

GLOBAL ACTION TASK FORCE CASE STUDY

The Tobacco Free Coalition, and its Global Action Task Force are staffed and coordinated by the San Francisco Department of Public Health's Tobacco Free Project. The coalition is comprised of individuals and organizations committed to tobacco prevention and education in San Francisco and in international countries with high immigration rates to San Francisco. In May 1997, the TFC developed a Global Tobacco Control Policy Framework outlining a number of local actions the TFC could take to address the global tobacco epidemic. Since that time, the TFC has accomplished a number of actions included on the Framework such as successfully advocating for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to adopt a resolution calling for US tobacco companies to adhere to the same standards both in the US and abroad and successfully advocated for the San Francisco Retirement System to divest both its domestic and international tobacco holdings. The following document is intended as a case study of the Tobacco Free Coalition's (TFC) fight to ensure that at least a part of the Attorney's General settlement funds received by the City of San Francisco be spent on tobacco prevention and education efforts. Part I includes a timeline of events and a summary of the events. Part II provides an analysis of the process and includes coalition members reflections on the process.

*...A majority of states have thrown away the (settlement) money – their first installment of a total \$246 billion – at nearly everything **but** smoking reduction, according to the American Legacy Foundation, architect of the TV ad reporting the . diversion of millions from its \$1.5 billion in settlement resources for future savings, rather than hitting tobacco with full firepower. And trial lawyers have filed new suits in about a dozen states seeking a cut of the settlement for individual Medicaid recipients and their own legal fees.*

Since the money started pouring in, only eight states have used it to start major new anti-smoking programs, according to a December report by the Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids, In most states, tax cuts, balanced budgets and school construction have won out. Six states have failed to put a penny into tobacco control the report said.

USA Today 2/9/00

The following document is intended as a case study of the Tobacco Free Coalition's (TFC) fight to ensure that at least a part of the Attorney's General settlement funds received by the City of San Francisco be spent on tobacco prevention and education efforts. Part I includes a timeline of events and a summary of the events. Part II provides an analysis of the process and Part II provides an analysis of coalition members reflections on the process.

Part I: Timeline of Events

Date:	Event
Master Settelement Announced.	
Committee to Save Laguna Honda (CLTSLH) Formed. CLTSLH begins work on sponsoring a bond measure for the November election to dedicate tobacco settlement funds to refurbish Laguna Honda Hospital. None of the funds will be earmarked for tobacco control efforts.	
Tobacco Free Coalition (TFC) meets to develop position on settlement.	December 1998
Global Action Task Force meets and chooses to advocate for the Board of Supervisors to pass a resolution on the use of tobacco settlement funds to support enforcement of tobacco control laws, supporting local and international tobacco control programs, and financing health care for all.	February 1999
GATF announces two actions at TFC strategy meeting.	March 1999
On-going GATF meetings to develop model resolution and to find a Board sponsor for resolution.	February – May 1999
GATF holds press conference on	May 1999

steps of City Hall to call for tobacco settlement funds to be used for tobacco control efforts both here and abroad.	
CLTSLH contacts TFC to discuss amending bond language to earmark \$1 million of the tobacco settlement funds for tobacco control efforts. TFC meets to discuss option presented by CLTSLH and also meets with Supervisor Leland Yee who agrees to carry model resolution the TFC has been advocating for.	May 1999
TFC meets and decides to accept CLTSLH's offer to include \$1 million of tobacco settlement funds for tobacco control efforts.	
Board of Supervisors Hearing for proposed resolution to put bond measure on November ballot that earmarks tobacco settlement funds to refurbish Laguna Honda Hospital. Resolution includes \$1 million for tobacco control efforts. The resolution passes and becomes Prop A for the November ballot.	June 1999
Prop A bond measure passes.	November 1999
TFC meets on ongoing basis to develop budget and plan for \$1 million dollars. Representatives of TFC meet with Department of Public Health (DPH) to come to agreement on plan.	November 1999 – February 2000
Joint DPH/TFC plan is presented to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors.	March 2000

Joint DPH/TFC plan is adopted by the Board of Supervisors as part of FY 00-01 budget and plan for the City.	June 2000

San Francisco was informed that it would likely receive in excess of \$476 million as part of the national Attorneys General settlement with the tobacco industry. Shortly after this notification, the Mayor's Office and the CTSLH proposed that all of San Francisco's share of the Attorney's General tobacco settlement funds be spent (along with additional funds) to rebuild Laguna Honda hospital, a city owned and operated long-term care facility. This meant that not a single dollar of tobacco settlement would be allocated for tobacco prevention and control, although the monies were awarded *because* of the smoking related illnesses caused by tobacco. The coalition decided it needed to take action to try and prevent this from occurring.

