anyhow, um, I want to, kind of, well, a little about myself is I study human rights and that's come up a lot already, so I study human rights here at Evergreen, and, uh, the first thing that I'd like to touch on is that I consider an all-out smoking ban to be very, very ablest. There are lots of people who live with lots of mental health disorders who find a lot of comfort and pleasure in smoking that they do not otherwise find in their medication, from the side effects of their medications, things like that. And to limit people who are trying their very best to attend a college to, you know, become the best people they can be, and if that crutch of smoking, which yes it is a crutch, sure, but if that helps them, then I think that's a big violation of their autonomy to say you're not allowed to smoke at this place where you attend college, where you work, etc. Um, my second biggest concern is, you know, I've attended Evergreen for, I've been here since 2010, and I've seen, overwhelmingly, a huge increase in people actually, to almost I never see anybody personally, uh, smoking outside of a designated smoking area where it would bother other people especially. Um, at first, of course, I will admit I would, I didn't see as much of it, but as the years have gone on I've seen more and more people, like I said, using the smoking areas. And my concern is, if we didn't have the smoking areas, that as much as people may wish that a ban will discourage people, and it might, but it won't stop it. People will smoke anywhere then, they'll litter, the secondhand smoke will be more of an issue because people who don't want to be exposed and I care about autonomy for all people, people who do not want to be exposed to secondhand smoke they will have to, they won't be able to know where it's happening, right? With the smoking areas, they can avoid them if they want to; they know where it's going to happen. But if, people were smoking anywhere, they won't. And who's going to enforce that. Are there going to be patrols? Thanks. And I truly think that, you know, given people not, you know, being bothered by smoking areas and I'm not opposed to a discussion about where they exist, but people not being bothered, well, being told you cannot smoke, for whatever reason, human rights reasons, is a violation of that person's autonomy.

(16:39) **NAME NOT GIVEN**- Um, so I will preface this by saying that I don't smoke and I never have and I don't quite plan to, but that I feel personally bothered by this because I feel that we can look at history and see all the times that we have created bans like this and I don't find that they're productive and I don't think that they actually instrument the kind of change that people would like to see. And if someone that is particularly interested in the environment, I'm afraid that people will instead, go into the forest, um, they'll go into other places, and, um, I'm wondering, how will you prevent people from going and doing what they'll probably do anyways and create an area where people can create trash,

um, with the waste that it produces. Um, I just feel as though you're going to have, you're going to create a market or an area where people will want to do this anyways and I don't quite understand how banning it completely is going to eliminate the problem. I think it's going to exacerbate it and create even, um, I don't know. I, I'm concerned. I don't, I haven't heard any alternatives. And I found both of your presentations to be really compelling. Um, it definitely made me not want to smoke, but, yeah, that's it.

(18:14) **NAME NOT GIVEN**- Well, I'm one of the oldest students on campus, I'm in my 60s. I came here from the East Coast, where there are many more people, population dense, um, smoking is a problem in all of those places, but when I came here, I was hoping that I could actually be on a campus with all these trees and actually take a deep breath. And so often, when school is in session, I can't do that. And it doesn't matter where I'm walking on campus, I can't do that. So, even when people are in the designated smoking areas, that smoke doesn't stay within those areas and I think that is something we have to deeply consider. It travels. The wind blows and it travels. Um, if 1200 other campuses have a smoke-free policy, campus smoke-free, we need to be looking at what they have created for alternatives and see if any of those could work for us. Smoking is an addiction, right? And so the people who may need it for health reasons, there may be other ways to get the smoke that stays inside. I don't know. There's all these technologies, so I know that they're being explored. Um, in my own journey, I did something last year. I looked up a book called, Golden Holocaust: Origins of the Cigarette Catastrophe and the Case for Abolition, by Robert N Proctor. It's pretty intense, it's over 700 pages. A lot of information there. The folks who are addicted and don't have any other remedies to support them in whatever issues they have health wise, we need to see what we can do to support those people in having alternatives that don't impact on people like me, who don't want to be impacted by the smoke, the secondhand smoke. So, I look forward to the continued journey on this one and I look forward to us having a smoke-free campus. Thank you.

(20:43) **Jonathan Gottley**- My name's Jonathan Gottley, and I've been on this campus for three years and I've been alarmed by how this college has this incentive for people to smoke. There's an incentive for people to start smoking. Because, all this, I've noticed, there's many, all the, all the spots, that, that are, that allow smokers to smoke, are the only spots that have benches. I mean, that's, that's it. It encourages people to smoke and I've had many friends who come to this campus who haven't smoked and then they, they, after staying on this campus, they start smoking. Thank you.

(21:19) **JJ Wompock**- Hi everyone. Um, so my name is JJ Wompock and I really appreciate the comments that the speaker at this mic before me made about how many other campuses have actually gone smoke-free. And so I've studied tobacco extensively, I actually did a large-scale study of tobacco use on our campus, and we're much higher as far as tobacco use goes than other campuses. First, I'd like to dispel a myth that an earlier speaker was talking about. Um, in that like anxiety and depression is actually reduced by smoking and so it's like necessary medically. Uh, that's just not true. If you look at the data, uh, you find that once people stop smoking, even when they're smoking, even when they're getting that hit of nicotine, their levels of anxiety, are actually higher than um, than when they're just not smoking at all. And, uh, so one of our near neighbors, uh, Pacific Lutheran University, actually just became a smoke-free campus. And what they found is that there's not nearly as much tobacco litter. I

don't know if you've ever looked down at the ground around you at the smoke zones, but you'll see tons of cigarette butts. And you know, sometimes that's not always the case, RAD is actually pretty good at getting those cleaned, but one of our greatest assets as a campus is our environmental reserve; is the natural beauty that we have around us. And, you know, if tobacco, it's pretty clear to almost everyone in this room, I don't know if anyone in this room would argue this point, that tobacco is um, healthy for you, we all know that, you know, it's not great for our bodies, but it's not great for the environment either. Tobacco, cigarette products are consistently one of the most polluted items in the world. If you look at any beach survey of a, when they do like, litter clean ups and you'll find that cigarettes are consistently in the top three. Now, um, one thing we haven't really talked about at this discussion is alternatives. And so, I'd like to make it clear that I am, I'm not, I'd like to make it clear that in no way do I advocate for anyone to use E-Cigarettes, and I don't advocate that as a healthier way to go. Um, but I do believe that I see a lot of passion from both sides and I feel that this is a policy that we both need to move forward on and so I think we should explore alternatives, like E-Cigarettes, that might help to mitigate some of the social justice and environmental health concerns. Now, obviously these solutions are imperfect, but I think the research we're seen is showing that E-Cigarettes aren't nearly as bad for a person's body so it helps to like really reduce some of the health risks people are facing and people tend to use, like E-Cigarette devices continuously whereas a single cigarette you throw away. And so we're seeing much more environmental damage from cigarette butts than we would from an E-Cigarette cartridge. And so I think that like, although I in no way endorse the use of cigarettes, I think that we need to find a compromise that works for both parties if we're to hope to make any progress forward on this issue.