Once apprised of the efforts by the CTSLH to ensure that settlement funds be used exclusively to rebuild of Laguna Honda Hospital the TFC began to mobilize. The TFC met on December 11, 1998 to develop a position statement on the use of tobacco settlement funds. The TFC's position statement urged the City and County of San Francisco to dedicate tobacco settlement funds to tobacco control activities including enforcement of existing and future tobacco control laws, funding community based comprehensive tobacco control programs to combat tobacco industry marketing and advertising, and promotion both in the US and internationally, and financing health care for all, including prompt access to tobacco cessation services. (Attachment __)

The Global Action Task Force (GATF) comprised of TFC members began meeting in January 1999 to identify a local action that would have a global impact. In February 1999, the GATF chose as their action to advocate for the Board of Supervisors to pass a resolution on the use of tobacco settlement funds to support enforcement of tobacco control laws, supporting local and international tobacco control programs, and financing. The GATF presented the proposed action to the TFC in March 1999 and drafted the language for the proposed resolution and sought to find a member of the Board of Supervisors willing to introduce the proposed resolution.

Meanwhile, the CTSLH had put forth a plan whereby rebuilding of Laguna Honda Hospital would be paid for with Attorney General settlement funds, and through passage of a bond issue in the November

99 election which would provide the rest of the needed funds. One of the Committee's first tasks was to get the Board of Supervisors to pass a resolution allowing the bond issue to come before the voters in the upcoming general election. The coalition realized it had to act quickly if it hoped to stop the CTSLH's efforts to ensure that all of the settlement monies go to rebuild Laguna Honda. The coalition then began its own efforts to educate members of the Board of Supervisors.

The TFC quickly initiated efforts to get the Board of Supervisors to pass a resolution explicitly allocating a percentage of the settlement funds for local tobacco control work. Early discussions within the TFC resulted in a decision not to discuss the transnational tobacco aspects of the TFC's proposal as part of the resolution submitted to the board because it might confuse or obscure the focus of the resolution.

At first, TFC members believed their proposed resolution was reasonable and would not engender a great deal of controversy among board members, as they had developed several strong tobacco advocates among the board. However, forces within the city that were eager to rebuild Laguna Honda Hospital using tobacco settlement funds were also well organized and had the mayor's support. TFC members soon discovered that there was little political will among board members to "rock the Mayor's boat" by confronting the CTSLH's efforts to use the settlement funds to rebuild the hospital. It appeared that many people assumed that the Laguna Honda proposal was "a done deal" and that there was little chance of getting any of the settlement monies for tobacco control and prevention given the size of the opposition.

In order to quickly intervene and stop what appeared to be an inevitable process the TFC called a press conference to alert the public about what was going on—that is, that none of the tobacco settlement money was actually going to be spent on tobacco control efforts and to call on the Board of Supervisors to earmark 20% of tobacco settlement funds for tobacco control efforts both nationally and internationally.

The TFC also decided to contact the two labor unions that were part of the CTSLH to see if any kind of compromise could be reached. Shortly after negotiations began, the CTSLH agreed to include in their resolution to the Board language specifying that \$1 million of each year's settlement allocation go for tobacco control. This was a victory for the coalition.

On June 14, 1999 a majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors voted to support a resolution allocating \$1 million dollars of the estimated \$20 million dollars the city expects to receive annually from the Attorneys General settlement be allocated to tobacco prevention and control.

A majority of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors also voted to put a bond measure to rebuild Laguna Honda Hospital before the voters in the November, 1999 general election. The bond measure (Prop.A) contained language allocating \$1 million for tobacco control education and prevention. The measure passed on November 5, 1999 by a two-thirds vote.

Seeking to be proactive, immediately following the November election, the TFC sent letters to all of the members of the Board of Supervisors outlining the TFC's proposal for exactly how the \$1 million of tobacco settlement funds should be spent on tobacco prevention and control efforts. In addition, the representatives from the American Heart Association and the American Lung Association (also TFC members) met with Supervisor Newsom to present the coalition's proposal.