(24:12) **Ian Senestraro**- Hi there, my name is Ian Senestraro. I like what that last speaker was just talking about, um, in terms of alternatives. And I'm curious, uh, looking at E-Cigarettes. I mean, what is the policy now? Can people smoke an E-Cigarette wherever they want on campus? 'Cause it's not tobacco. And what would the policy be afterward? I think that's a good question. Because I could see, 'cause one of my main concerns about banning, uh, cigarette use outright is uh, I don't know if you guys are aware, but it's also against the rules to smoke marijuana on campus and uh, I think we all know that happens. It's also against the rules to drink alcohol in the woods, and we all know that happens. There's bottles and cans out there and there's cigarette butts too. So, I think we know that, like, just because we ban something doesn't mean it goes away. And sometimes it makes the problems worse because then we're afraid to talk about it. Um, I'd, so I'd like to, s'been thinking about these alternatives with the E-Cigarettes, and what are we going to do about that. Um, something that the, the, both of the introductory speakers brought up, um, that was compelling was that, um, cause you know, I think everyone's very familiar with the health effects and any person my age, college age, like is aware that smoking cigarettes is bad for your health. So, usually, they're still smoking, so they don't care or they don't care enough. Um, but I mean a lot of the social justice things that both those speakers brought up, I've never really considered it before. I don't smoke myself, but I had never, I never considered, like the depth that like, the labor that's involved and just the abuse and stuff that's involved. And, gee whiz, where would be a great place to educate smokers on that kind of stuff? What if we could put, at the smoking areas, what if we could put some information about that kind of stuff? And it's like, the centralized place where smokers would see it? That's your audience. Those are the people to talk to.

Um, I think, I think we should like, discourage smoking, with education. Um, I think we should be realistic. I think, I mean, if you ban it, someone show me numbers, I don't know them, at these other colleges where it's been banned, has tobacco use gone down? And, like, if not, then they're still smoking, right? And they're probably not waiting all day. Some campuses are smaller. Maybe it's easier to walk off the campus, you just walk across the street, but here, you, unless you have a car, you aren't going to be able to go off campus. So, I think we need to think about what we're really doing here. Um, let's be realistic. But, you know. Thank you.

(26:59) **Nicholas Bense**- My name is Nicholas Bense and I'm a huge advocate for health on campus. However, I do believe that prohibition has a very terrible track record and not only that, but I believe, you know, that liberty is something that, it's a sign of a healthy society. A society that enforces restrictions and fascist protocols upon its populous, that's not a healthy society. That's not how people should, you know, arrive at their proper health choices. It should be their own decision to make. Um, in terms of some of the points that were brought up, uh, such as the child labor in Malawi, I've actually just recently returned from a trip to Tanzania, one of Malawi's neighbor states, and the cold-heart truth of the matter is that, you know, those children are working because without that work, that source of labor, they will starve. And I know that sounds politically incorrect, but at this point I think, until we are able as western societies, to help, invest, and build you know, stronger economies in those countries that are being exploited for you know, cheap, cheap, uh, sources of crops, etc., you know, the current situation is that they, they are facing starvation, and that is why they are working. Um, not only that, but, you know, I just, I feel as though it's a situation where like, banning campus smoking, to me it's like, almost a tactic that you know, the right-wing would impose. You know, such as, um, okay, uh, I don't know, go into a country and um, you know, nation build by, you know, forcing them to adopt our cultures and our lifestyles. Yes, you know, not smoking might be healthier for you, but you know, it's, it's also a choice. It's, it's a choice that, you know, it's a choice, you can choose brands too, you can choose brands that are, you know, less harmful to the environment. It's also interesting to note that tobacco is not really that much different from any other crop. You know, you could say lettuce is very harmful to the environment, depending on how the lettuce is produced. If it's organic lettuce you can also have sources of organic tobacco. And these are all brand choices, choices that consumers could make. And, I, I, I don't know. I feel as though it's um, it's definitely an issue where people who are being affected by the smoke, that needs to be taken into consideration too, because that is their freedom to not be, to not be harmed and perturbed by the presence of smoking on campus. So, I propose, you know, that we just ensure that the smoking areas are in the appropriate places, away from, you know, places that would, you know, prove to be annoying to those who don't smoke.

(30.03) **Tyler Beiber**- Alright, well, my name is Tyler Beiber. I'm a first year student here and I'm also the president of our RHA, the greener organization, uh, but today I'm just talking as Tyler, student of Evergreen. Um, I want to start with a story because if you know me, I like telling stories. Uh, my Aunt Betty, uh, who is now in her late 60s early 70s, grew up in a time when in high school she was told that a certain brand of cigarette was quote unquote, "just what the doctor ordered," because it lubricated the lungs and it made you feel good. Uh, she has recently quit smoking after 40 years and multiple attempts. It's not that she didn't try quitting, she tried multiple times, it's not that she didn't want to

quit, she did, that's why she tried. It was that, a recent spate of hospital stays forced her because her internal organs had been irreparably damaged to the point where she could not go on living the life that she lived alongside her sister who is about 15 years her senior, living with her and having to basically, withstand the smoke and just the smell being so unbearable in their small house. I bring up this point because it used to be that smoking became a social norm, it became something that you did in order to fit in as part of a group and eventually became an addiction. I wish that I could say that that's changed, but it hasn't. See, the problem we have now is that as a freshman, I know the most social place to be is not in the common rooms, it's not in the Greenery, it's not in any place like that where you can have a safe conversation and not worry about harming yourself. It is in the smoker's pits as a freshman. I know that if I want to advocate anything, if I want to tell anybody about anything, word spreads fast in the smoker's pits. The fact that we would continue a policy that would support that kind of state of being for this college is troubling to me. The real war that we fight outside is not necessarily one directly about public health, it's the fact that cigarette companies push three times the amount of funding a day in cigarette ads, mostly to youth, mostly to poor college students, mostly to disadvantaged teenagers, than we get a year from the state. Three times more in one day than we get in one year for our entire institution from the state that funds us. Now I do agree with previous speakers that an outright ban would be irresponsible. Something like a quick fix like that is not a fix at all. But if we did want, an actual, effective fix, I think it would take the form of a phase-out, which would include a lot of attention given to resources given to students who are currently addicted because as long as we're able to say that smoking is something to be demonized, we must not say that smokers should also be demonized. One thing I can think that we can do right now is coordinate student groups to work with medical centers and facilities in order to make sure that resources are given to students who need them and make sure that knowledge is widespread. Because the fight is something we cannot win financially but it's something we can win with a better and more well directed state of mind. Thank you.

(33:06) **NO NAME GIVEN**- I don't smoke very often, but as someone who has a lot of problems with depression and disassociation, it is something that is important to me once in a while. And so that's kind of a response to the speaker who said that maybe statistically that smoking doesn't help with depression, but I know that for me it does help me get my work done and it does help me get through school. Um, I think there's also been a lot of talk over large issues like problems with our agriculture system or large systemic issues, but maybe if those were important things then, those would be places where everybody's time would be better spent than talking about a ban on campus that probably wouldn't change any of those things.

(33:52) **Gail Wooten**- Everybody, my name's Gail. I am a staff member on campus and I don't want to see smoking on campus. I have two reasons. One is personal and that is that I ride my bike to work most days and I work in Lab I so I ride through the, um, bus loop area, and as you know there are two smoking areas right there. So, my first whiff of campus isn't the trees or the rain, it is a big cloud of smoke, um, depending on the day. And often times it is, uh, secondhand smoke that I'm getting to breathe in and as you know when you ride a bike for 30 minutes you are breathing at a higher rate. And I have just always found that very unwelcoming here. I've been here for four years and it's always a disappointment to me. The second reason is work related. I actually recruit graduate students in the

environmental studies graduate degree here and I just think it's weird, so I look at our campus and a lot of, and Olympia and just everything in general from a, "how does a student perceive us" point of view. About half of our students actually come from out of state, have never seen this campus, they're wowed by the trees and, and our liberal thinking, but I can't help but wonder if the people that don't smoke, which I'm assuming is the majority, how odd is it that again when they're first, um, walking onto campus, and like I said, those two smoking tents right there at the front of campus, are welcoming them. It's not, it's not the sign saying, "EVERGREEN," it's not Red Square, it's a waft of smoke coming up as their first entry way to campus. I just think that's a little odd, especially when our campus is struggling with enrollment which I'm very worried about, as it's a big part of my job. And then, just a third comment, and I don't know if this is a for real thing, maybe some people here might know, um, I hear that we're a scent-free campus. I don't know what that means, but to me, cigarette smoke is one of the, uh, I sneeze a lot at smells and cigarette smoke is one the main reasons why I sneeze. So, if you come into my office, I meet with students a lot one on one, and you smell like perfume, that's just as not scent-free as smelling like cigarette smoke. And the same thing with just walking around on campus. So, it's kind of weird that we have a scent-free policy, but we're still allowed to have a smoky-smell policy. Thanks.

(36:29) **Robert Smurr**- Yup, um, oh go for it. Sure thing. Hi, um, my name is Rob Smurr, I've been faculty here for 14 years or so. I'm entirely for a smoke-free campus as quickly as possible. I've been that way ever since I came here. I'm not a fascist and I'm not even a Republican, believe it or not. Um, what I decided to do, I can rebut almost so much that I've heard today, but I have a list of things that I think are important to share. So, I'll start with that and then if I have time, I'll get to the list. Every surgeon general since C. Everett Koop, 1982-1989, has detailed the serious health consequences of first and secondhand cigarette smoke. First and secondhand cigarette smoke. All the subsequent, all these facts, coming hence forward, are from the CDC, the Center for Disease Control. More than 10 times as many US citizens have died prematurely from cigarette smoking, than have died in all the wars fought in the United States during its history. Smoking too, smoking harms nearly every organ of the body. This is just firsthand smoking I'm talking about, right now. Third, smoking is the leading preventable cause of death in the United States. Fourth, about one in five deaths in the United States are caused by smoking. It averages about 480,000 deaths per year. Almost half a million deaths per year. Smoking causes more deaths each year than all of these combined. Listen to this list, all of these combined. HIV, illegal drug use, alcohol use, motor vehicle injuries, crashes, and firearm incidents. More than all of those combined. Secondhand smoke. And this is what really matters primarily to me since I'm not a smoker, but I smell secondhand cigarette smoke all the time. There is no free, no risk free level of contact with secondhand smoke. Even if exposure, uh, even brief exposure, can be harmful to health. In adults who have never smoked, secondhand smoke can cause heart disease and/or lung cancer. Heart disease, for non-smokers. Non-smokers who are exposed to secondhand smoke at home or at work, increase their disease risk by 25-30%. Secondhand, uh, smoke exposure causes an estimated 46,000 heart disease deaths annually among adult non-smokers. That's the real issue here. In the United States alone, lung cancer, the same thing 20, 20-30%. Secondhand smoke exposure causes an estimated 3,400 lung deaths. 100% in October 1, 2007, 96 campuses were smoke free. January 2nd, this year, 1,182. SPC,

only 5 miles away from us, entirely smoke-free. I visited just happenstance, um, University of Montana, big university, entirely smoke-free overnight, and it works.

(39:57) **Bae**- Hi there, my name's Bae, I'm another older student, at the age of 40. I'm also from the East Coast originally where smoking is much more prevalent. Uh, I'm going to speak mostly about my personal experiences with smoking on campus. Uh, I do not smoke. I am in fact mildly allergic, which means I do not go into anaphylactic shock, thankfully. However, the physical results of walking through the secondhand smoke do include loss of focus of my thinking, burning eyes, difficulty breathing. Uh, my most frequent exposure is when I'm leaving the CRC from swimming laps, which means that I do have that expanded breathing, which means that I experienced more severe results at such time. Now I have never once, not one day that I've come to campus, not experienced secondhand smoke to some degree. This is unfortunate. I do drive to campus from, uh, south of Olympia. I live in Chehalis where smoking is much more common. Yet, somehow I manage to avoid cigarette smoking completely when I'm not on campus. Just by the fact I live in a rural area a lot of people smoke. Uh, I am curious to know what kind of repercussions there would be if there were a complete ban. How would this ban be enforced? Uh, I have experienced cigarette smoke outside of the designated smoking areas more than once and I don't know how it would be banned. What, what, uh, consequences there would be. It seems to me in the past when I have encountered fellow students who are smoking outside the designated areas, there have not been very many consequences, including people smoking pot right in front of the classrooms unfortunately. Uh, I do not begrudge people making their personal choices, but unfortunately, I do feel that there has to be some way of accounting for those of us who cannot be around it without ill effect. And unfortunately, nothing short of a complete ban which is enforced is going to bring that about. That's all I've got to say.

(42:08) **Carolyn Prouty**- My name is Carolyn Prouty. I'm a faculty member here and teach Public Health and Health Sciences. I appreciate many, many of the comments and I'm very much in support of a ban. Um, a couple of pieces, um, so at the different campuses, um, that have done this before. One thing we can say is that bans work. So, um, smoking areas increase, this is research that I'm quoting, increases the likelihood that people will start smoking. Bans decrease the number of people who start smoking and encourage people to quit smoking. So, those individual stories, um, are not, as we say in public health, anecdote plus anecdote plus anecdote does not equal evidence. So evidence across the board, it says that, that, that smoking bans work. Um, and if you don't start smoking before you're 26, the likelihood that you're going to start is very, very small. If you start before you're 26, it's much, much more likely that you're going to continue to smoke the younger the more likely you're going to continue. But I want to also address autonomy and choice and um, so I want, I teach ethics as well, and I think it's important that we think about choice. We understand that we limit our autonomy all the time. We choose to not go 80 miles an hour, but to try to, um, obey, smoke, uh, speed limits. There's a, we sit in class, um, and give up our autonomy to go and do whatever we want because we're looking at some greater value to ourselves and potentially society. So, we're choosing to limit our autonomy many different times. Um, in addition, our government and institutions that surround us also, um, impose on our autonomy for reasons. And so that's certainly one of the things many of the different public health advances that we've made have done that. So to lastly address choice, I want to recognize that when

we choose, um, something like smoking, our many other behaviors, whether it's smoking, or diet, or exercise, they're influenced by many things besides this just sort of, this I have in my mind that I'm going to choose it. It's influenced by our socio-economics, it's influenced by our race, it's influenced by our age, it's influenced by our social, um, interactions. And so when we talk about, so that when we would impose from the outside a ban, add something else to that, that choice. But that's not different from many other things that already shape our behaviors. And I would advocate that this institution has in its interest of individuals as well as the interest of all of us to impose that, to impose, to um, impinge on those choices it was. So I think all these questions of how do we do it in ways that support people, um, being able to live with this because, um, socio-economics do, um, the people, 'cause socio-economics have a big intersection with who's smoking. Thank you.