Supervisor Newsom asked that the Health Department provide information on how they believed the settlement funds should be spent (as the Health Department would be responsible for overseeing the funds). TFC members met with representatives from the Health Department to discuss TFC's proposal. After this meeting, several revisions were made in the proposal and it was then forwarded to the Health Department's Director of Policy and Planning for review. The Health Department's Executive Committee made two suggestions about the coalition's proposal: 1) that the transnational component be removed, and 2) that there needed to be an opportunity for more public comment on the proposal.

At the same time, coalition members also met with Supervisor Yee, who indicated that he would support any proposal that was evidence based and in congruence with the Health Department. However, Supervisor Yee did not support the transnational portion of the proposal and stipulated that the proposal should be introduced by the Health Department (rather than the coalition) as the Health Department will ultimately be accountable for the funds.

Supervisor Newsom made similar comments about the coalition's proposal, recommending that the transnational component be removed, and that the funds originally allocated for transnational tobacco work be re-allocated to the media component, which he believed to be under-funded.

Health Department staff accepted these recommendations, which were similar to their own. Health Department representatives presented their proposal to the Health Commission on March 21. By presenting the proposal to that body, the coalition and the Health Department were

encouraging community input on the proposal. Once approved by the Health Commission, the proposal was referred to the Board of Supervisors. On March 6, Supervisor Newsom also called for a hearing on the proposed plan to be held by the Health Committee of the Board of Supervisors. The Health Committee hearing provided another opportunity for public debate.

The coalition's proposed budget was then referred to the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors and was discussed and passed by that body on May 24, 2000. The proposal was then placed on the full board's consent calendar and adopted. Supervisor Newsom said he would call for a hearing of the TFC's proposal. Supervisor Newsom and other members of the Board also wanted to hear input from the Department of Public Health as to how the \$1 million should be allocated.

Analysis:

The strategy devised by the TFC to secure at least a portion of the Attorney's General settlement funds for tobacco control initiated a spirited debate within the TFC and reflected the most disagreement about strategy encountered within the coalition to date.

While coalition members all agreed that some of the settlement money should be allocated for tobacco education and prevention efforts, coalition members were not yet in agreement as to the amount of money to request, and what the money should be used for. Some members felt that the coalition should ask for 25% of the settlement money and not negotiate; others felt the coalition should compromise with the CTSFH in order to be assured of at least some portion of the settlement monies. Other coalition members disagreed about whether or not the coalition should explicitly ask for money for international tobacco control efforts. Several coalition members believed asking for monies to fund international tobacco control work was political suicide, while others felt it was an essential part of the Coalition's mission and identity, and that the coalition was ethically responsible to help developing countries fight off the onslaught of American tobacco companies.

The remaining question for the coalition is what steps if any it plans to take regarding funding for their transnational tobacco control work. Several suggestions that have arisen so far include: 1) continue working to educate members of the Board of Supervisors about the importance and need for transnational tobacco control work; and 2) continue working with transnational tobacco advocates but inside the U.S. perhaps by having them come to this country and receive technical assistance and support from the Coalition..

Part II: Tobacco Free Coalition Members Analysis

Although the issue of the Attorneys General settlement had been discussed in the coalition even before the case was settled, it did not become a high priority issue among coalition members until they learned that local settlement funds might be diverted away from tobacco education and prevention efforts and instead, that the Mayor wanted settlement funds to be used exclusively to rebuild Laguna Honda Hospital. It was at this point that the coalition began to mobilize their respective constituents to help ensure that at least a portion of the settlement funds would be allocated for tobacco prevention and education efforts and that some of the funds targeting transnational tobacco control efforts.

First, the coalition had to decide how much to request from settlement funds and then to design an effective strategy to secure the funds. Deciding how much to request engendered a great deal of discussion among coalition members. The initial request proposed (25% of total settlement dollars) was based on national guidelines determined by the Heart, Lung, and Cancer Associations along with Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids. However, after those guidelines were released, the CDC issued some numbers for the comprehensive statewide settlement efforts. After many discussions the coalition agreed to go with a fixed amount rather than a percentage of total settlement dollars. Not surprisingly, coalition members' recollection of how the group determined the amount of settlement dollars to request varied from member to member.

There was disagreement among TFC members as to whether or not some of the settlement funds should fund groups abroad with high immigration rates to the US to undertake tobacco control efforts while other members felt it unwise and unrealistic and that asking for even a portion of the settlement funds to be used outside the U.S. could result in the board's blocking the coalition's receipt of any of the settlement funds. Despite the disagreement the group did brainstorm methods of including a "global" aspect" to the resolution by providing groups abroad with computers, technical assistance, etc. Some TFC members felt that the statement on the use of settlement funds that the TFC initially came up with in December 1998 was more realistic in nature and that the GATF took the issue in a slightly different direction.

Once the resolution was crafted, the most pivotal strategies used by the coalition to get the resolution passed were contacts with the board of supervisors individually and the May 17 press conference. The press conference generated public interest (i.e. Examiner story) and made the Laguna Honda group aware of Tobacco Coalition's efforts. Laguna

Honda group almost immediately contacted the coalition to meet and talk about a compromise.

The Tobacco Free Coalition met to develop a proposal on how the Attorney General money should be spent and came with a recommendation that 20% be spent on tobacco prevention efforts and 5% on international tobacco control efforts. (The 5% proposal was always the most controversial, even within the coalition). The larger, more well established groups tended to believe it was political suicide to ask the board of supervisors to allocate money that would be used not by local organizations, but by organizations outside the U.S. Other organizations felt the request was consistent with the mission of their respective organizations, and that the coalition had a responsibility to help countries with high immigration rates to San Francisco to try and fight the targeting of their countries by the tobacco industry.

At the same time, the Global Action Task Force , comprised of youth and adults, convened to develop criteria for international funding should that aspect of the resolution make it through the process which included:

- Amount of funding groups can apply for and the types of groups that can apply, e.g. Local grassroots experience in advocacy, etc.
- Funded projects must be youth driven
- Projects must submit workplan that outlines major activities and timelines to accomplish those activities. Workplan must be sustainable, policy focused, etc.
- Projects must submit budget and budget justification that details how funds will be spent. Funds can be used for staffing and operating expenses including office space, telephone, computer, etc.
- Projects will be required to submit progress reports and financial reports on a regular basis.
- Some funds should be earmarked for local administration of the program which includes site visits, TA and training.

On March 17, 1999, the Global Task Force drafted a resolution to the SF Board of Supervisors which included the following points.

“BE IT RESOLVED that 75% of new revenues resulting from the AG settlement monies will be dedicated to health care including smoking related illnesses (\$15 million per year)

BE IT RESOLVED that 25% of new revenues resulting from the AG settlement monies will be dedicated to tobacco prevention and tobacco control efforts (\$5 million per year) to include:

- *Enforcing existing and future city, state, and federal tobacco control laws.*
- *Funding community based comprehensive tobacco control programs both in San Francisco and Internationally. Priority be given to those communities targeted by the TNTs. Five percent be designated to supporting tobacco control in countries with high immigration rats of SF.*
- *Financing prompt access to tobacco cessation.”*

It was further agreed that once the resolution was finalized, two supervisors would be approached and asked to give guidance to the coalition as to which board member would be the most appropriate sponsor for the resolution. GATF members agreed to approach various Supervisors that they had an existing relationship with. The plan was that after a sponsor for the resolution was secured all the remaining supervisors would be approached to co-sponsor the resolution.

A press release issue by the coalition made the following statement: Initially coalition members believed the non-binding resolution would be viewed as fairly non-controversial by the Supervisors. However, when coalition members approached two supervisors that had always been supportive of the coalition’s work, neither was willing to sponsor a resolution calling for some of the settlement funds to be used for tobacco prevention when there was such strong support at the highest levels (the Mayor) for all of the settlement funds to go to the rebuilding of Laguna Honda.