(45:11) **Kate**- Hello. No. Ok. Um, ok, my name is Kate. I'm a student here and um, my main, I'm interested in a smoke-free campus, not just for personal reasons, but as a larger statement um, and standing with other colleges as a smoke-free environment. Um, towards cigarette companies and the control they have over who they target and who is smoking and why they're smoking. Like Carolyn was talking about social determinants of whose smoking and I think being a smoke-free campus would be part of that statement of eventually working towards those companies and their targeted, um, campaigns. And with my like support of being a smoke-free campus, I think it would be really important to follow that with a larger commitment towards the campaigns of those large companies. Um, and seeing it as just like a small maneuver towards a larger problem. Because being a smoke-free campus is not really like the end of tobacco companies influencing our lives. Um, I also wanted to bring up, we are a fragrance-free campus but that somebody already brought up and also I was thinking about when we made the decision to have no smoke in restaurants and that wasn't that long ago. And at one point there were sections where you could sit in the smoke-free area, but was that really smoke-free? Not really. Um, yeah, I think that's everything. Um, and that I guess I see campus kind of like a restaurant in that it is an enclosed area where we all are there and we just take a moment to like not be smoking while we are there and you can smoke in other parts of your life as well. Hm, cool, I think that's everything. Thank you.

(47:28) **JJ Wompock**- Ok, um, just to make a few clarifications. Uh, so one of the differences between tobacco as a crop and food crops, besides the fact that tobacco doesn't provide any nutritional supplementation, is that tobacco actually leaches a lot of the nutrients in the soil, uh, making it much more barren, making it barren at a faster pace than the other types of crops would. Uh, another thing to consider when we're talking about child-labor and agriculture is, it's not just the fact that these kids are losing an education from, um, from working on these farms, it's also the occupational health that goes along with it. So there's a sickness known amongst, um, people in public health called "Green Tobacco Sickness" and uh, so, I think it was Seth earlier that said that a child can absorb up to 50 cigarettes worth of nicotine a day uh, when they're working on one of these farms. And the danger in that is with even lighter amounts of nicotine absorbed directly from the plant because it's absorbed from your skin, uh, is, um, Green Tobacco Sickness can permanently alter the way that children's minds and bodies work. In addition to that, it's a problem because they'll have immediate acute symptoms of throwing up blood, they'll have abdominal pain, they'll feel light-headed, and they'll feel like they're barely able to breathe.

So, it's not just an issue that they're working and they might not be missing out on other opportunities, but it's also very detrimental to their health. Um, I think uh, another thing we've talked a lot about, is uh, other campuses moving towards, uh, having a smoke-free campus. And so, we can actually see how that's working at places like PLU and SPSCC because they're right in our backyards. And what we found is that even though like, people often talk about, we need to have a way to enforce it before we can move forward, the fact of the matter is like once enforcement goes into place, not actually, there's not actually that big of a need for it. So, like we assume that people will be like really, really passionate and they might stage these massive smoke-outs, um, but once people know the policy is in play, they tend to respect it and the campus tends to be a lot cleaner. Um, the security officers I've spoken to at PLU haven't really had to issue very many fines. So, I think that, you know, on the other side of things, like how are we actually, how are we going to implement these bans, I think it's a lot easier than some of the challenges, eh, the challenges that we face may not be as massive as we're worried about.

(49:50) **Nicholas Bense**- So, I think it's important to just note that, I mean, I feel as though it's almost a minority that, that's kind of for the smoking ban on campus. I mean, there's fewer people in this room that I see at the smoking pits on a daily basis. And, I mean, I do believe in brokered democracy, you know, where the interest of a minority are met, you know, through the democratic process in a way that, you know, uh, it is composed of compromise, such as, you know, being able to smoke in areas that are out of the way, you know, not near anyone. Not like, near any entrances etc. etc. I mean, I think the amount of smoke particles in the air would be ridiculously low. I don't think there's any medical affect whatsoever. If there was like, say one, two, three, you know, like a few designated smoking areas and you know off, off, you know places that are kind of like off to the side or whatever. Um, and you know in terms of the, you know the specific brands and the specific practices that are put into place by, you know, uh, companies such as, you know, larger, uh, such as Marlboro etc., I think it would pretty cool if you know, maybe our, our campus store only sold, you know, the organic or you know, more progressively oriented brands. Um, I think that would be an awesome step. Um, I just, I also, like, I, I, I don't know, I believe that I would personally rather die of cancer than live free of the choice to smoke. And I think for someone else to decide something for me is despotic and I think that despotism has no place at Evergreen.

(51:35) **NAME NOT GIVEN**- I, um, I want to say I really do appreciate the social and international justice rhetoric that I've heard, that's fantastic and I, but I'm also a little confused. Because, I'm confused about the fact that we still have Aramark and their practices, right? I'm still confused why we haven't divested from Caterpillar, and their human rights abuses, I'm confused that we didn't have more support for the support staff services, student services support staff union, last year when they had a strike because labor was not being respected. These are things that are all really important to me. And I don't take them, like I take them into account, I do. But I, I really do worry about the people who we've talked about privilege a lot also today. And there's a correlation between those who are not as privileged in our society and smokers. And I'm not saying that that's not because tobacco companies target them. It may in large part be because of that. However, that doesn't mean they're not being targeted, right? So all these other issues, all these other really important, international social justice issues, are not being fought for on a large scale. There's not meetings about it, there's not town hall meetings about all these

important things and yet, when underprivileged people are enjoying cigarettes all of a sudden now they're being targeted. And that's what I wanted to bring up. What's that's about? Why are these corporations, Aramark, Caterpillar, why are they not being targeted for their abuses? And yet, people who just want a cigarette between class, why are they the enemy? I, I'm not the only one. I understand tobacco companies are too. But, why, who does it affect? Uh, I also wanted to touch on, uh, folks who live on campus. I haven't done that for a few years, but I did once and I have a colleague who's an RA who told me some really great things about how much they try to make this campus a home for those people. And I didn't feel that necessarily, but I respect that the RAs try and I really admire them for that. And I really admire that this place can be a home, living on campus for 4 years even for some people can be a home. And, well, it's another issue of autonomy and the right to smoke outside of your home, right, is a whole question. I think that is within someone's right as long as it doesn't infringe on other people's health. Lastly, I've heard a lot of rhetoric around indoor smoking bans, things like that and I think that it's really important to acknowledge the fact that we are outdoors, in a place with very clean air that very quickly does clean it. Uh, yeah, so thanks.