Two resolutions were put before and decided by the board—one by the Committee ---Laguna Honda and one by the Tobacco Free Coalition. On June 1, 1999, Supervisor Yee introduced the resolution drafted by the Tobacco Free Coalition to the full Board of Supervisors. The resolution was then referred to the Board’s Finance Committee for further discussion on June 9, 1999. Excerpts from the coalition are included below:

RESOLVED: *That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco supports tobacco prevention, education and control services, and be it*

FURTHER RESOLVED: *That the Board of Supervisors urges that \$1 million of new revenues per year resulting from the Attorney General tobacco lawsuit settlement be dedicated to tobacco education, prevention and control efforts, such as funding community based comprehensive tobacco control programs and training and technical assistance; financing prompt access to tobacco cessation services; and enforcing existing and future city, state, and federal tobacco control laws; and, be it*

FURTHER RESOLVED: *That funds should be expended according to comprehensive tobacco control guidelines designed to change social norms and based on research on effective approaches that reduce tobacco prevalence such as community based interventions, media advocacy, and policy development.'*

Prior negotiations by members of the Tobacco Free Coalition, with the Laguna Honda Committee resulted in the Committee's resolution being amended to include a stipulation that \$1 million of the settlement funds be spent on tobacco prevention annually in addition to its main intent to allow for a special bond election to refinance the hospital's rebuilding. The resolution "calling for a special election to be held in the city and county of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 2, 1999, for the purpose of submitting to the voters a proposition to incur bonded debt and/or other evidences of indebtedness and/or undertake lease financing by or for the city and county in the principal amount of \$299,000 for the acquisition, improvement, construction and/or reconstruction of a health care, assisted living and/or other type of continuing care facility or facilities to replace Laguna Honda Hospital: providing for the use of tobacco settlement revenues..."

Section 2 of the Committee's resolution contained the following the paragraph below

"A valuable tobacco settlement revenue" is defined as the total payments the City and county receives under the 1998 Master Settlement Agreement over the term of any lease financing, bonded debt and/or other evidences of indebtedness authorized hereby that the City and County may use for the Project under applicable law, less \$1,000,000 of the amount the City and county receives each year under the Agreement during the term of any obligations authorized hereby, which amount the city and County intends to use for tobacco education, prevention, and control purposes."

On May 28th, the Coalition called an emergency meeting to "re-group" and to decide whether or not they should give up their efforts or push onward in spite of the opposition. After voting to continue and to pursue

an even more aggressive stance (at the off-the-record advice of a Supervisor), the coalition called a press conference on May 17th to discuss their efforts to have at least some of the settlement funds be allocated to tobacco control efforts. Rather than asking for a percentage of settlement funds to be allocated for tobacco prevention and education efforts, the coalition actually calculated the amount of money they felt they needed to complete the goals they had set for themselves. It was from this effort that the request for \$1.1 million emerged. (In the negotiations between the unions and the coalition it came to the coalition's attention that Laguna Honda Committee would support a request for \$1 million annually, so that what was presented in the revised resolution.

At the suggestion of several members of the board of supervisors (and based upon the strategy developed in the global task force's education sessions, coalition members met with members of the two labor unions involved in the Laguna Honda proposal (SEIU Local 250 (hospital workers) and Local 750 (office workers at Laguna Honda) to try and see if a compromise was possible. The coalition also assigned different coalition members to try and meet with the various members of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, etc. While coalition members from the American Heart Association and the American Lung Association began negotiations with union representatives, other coalition members were conducting meetings to engender support for the coalition's resolution. Staff and project youth from Mission Agenda, Mission Housing and Development Corporation, Chinese Progressive Association, and the San Francisco African-American Tobacco Free Project met with Supervisor Yee who agreed to introduce the coalition's resolution to the full board, which he did on June 1, 1999. The issue was then referred to the board's Finance Committee for further discussion on June 9th.

"Member organizations of the SF Tobacco Free Coalition are pleased that the City and County of San Francisco will earmark \$1 million annually in available tobacco settlement revenues for tobacco prevention programs. As state funds for tobacco control programs decline, this decision represents a recognition by the City that more needs to be done here in San Francisco to respond to the international epidemic of tobacco addiction. The commitment of using \$1 million of the estimated \$20 million to be received annually to enforce existing tobacco control laws and to fund community-based prevention and education efforts and cessation

programs is an appropriate long-term investment in the health of the residents of San Francisco.”

How A Global Action Was Selected

On February 9, 1999 the Global Task Force underwent a brainstorming process to discuss and select a global action to be presented to the full coalition. (Taking on a global action was in the coalition’s workplan). At the February task force meeting, the group broke into small groups and came up with a list of possible actions including:

- Organizing a boycott in which SF schools and organizations would not buy products made by tobacco companies.
- Getting the Board of Supervisors to adopt social justice criteria for San Francisco’s sister cities.
- Campaign finance reform
- Trying to address the manufacture of Bidis and more specifically the child labor involved in their manufacture
- To attempt to get some of the Attorney General settlement dollars for international efforts.

After discussion in the small groups, the whole group came together and voted on which of the top two issues to address. The issue which received the most votes was to pursue efforts to use the Attorney General settlement funds to support international efforts (13 votes), and trying to organize a school district boycott of items made by tobacco companies (9 votes). Tobacco Free Project staff then researched whether there was anything written in the legislation preventing the proposed transnational work, as well as how other groups had successfully undertaken similar efforts. For example, one staff member explored provisions in the McCain bill for funding groups overseas, and another researched the IDEX criteria for funding groups overseas.

It was decided at the Feb. 25 1999 task force meeting that MHDC would take the lead on the proposed school boycott action with support from other coalition members. The task force would take the lead on asking the Board to pass a resolution on how the Attorney’s General (AG) settlement funds should be used. It was also decided that any proposed resolution to the board should focus not only on supporting international tobacco efforts, but should also include the other three components (enforcement of tobacco control laws, funding local tobacco control programs, and financing health care for all including cessation) of the Coalition’s position paper on the AG settlement funds.

These two choices were introduced to the Coalition's Strategic Planning Meeting on March 4 by coalition members representing Columbia Park, ALA, Mission Agenda and SOMC.

Educating Coalition Members

Several coalition members represent constituency with large immigrant populations. It was hoped by these organizations that some of the settlement money could also be used to fund transnational tobacco control work. These members expressed great concern about the extent to which American tobacco companies, thwarted in their marketing efforts in the U.S., had begun heavy targeting of third world countries. However, as a whole, the coalition needed more information about international tobacco control efforts in order to make an informed decision about whether or not to continue their efforts to secure funding for this work from settlement funds.

The Chinese Progressive Association (CPA), a longtime coalition member and Prop. 99 funded provider was particularly interested in working on global issues because of their own constituency, the large number of Asian immigrants in San Francisco, and the tobacco industry's increased targeting of Asian markets. As members of the Tobacco Free Coalition and its global task force, the Chinese Progressive Association, with support from Tobacco Free Project staff, took responsibility for educating the coalition's other community-based organization staff about transnational tobacco issues. CPA also facilitated the group's development of a draft resolution to the Board and development of a strategy to get the resolution passed.

As mentioned earlier, because CPA was the first organization within the coalition to focus their 1999 Prop. 99 work on global tobacco issues, they volunteered to take the lead on educating other coalition members transnational tobacco issues. CPA facilitated a process whereby Global Task Force members engaged in an interactive process and a lively debate which culminated in the coalition's drafting of a resolution to the Board of Supervisors.

Coalition members met on April 9 1999 to rehearse visits with various members of the Board of Supervisors, namely Supervisors Bierman, Ammiano and Yee. The training focused on the following suggestions with regard to the upcoming visits:

- Make a request for the meeting and let the supervisor know the general topic of the meeting.

- Practice and be ready to anticipate tough questions that the supervisors may ask
- Be ready to explain what the Global Task Force is
- Be ready to defend why you believe settlement funds should go to tobacco control
- Be ready to defend why you also believe that some of the funds should go fund transnational tobacco control efforts.

Coalition members were also provided with the following tips designed to make their visits more effective:

- Smile, stand up, shake hands and say hello
- Introduce yourselves
- Be clear what you are asking from the supervisor
- Provide a copy of the resolution for the supervisor and staff as a leave-behind
- Discuss next steps getting co-sponsors, will there be a hearing for youth to present
- Be sure to follow-up with a thank-you letter to the supervisor.