(54:35) **Robert Smurr**- So, folks, a quick follow up. Um, the problem with smoking isn't the fact that you're smoking, you're free to do what you want as long as it doesn't infringe upon others. And secondhand smoke does infringe upon others. You can't leave your seminar, go out to Red Square, and pull out a Jack Daniels and start drinking. You can't even pull out a beer. It's not that we're trying to enforce a nanny society on anyone, what we're trying to do is make it a healthy environment for everyone. Something else I think I should note is, there's a student survey and this student survey was taken in 2008 and both of the students who undertook this survey were smokers because they were opposed to my, uh, move to make this a smoke-free campus even back then. And their survey found there were 17% of campus users, student, faculty, and staff, who smoked regularly on campus. 17%. Fewer than 1 out of 5 on campus. I'm a little hesitant to use this, but Tokeville said, you know, one of the problems that he could see in America as it was forming, was something called the tyranny of the minority. And I fear that's kind of what we have here. The power of the cigarette companies and cigarette smokers is pretty astonishing. To me it's, I'm not going to try to fling names, but it's kind of like the power of the NRA. How can they have so many rights that inflict negatively on the health of non-smokers, even when they're a small minority? I, that one I can't figure out. The only thing, the reason why I want this to be a smoke-free campus, primarily; Two reasons; one, for those who choose not to smoke or breathe secondhand smoke; Uh, secondly, the litter is just atrocious. Absolutely atrocious on this campus and it's one of the biggest causes of litter in the world. That's my comments.

(56:53) **NO NAME GIVEN**- Um, you cited a survey and I was just wondering if that survey was uh, campus-wide or if it was self-selecting? ... <he responds in the background> ... Ok, because if it wasn't, I just, I have trouble believing that less than 1 out of every 5 people on this campus smokes. Um <he continues in background> .

(57:42) **Carolyn Prouty**- I was just consulting with JJ 'cause JJ actually did a recent, uh, a survey two years ago, right? Of smoking on, on, of, of student smokers, of, of people on campus and smoking rates. So I just wanted to give some of his information. And it's not about, um, uh, so this is not just on campus, but, um, those who had reported, this is students, not faculty or staff, correct? Uh, heavy use in

the past 30 days, about 24.6% and light use in the past 30 days, 14%. So, 38% you might say are regular smokers. And, just, just to say that it's, so I would use that as evidence that this campus is not like other campuses. I spend a lot of time at other campuses. We have actually considerably more smoking and I, uh, um, I would assert, and actually research backs up that it is, that the practices that we have here encourage people to smoke. And we've heard some of that. And so that, that's my concern. They are social areas and that banning as they said that bans even on, um, large campuses. So it's a really important question about um, it's not easy to get off of campus. And nicotine is one of the single most addicting drugs that there is. Um, so it's a very important question how we make this work for people who are addicted. And I, think I, that's, and I hope that we can get to that because I think all these questions about how to support people who have, um, this addiction is really important. And, know that the practices that we have influence, um, help to influence, that these lifelong behaviors. Thanks.

(59:31) **Nicholas Bense**- Um, I'm addicted to ice cream. Does that mean that like, I don't know, I should seek ice cream help for uh, dealing with that problem? I just, I feel as though it's uh, I, I, I don't know. It's like any other thing. If it's something that people enjoy, then they'll continue to do it. You know, I, I actually, you know, used to smoke. It wasn't that I couldn't quit when I decided to quit, it was that I decided that I didn't want to do it anymore. But that was really what I decided. It wasn't like, oh, I can't do this. It was just, uh, this doesn't really appeal to me, you know, I wish I had more, you know, uh, cardio-vascular ability or you know, like, more um, more lung capacity. I don't like running out, you know, all the time in the middle of the night or whatever and you're just kind of like, you know and then you kind of, you know, kind of boned without them, and you know. I, I, I just, I think, I think it's just a choice thing. You know, I think educating the people about, you know, the health risks and you know, um, its, especially the stuff about, you know, I, I didn't know some much about how adversely it affects the, you know, the soil, and, and, the issue of child labor in Malawi. I think that's a very terrible, a horrid thing and it's a very harsh situation to deal with just because when you, when you restrict the, when you lessen the amount of exports that they're going to be dealing with, you're actually also hurting their economy. Which is influencing the economy to change, but it's all, you know, for the better I would hope. But, at the, in the meanwhile, in the immediate time, it's also kind of negatively impacting those communities. Um, hopefully for the greater good. I don't know, I just, I uh, I just believe that it's an issue of choice. I mean, you know, even in terms of the adverse, uh, of the adverse health effects. There's a tribe down in uh, in Northern Mexico, called the uh, I believe it's the Tarma Majulens <Tarahumara>? I always get it wrong, there's a couple syllables I always mix up there, but they're ultra-marathon runners. They run, you know, on average about 100 miles a day, smoke like crazy, drink like crazy, you know. In fact, they have these huge parties where everyone gets really wasted and just smokes a whole bunch of cigars and stuff right before they go on these ultra-marathon runs. You know, smoking isn't necessarily a cause of poor health, it just happens to go hand in hand with habits, you know, such as, if you're smoking, you're probably not going to want to work out etc etc., which is going to make you more unhealthy, but you can do both.

(1:02:20) **Tyler Beiber**- I um, I introduced myself originally as Tyler the President of the Greener Organization, but then proceeded to tell you my thoughts on the subject as a student. My thoughts on the subject as a person who is hired to be as the constitution of the go states, a chief advocate for the

residents of The Evergreen State College, is a little bit different. Um, today, I've heard a lot of people say that because we are an outdoors campus, because it's not nearly as dense here as it is in other parts of the country. Because we have the ability to move around and we are not constricted by our building and our infra-, our uh, our architecture here, that we essentially can escape what is secondhand smoke, we can escape the effects of secondhand smoke. But as somebody who is hired to care about the health of my residents, of 970 residents, and as an extension the rest of the students, any visitors, any faculty members, anybody, who steps foot on this campus. I mean, I have to start asking the question, at what point do we say it's an acceptable number, the particles per million in the air, when it's from secondhand smoke? At what point do we say it's acceptable for x amount of students to become addicted to smoking their first year of college? At what point do we say it's okay that a certain number of students are going to the smoking pits every single day to be social and they get hooked on smoking or they develop an addiction to smoking as a result of being here? And I have to ask, finally, at what point do we say something's acceptable when we know it's directly detrimental to health, when we know we're not doing anything to stop it and we know that we're not giving any thought to how we can try and prevent it. So for me, I look at it as a systemic problem. We have these problems when it comes to communication, when it comes to efforts, because our groups are disorganized or they try their own deals and they don't work out because there's no widespread support. Because we don't take in our personal opinions of multiple parties, which I think this is very constructive, to hear what people say. This kind of a forum is very constructive in that. I've made it a priority for my organization over the next year or so to make health a major priority of its efforts outside of events planning. I think it's very important for us to understand that there are systemic problems on campus that have led to a decrease in student population, a decrease in funding, and a very bleak future if we don't do anything to stop those things from happening. Smoking's one way to do it. And for those people who say that the corporations are that are on campus that are feeding our campus lives in corruption, their wrongs will be righted through our efforts. Their wrongs will be addressed. This just happens to be the issue of the day. It's not that we're picking on anyone, it's not that we're demonizing smokers. I've said that before and I'll say that again. It's not that we're demonizing the people who are smoking. It is that we are demonizing a practice that we continue. We continue to get addicted to and we do not solve because don't want to stop on anyone's toes and we don't want to potentially, give away some of our autonomy for the better good, and the greater good of the entire campus.