Also in April 1999, CPA led an exercise entitled “Money and Power, Support and Opposition”. As part of the exercise, the group brainstormed a list of organizations likely support the coalition’s resolution as well as organizations likely to oppose the coalition’s efforts. Then each identified organization was reviewed as to how much money, power and influence was attached to each. Education strategies were then devised to approach the organizations to educate and perhaps persuade them to support the coalition’s resolution to the Board. The key points to be addressed when approaching these organizations included:

1. What is the Global Task Force
2. What is the Attorney General’s tobacco settlement?
3. What is the Global Action Task Force proposing and why is this important
4. What you can do

The Role of the Coalition’s CBOs

As mentioned earlier, while the coalition was busy educating its membership, a committee appointed by the Mayor was already actively engaged in efforts to ensure that all of the settlement dollars would be allocated to the rebuilding of Laguna Honda Hospital—the city owned and operated long-term care facility. This committee also wanted the Board of Supervisors to pass a resolution calling for a bond election in

November of 1999 which would, when combined with tobacco settlement funds, provide the huge sum needed to rebuild Laguna Honda Hospital. The Tobacco Free Coalition then began to draft their own resolution to the Board of Supervisors specifying that at least a portion of the settlement dollars be allocated for tobacco prevention.

Representatives from all of the capacity building projects participated in efforts to draft a board resolution to the Board of Supervisors asking that a portion of the settlement funds be allocated for tobacco control.

Representatives from all of the capacity building projects participated these efforts. Some members spoke at press conferences related to the request for a portion of settlement funds, others visited supervisors to educate them on issues and testified at hearings. CPA took the lead on educating the other capacity building projects about global tobacco issues and to help them decide whether or not to support international tobacco control as part of the resolution. CPA also worked with the projects to help them develop a winning strategy to get the resolution passed by the board. Using a very inclusive process, CPA facilitated a discussion through which all of the capacity building projects had an opportunity to actively participate in drafting the resolution. For example, each project came up with three “Whereas” and at least one if not all three of these was then included in the resolution. The “be it resolved...” portion of the resolution was determined through voting and ideas generated at Task Force meetings

According to the **American Heart Association** representative San Francisco’s deliberation about rebuilding Laguna Honda hospital had been going on the past four years. Ultimately the Mayor appointed a rebuild committee (which included the head of the Health Department and the City Attorney) and that committee began to actively advocate for using the Attorney’s General settlement funds to rebuild the hospital.

“The public was never informed nor consulted about how the money should be spent and as a result San Francisco residents were excluded from the decision.”

The **Chinese Progressive Association** also played a major role throughout negotiations as they were particularly interested in trying to have some of the settlement funds used to fight the influence of the tobacco companies in Asia..

The staff from **Mission Agenda** also felt their involvement in the fight for Attorney General’s settlement funds was very educational. They indicated their advocates felt they were “on the right on the side” and at

first didn't understand how board members could not support at least some of the tobacco settlement funds being for anti tobacco activities."

"We saw how we could use opportunity to discuss AG settlement issue but also discuss Mission Agenda's concerns about housing and SRO hotel safety issues. It was the first time we have ever experienced this type of dual dialogue with members of the Board of Supervisors."

According to **Mission Housing Development Corporation's** staff participation in the effort was a very positive experience. It was an education for their advocates to learn how politics really work. Although they had participated in same standards resolution to the Board of Supervisors in the past, they had never participated in such a political issue. This effort (the AG resolution) was more directly adversarial—that is the coalition was vying for money that others also wanted—was more directly adversarial than other issues on which their advocates had worked. According to staff, the Mission Housing advocates experienced a range of emotions—initially optimistic, their optimism briefly faded as the enormity of their opposition became reality, and then rose again with support from other capacity building projects.. The advocates realized they had to adopt more realistic goals and learn the art of compromise.

"Our advocates learned the "language" of politics and sharpened their public speaking skills. For the youth, the hands on activities (meeting with supervisors, speaking at press conference and public hearings) were the most educational. The passing of the resolution showed the youth that their efforts were not in vein. The youth learned about the process involved in passing resolution and the political nature of the system. By attending the press conference and presenting their viewpoint the youth learned how to speak clearly, powerfully and persuasively."

Chinese Progressive Association and ten youth advocates met with Supervisor Ammiano's aide. They presented a list of points supporting their hopes for how the AG funds would be used in San Francisco. However Ammiano's staff, while supportive of their efforts, reminded them of the competition they faced for the money, He reminded the advocates of the and the relatively long process undertaken by the Mayor's Office and the Mayor's Rebuild Committee to reduce the city's bond debt by using AG money to rebuild the hospital.