(1:05:23) **Bae**- I'm going to talk a little less personally this time and note that the effects of what we have on campus; the shapes of the buildings the locations of the buildings. Air is often funneled, as I'm sure most of us have noticed, between the buildings in such a way that the uh, whatever compounds, are present are channeled actually towards places where that air then gets trapped. For example, the overhangs of certain buildings, such as the library, such as um, Sem II in particular. And the result of this is that we are faced with increased concentrations in these places. Where smoke gets trapped and there's only so many ways you're going to be able to get rid of that and demolishing half the buildings on campus is not going to happen, uh, we're coming down to what essentially is a case of what I'm hearing. Whose freedom is more important? The freedom of those of us who don't want or can't handle the physical effects of the smoke, or the people who want to smoke? I don't begrudge anyone their right to smoke. I feel though, that the right to smoke has to, at some point, have a limitation when

somebody else can't breathe or can't think properly. In my case, for example, the mental acuity, there is a drop. This happens right when I'm about to go into class. It takes time to get past that. I know from speaking with other students, I'm not the only one who has experienced this. Uh, I would say that if there's a compromise, it's going to need to involve moving the existing smoking locations somewhere that air circulation isn't going to trap these particles or channel them towards the primary areas of congestion of students. And at that point, there's going to be complaints on the other end because it's going to be that much further from the main areas of campus. So, whose freedom is important?

(1:07:40) **Robert Smurr**- So, I would like to take just a quick moment. I love the exchange of ideas. I don't like the exchange of ideas if the facts are presented as facts and they're not. I just heard from this gentleman, uh, that smoking doesn't necessarily harm one's health. That's wrong. It absolutely does, flat out. That's not just me, that's the Center of Disease Control, that's the National Institute of Health. Endless numbers of studies have shown smoking, any smoking, and breathing any secondhand cigarette smoke does harm one's health. That's flat out, so that was incorrect. If people desire some sort of um, independence, fine, but your independence afflicts others. That's the key issue here. It's making this campus, it's using evidence, it's using facts to transform this campus into something better than it is. To use information for the positive, it's not inflicting a nanny society, yet again, what it's trying to do is use facts, evidence to make people's lives better, longer, everybody's. Not just the smoker's, but those who have to breathe, and we do have to breathe as non-smokers, secondhand smoke. To show more of my conservative side, which I'm not, I was in the army for a number of years. 27 years ago, 27 years ago, I managed to get the army in this institution I worked at, to go entirely smoke-free. I went to the inspector general, I said, this isn't according to policy, this place needs to be entirely smoke-free. It was done within two weeks of my complaint to the inspector general. The army is no liberal institution. I've had so much difficulty here at Evergreen and I can't understand what the blowback is. Secondly, I had a recent uh, issue with the Safeway store over on Black Lake and whatever, Harrison. They were smoking, a whole bunch of people were smoking right next to the entry door. I went to the manager. Hey you've got to stop this. They're even too close to state law. He said ok, I'll take care of it. Next week, nothing done. I contacted him once again. He said, I'll take care of it, nothing. Then I called the corporate headquarters. It was solved immediately after I contacted the corporate headquarters. What I'm saying is, we can easily, quickly, immediately transform this campus into what it should be a free, smoke-free zone, for everyone to breathe clean, forest, seaside air.

(1:10:30) **Nicholas Bense**- The blowback is the idea of freedom. You know, I mean, that's what I think is a very prevalent idea at Evergreen. Um, I think that's one of the big problems for you there, is people want to be free to make choices. Um, in terms of what we discussed, I never really um, said that smoking wasn't healthy, although to give you like, kind of a weird little you know, just to throw an idea out there, it could actually contribute to the process of evolution. It could prove to be evolutionary adaptive to those who smoke at some point in time. We don't really know. Um, also, in terms of public intoxication, versus smoking in public, I think the reason there is because when you're really drunk and you're in public, you're acting all crazy and stuff. You know, usually when you're having a cigarette, you're just kind of smoking a cigarette. It's not going to psycho-actively affect you too much and yeah, so. I don't know. I just, I don't think it should be a big deal if somebody wants to shave a few years off

their life, enjoy a little creature comfort, as long as they're not blowing it in anybody's face. I mean, that's, I think that both, everyone's freedom, has to be, there has to be that middle ground. You can't have, you know, there's no absolute here. It's not like, oh, okay, no smoke particles in the earth's atmosphere ever, you know? It's got to be somewhere that both parties feel comfortable with the arrangement. Reasonably. Not just because the idea of smoking bothers them, but because they are not being bothered by other people who are smoking. So...

(1:12:37) **NO NAME GIVEN**- So, I came here expecting to hear instantly rhetoric about a complete ban against smoking. But I came here hoping that the conversation would be around policy about around where the smoker's areas are, talking about all of that. I was really hoping for that and I was really disappointed when it didn't, when it was framed in a different way. Because, I'm not here opposing talking about where the areas are, talking about solutions, talking about all of these things. I want people to have their health respected. I don't want anyone who doesn't want secondhand smoke around them to be exposed to it. But it's becoming this conversation very quickly and that's what I think may be shifting it away from total ban, which if that's what you believe in, please speak for that. I would never tell you not to speak for that. But just from my perspective, as a smoker, you know, I'll disclose that, but from my perspective, the conversation, it makes me very react, very knee-jerk, right? A ban, well, I'm like no no no no no. And it makes me want to completely oppose any suggestions. So I hope that we can talk about solutions. I don't like the word compromise because it implies that people have to sacrifice things, but collaborative solutions, right? Thanks.

(1:14:12) **JJ Wompack**- So yeah, I really like the idea of moving to that thread and so I guess um, I would be someone of the mindset that compromise is about sacrifices that are necessary to make. And I think that what I've seen at over the last two years at Evergreen is you know, like, I, myself, I personally advocate for a ban. I think that's the best way that we can go. And I feel that strongly because not only because of the harm that it has for students, but because of the people who produce the nicotine and the way in which it is produced. However, I recognize that not everyone feels that way. My concern, primarily, for people on campus, is harm mitigation. And so, when I talked about E-Cigarettes earlier, it wasn't because I think that this is something I think everyone should start or that I have a ringing endorsement of, you know, that booth that just came up in the mall. What I think is that we have to find a compromise to make this policy not only something that helps the health of our students, but really helps the health of our campus in general. Now, when parents come onto this campus and they're seeing people smoking at the smoking pits, they're obviously concerned about the health of their children who they're sending here. And I think that, you know, there's a lot that goes along with that. It's not just the image, but it's also the smell, it's also what that cigarette produces. And so, I think that maybe I want to open up the floor to talking about maybe banning some types of tobacco products, like cigarettes, leaving room open for people who feel that they need to get their nicotine fix on campus, like it's something that really helps them, through products that have less of an impact. Like patches, or even seeking out support for patches or through, you know, not banning some types of tobacco products.

(1:16:02) **NO NAME GIVEN**- So, I think it is important to talk about solutions. Um, but I think it's also important to recognize that people have personal responsibility and that if you institute a tobacco-free

policy and say that it's going to do something like increase littering on campus or increase tobacco or cigarette butt littering, is that you've then switched from holding someone personally accountable for their own actions into blaming a policy. A policy isn't going to make someone litter, that person is choosing to litter. I think as we go forward it's important to recognize what policies are going to be affective.

(1:16:45) **NO NAME GIVEN**- Hi, I just want to say first, thanks everyone for being here. I think it's great a few people showed up to make their voices heard. And um, one argument that I've heard that I want to talk a little bit about, is um, the personal choice argument, and I want to talk about how that is a very limited argument. And that um, personal choice I feel like is not always as strong as we like to believe it is, in that um, I feel like some people have spoken already about um the, about how the tobacco companies, um, who they target their ad campaigns towards and that they target minorities, homosexuals, lower socio-economic class people, and I forget what other, what's that? And young people. And so that's taking out a large element of personal choice there. Not that they're taking a choice away from there, but they're taking it away from the population, the population does not get an equal personal choice. 'Cause they don't have equal exposure to advertisements, to coarse slogans, and to sayings, and addictive behaviors. They're targeting people who have lower, less access to resources, have a higher thresh, not threshold, but higher, more stress in their lives, likely, because of their less, lower access to resources. And so they're going to be more likely to reach for these cheap available resources that are being advertised to them to help them deal with stress, another of them being alcohol. It's a big reason why there's more alcoholism, more substance abuse in general in a lot of these populations. And so the personal choice aspect is a big reason why, um, I think it's important to approach this issue from a public health standpoint, of like the greater good of the population and not so much like, your choice is being taken away. But maybe we're trying to account for certain population's limited personal choice on this issue.

(1:18:55) **Robert Smurr**- Not to keep being the one who blabs. I just want to address some of those policies. Ah, current policy on E-Cigarettes, my strong hunch is that we have zero policy on it right now, I think they're relatively new. We actually do? And? Same as, treated same as cigarettes then? Uh, huh. I've talked to two campuses, smoke-free campuses I've talked to, representatives who are the heads of the health departments who are charged with insuring that it remains entirely smoke-free. One is our neighbor and the other is the University of Montana. I've got a whole bunch of information. Both of them ban E-cigarettes too, entirely. It sounds like we treat them the same as cigarettes too. And I asked them why, because I really didn't know much about E-Cigarettes then. And they said it, uh, one, it also distributes nicotine, but primarily they didn't want it to be seen as yet another form of smoking because of the way you kind of smoke it or suck it in. Um, and when it comes to, so both of those again, that was a University of Montana and SPSCC, completely banned those. And how would a ban be enforced? There are so many it can be enforced and fairly easily, to the degree. I remember reading a newspaper and I asked them at SPSCC about this one, that they ban it even in the parking lot. You have to smoke it inside your car and one guy had a pickup and he was making a show of it and he put a chair in the back of his pick up and was smoking and they actually said no you have to be in your car, it was that strict there. Um, but there's a whole bunch of NGOs and other things that can really help bring about the

process and the police don't have to be involved too much at all. The final thing I really need to state is, and I'll keep being positive, when we go smoke-free, the longer we're smoke-free, the less problem we'll have in enforcing or in attracting students who are smokers. We'll be able to bill ourselves fully as a green, real green, smoke-free campus. And that'll make a huge difference I think.

(1:21:37) **Elizabeth McHugh**- I'll just be quick. I'm Elizabeth McHugh, I'm the Director of Health and Counseling Services on campus and I'm starting to feel like it would be irresponsible of me to not comment on the public health of our campus. And um, you know, I think we've heard some great points, topics of conversation today, I'm not going to go through the health impact and the um, socio-economics perspective, I will say that I think it's pretty clear, Evergreen will be smoke-free, whether we do it or not, I think that's the trend, it's pretty clear we've heard about restaurants and um, other places. I guess I, as an Evergreen graduate as well as the Director of Health Services, would like Evergreen to be a little more proactive and so, not wait for something to be put upon us, but rather be thinking about what are the steps we can do. What would policy look like? What do the needs of our campus community members look at or look like? And what is it going to take to get us there? And so I think it's a good segue, I don't think there's much more to be gained in terms of convincing smokers to stop or that sort of thing, but I really do think we ought to be talking about what do we need to move us to the next level as a campus with regard to um, what current policies look like, what steps will take us down that path in the future.

(1:23:38) **Tyler Beiber**- As a somebody who is addicted to his app, that is the politico app on my phone, becomes something of a policy walk in the past few years through debate and I actually, I have a few steps that I think we can all manage and support. And again, after this conversation is over, I would entertain anybody to come up to me and just, you know, talk to me about these steps that we could take. Because I feel that on one side you have people who are very, very much opposed. They're willing to listen to what some of the alternatives are, but they're very opposed to an outright ban. And there're some people whom that is the only solution. And call it whatever you want, call it a collaborative, call it a compromise, I think that these might be able to help. So, I see four steps that we need to take. First one is, and this is actually something that I'm undertaking right now, is uh, we need some sort of a health priorities panel, where we need to get some medical center people, we need to get people who know about the health problems on campus in one room. We need to open it up to the public, we need to be able to have an open and free discussion as we are a democratic campus, it's one of the great tenants of Evergreen, is we're very democratic in our decision making. And we need to open it up to people who pay to be here. We need to give them a voice and make sure that in our drawing up of the priorities for the next year and for the next ten years, when it comes to health, they have an input. So that needs to happen first. And that will happen next quarter. The second is, after that is done, we need to start accumulating more funds; be it through the state, be it through lobbying our legislatures, be it through asking from different areas of this campus including possibly even the S&A board for extra funding for things like resources for people to get them off of smoking, instead of just saying that a ban is going to quit somebody's smoking habit, we need to address the habit as it is. And that's an addiction, not just a habit. And so we need to have those resources in order to combat that. The third thing is we need to reevaluate our smoker's pits. I think that that's a huge problem that we haven't done enough

of. We need to reevaluate why they're there, what policies govern them, who governs them, and where they're placed. Because right now they're in very sociable areas, they're in areas where there is a lot of foot traffic and they're in areas that are very accessible to people who are specifically in first year residences, which can be very detrimental to those who are just coming into our community and we are doing them a disservice by allowing them that freedom to go and do something horrible to their body just outside, in order to be social in their new environment. So we need to reevaluate how many we have and where they're placed. And finally, in a few years we need to start looking at an outright ban. And I say in a few years because I don't expect an outright ban to happen tomorrow, I don't expect it to happen in a year, or three years, at least as far as we can tell. The state may do whatever they want because they are our primary funding mechanism. They are our primary source of funding when it comes to our existence as an institution. But if we are to be proactive, we are to start looking at how to phase out smoking on campus, not ban it outright, but to phase it out. And so again, I'm willing to talk about this outside of this body, and I'm open to anybody to help collaborate with me on this plan. Thank you.