According to Ammiano's office staff, it was their staff that recommended the coalition meet with the Rebuild Committee and the Laguna Honda backers to strike a compromise. If the coalition had come out against the opposition it would likely have killed the Committee's efforts and that the resultant compromise was a fair one to both sides

Areas of disagreement among coalition members

The Tobacco Free Coalition is comprised of a diverse group of organizations and individuals, including both youth and adults. While coalition members played varying roles within regard to the fight for Attorneys General settlement funds and members disagreed about strategy, the group was ultimately united in their efforts. Two primary issues that coalition members did not agree on included 1) the percentage of funds to be requested from the total settlement, and 2) and specifying in the resolution language about using the funds to pursue global tobacco issues by working with countries outside the US with high immigration rates to San Francisco.

The coalition's resolution to the Board of Supervisors regarding use of Attorney's General settlement funds was the most hotly debated within the coalition, and generated the most disagreement among coalition members. At one end of the spectrum were the larger, more mainstream organizations that had a history of negotiations with the board. They believed that putting forth a resolution that allocated settlement money be used for international tobacco control efforts was political suicide, and would cause the entire resolution to be defeated. On the other side were the smaller, grassroots organizations that pushed for a more confrontive approach regarding the use of settlement money for international tobacco control efforts. These organizations felt a strong ethical responsibility to help international countries being targeted by the U.S. tobacco industry. These differences among coalition members ultimately resulted in a resolution that was a compromise, pleasing neither side completely. The coalition initially voted to support a resolution calling for 20% of settlement funds to go for local tobacco prevention and 5% to be allocated for international tobacco control efforts. Over time, that was negotiated to requesting \$1 million with no funds explicitly requested for international tobacco control efforts.

Another issue engendering differences of opinion among coalition members was the decision to negotiation with the opposition (the Mayor, hospital unions, etc. Some coalition members felt the coalition should strike a compromise with the opposition, allowing language regarding the bond issue to spell out \$1 million of the settlement funds would be spent on tobacco control—thereby eliminating any opposition. Other coalition members felt the coalition shouldn't take a position on the bond issue at all because the coalition's support would indicate that it was happy with

the \$1 million for tobacco control. They believed that if the bond issue didn't pass, the whole amount of the Attorney's General settlement might again be up for grabs. By endorsing the bond issue these members believed it might hurt the coalition's chances of securing more funding should the bond issue not pass and more of the settlement funds become available. Eventually the coalition came to a compromise through discussions and debate. Ultimately the coalition did negotiate with the opposition to ensure getting both the coalition's and the opposition's resolutions passed by the board but tried to keep some distance active support of the proposed bond issue. Instead the coalition concentrated on seeing that the resolution to give \$1 million to tobacco control was passed by the board.

One coalition member said in retrospect "We got the \$1 million so easily maybe if we had pushed harder we could have succeeded in getting more money and in pursuing the global agenda/international aspect of our work. We would have liked to stand up to those in power and push for a broader global agenda but there were not enough risk takers in the group."

Epilogue

In the year following this important work the Coalition developed and implemented a plan and budget for the \$1 million acquired through the passage of Proposition A. The plan is based on comprehensive tobacco control guidelines designed to change social norms and research on effective approaches that reduce tobacco prevalence through community-based interventions, media advocacy and policy development and enforcement. According to the San Francisco Health Commission resolution adopted March 21, 2000 and referred to the Board of Supervisors.

'RESOLVED that the Health Commission recommends that funds in the Tobacco Education and Control Revenue Subaccount of the Tobacco Revenue Account be appropriated to the Department of Public Health to enhance tobacco prevention and control activities provided by the Tobacco Free Project; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Health Commission recommends that \$1 million in additional funds for fiscal year 2000-2001 be used to 1) evaluate prevention strategies designed to curb tobacco use, 2) enforce Federal, State and local tobacco control policies, 3) expand the media campaign, 4) support community-based tobacco control activities, 5) provide tobacco cessation services, 6) enhance tobacco prevention and education strategies within the San Francisco Unified School District,

and 7) provide administrative support; and be it,

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Health Commission recommends that funding dedicated to tobacco prevention and control from the Tobacco Settlement be maintained in an interest bearing account.”

Program objectives for FY 00/01 included were focused on four critical areas:

- ◆ Media Component
- ◆ Enforcement
- ◆ Cessation
- ◆ Community Capacity Building

The success of work undertaken during this important first year is being evaluated and will be available at the Tobacco Free Project office in July 01.