(1:26:48) **Robert Smurr**- In response, there is a health and safety committee. That's a standing committee; they're members from health and safety committee here. I've met with them at least a few times. I've been working on this campus for a good eight years at least, trying to get this campus to be smoke-free. I think we've waited long enough. It took me a long time just to get the bookstore to stop selling cigarettes. I had to do that and one way I did it was calling numerous, about a dozen, bookstores, campus bookstores throughout the state of Washington. None of them sold cigarettes. Many of them, "cigarettes?" kind of, that was kind of the response when I asked them. So, I used that as ammunition. This is a pointless place. Now, what I'm going to say is going to surprise a lot of you, but I think Evergreen, actually, in a lot of ways, encourages smoking. Why? We sold cigarettes in the bookstore, at the same time, and as far as I know, I may be mistaken, then and maybe even now, we don't sell kits for people who want to stop smoking, we don't sell detail packages or books deliberately for those who want to quit smoking. Yes, smoking is, many smokers are addicted. I will also say, and people hate it when I say this, even my wife hates it when I say this, but early on we heard, nobody needs to talk about the ill effects of smoking. I disagree, that's why I gave the facts. But everybody said we understand before I even gave those facts. In other words, everybody who starts smoking now, at least the younger age, know that it's addictive. So here's the phrase I say. "It's an addiction of choice." And that addiction of choice, they don't seem to go together, if you think about it, if they know in advance that ill effects and the addictive qualities, to me that's how it seems to be. And I have spent, with others, and I'll go down a list, these are all the different people I've met with over the years. Oh first, very often there's not, can I go a little bit over perhaps? An extra minute? Yeah, because, ok. Um, very often, another reason I've seen pro-smoking culture, the smoking shelter that some of you complained about right at the top of the stairs of the CRC, there was absolutely no campus discussion about where that was going to be or how much it cost. I managed to get the information from that a couple years ago and that shelter cost \$23,910. That was without any faculty, any students, and I suspect, the staff as a whole weren't questioned. Where did that money come from? Why was it used to build a shelter at the top of a place where people exercised, right next to where everybody likes to go get coffee? And it seemed nonsensical and a huge waste of money, one that promoted, again, smoking. So those are some of the

issues I've had over the years and the reason I ask what can we do, what do we do next? Um, if we're much more for transforming this quickly. I've been, I think we can actually, by the start of the next academic year. It takes commitment, action, there's power structure and it's nebulous on Evergreen. But I know some in the "administration." I know the Vice Presidents and the Presidents are the ones who will ultimately make the decision, I've been told that. Um, why hasn't it been done with all the evidence we have about the harm of firsthand smoke, secondhand smoke? That's what I want to know. How do we take it forward, more rapidly?

(1:31:09) **Allison Van Nostren**- Hello. Um, this isn't necessarily a direct response to your question, although it might address part of it. Um, my name's Ally Van Nostren, I'm a new member of the Health and Safety Committee. And um, I'm on the Health and Safety Committee because I'm chief shop steward for the Student Support Services Staff Union. Um, and so we are a new union and haven't really talked much about this issue specifically, we've been focused on other ones. Um, but we're the college to significantly change its policies surrounding smoking. Um, the union would most certainly need to engage. We have members who support a ban, we have members who are regular smokers and definitely take issue, you know, with changing the current policies in big ways. Um, so, you know, if policies do change and people feel like they're negatively impacted, which changes their working conditions. Um, for example if we move the smoker's pits, smokers tense and they have to go farther, you know, that's going to impact people. So, that conversation will happen, if that happens that conversation will happen, there will be timelines on it, and it will need to be resolved. Um, so, as I said, we're kind of a new union and we haven't jumped into that immediately and we haven't had people reaching out about it, wanting to change it, so I just want to say that, um, I hear you saying that the Health and Safety Committee exists and why hasn't there been movement on this yet. I have to acknowledge that I feel like the Health and Safety Committee is a little bit biased in this sort of issue and shouldn't probably be the sole body making decisions about this. Um, and so I guess the union is ready to engage, ready to have the conversation and to collaborate to find creative solutions. From a personal standpoint I really, I'm not a smoker, but I am also interested in creative solutions that meet everyone's needs and specifically I'm looking forward to the conversation, uh, when I guess, maybe when it happens, about where to put the smoking areas. So that folks who don't want to want to be impacted don't have to, but hopefully, I'm hoping that we can identify some spots on the map that wouldn't be too, too far out of the way for folks who want to smoke too. I'm hoping that that can happen. I think that may be a good place to start. And I don't have a map and I don't have a good idea of what those are right now, unfortunately, but I'm hoping that will be a part of the conversation when it happens.

(1:33:55 – 1:35:38) Audience statements and questions

(1:35:39) **Robert Smurr**- If I can address the top question, what has been my experience with the present policy. And this is why I'm opposed to smoking areas entirely. People, you've all run into people not smoking in smoking areas. Uh, I'm one of the few faculty who will actually say you're not supposed to smoke there and about 50% of the time I get the finger, I get the, you know, and the words along with it and I get continued smoking and once, blowing smoke right in my face. I know several faculty that I've spoken to who used to confront and they don't do it anymore because they have been, they felt too intimidated, frightened by some of the responses. That is one of the key reasons I think

continuing the smoking area tents doesn't work really, at all. And all of the smoke-free campuses said the same thing. Once they, it seemed much easier than most of them thought once they went smoke-free, to patrol and police it.

(1:37:05) **NO NAME GIVEN**- I do just want to respond to that. In that, I think that those are really excellent points about the community reaction, things like that. And I do actually, unbiasedly fear that in all, if it's that bad with designated smoking areas, like how bad could it be, at least at first, I don't know, but how bad could it be then if it's completely banned? Like, if that's already an issue, people not listening, people being disrespectful, right, like, how much worse could it be? Or better? I don't know the answer, but how much worse could it be if there are a group of people smoking and they're out of the way and somebody comes up to them and says, you're not allowed to smoke here. Is that going to solve that issue? That's all.

Closing comments, microphone not used.