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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction
Exposure to second-hand smoke (SHS) in public places remains a public health concern, as it increases rates of asthma, chronic bronchitis, cardiovascular disease, and cancer in ex- and never-smokers.\(^1\)\(^2\) A decade prior, in 2006, there were six communities in British Columbia that recognized the need for stricter policies to reduce SHS. Today (year-end, 2016) 71 BC communities\(^3\) have outdoor policies in place that are more restrictive than BC’s *Tobacco and Vapour Products Control Act*.\(^4\) These ordinances vary, regulating smoking, and sometimes vaping, in a variety of places not regulated by the province such as patios, parks, beaches, trails, playgrounds, building entrances and other public venues. An analysis of BC’s tobacco control bylaws conducted by the Canadian Cancer Society, BC and Yukon (the Society) indicates that there are 122 communities and nearly 1 million individuals in BC alone that are not protected by any outdoor smoke-free bylaws.

The current study assessed the methods used to promote, implement and enforce these bylaws, as well as the reported associated costs. Public response to the bylaw was also investigated. Municipal staff from 24 jurisdictions in British Columbia with a smoke-free outdoor places (SFOP) bylaw/policy participated in a telephone interview between May-July 2016.

With the steady expansion of local legislation, it is beneficial to understand the impact of outdoor smoke-free ordinances on communities and whether such policies have affected municipal capacity, specifically enforcement and legal staff. Additionally, this report offers municipal viewpoints four years after BC municipalities passed Resolution B92 calling for provincial smoke-free outdoor places legislation.\(^5\) It offers perspectives on how the Province of BC might move forward on this issue in future.

Methods
Staff from 41 BC municipalities and regional districts were contacted by telephone and email to determine their interest in participating in a 20 to 30 minute interview regarding the implementation of the smoke-free outdoor places bylaw that had been passed in their jurisdiction at least one year prior. Interviews were conducted with 24 out of 41 jurisdictions: a 59% response rate. An additional six jurisdictions provided email responses to some questions as well.

\(^3\) Note: Trail and Prince George passed adoption in 2016 and will implement in 2017.
\(^4\) Non-Smokers’ Rights Association Smoke-Free Laws Database. [http://database.nonsmokersrights.ca/](http://database.nonsmokersrights.ca/)
Findings

E-cigarettes
- One quarter of municipalities (25%, n=6) interviewed reported that provisions for e-cigarettes are included in their jurisdictions’ SFOP bylaw.

Public Consultations Prior to Bylaw Adoption
- Almost half of municipalities interviewed conducted public consultations (42%, n=10), while others did not (54%, n=13). Consultations included public meetings, open council meetings, social media, discussion groups, open houses, online discussions, etc.
- Many municipalities (63%, n=15) framed their public communication messages under protection, including clean air, second-hand smoke exposure, and health, while many others (43%) used a combination of approaches (such as preventing youth from starting to smoke, supporting smokers who want to quit, and environmental reasons).
- One third of municipalities (33%; n=8) reported holding at least one public meeting with the community, which incurred little or no cost.
- Over half (54%, n=13) reported that staff had conducted presentations to the community about the bylaw including internal presentations (e.g., departmental staff) to formal presentations (e.g., public or city council).

Signage/Bylaw Promotion
- The majority of municipalities interviewed (83%, n=20) indicated that they had posted signage to communicate the new bylaw.
- Almost half (45%, n=11) of the municipalities reported using promotional materials (pamphlets, brochures, posters) to communicate the new bylaw, the majority of which were produced in-house and incurred little cost.
- Most municipalities interviewed (83%, n=20) had used additional resources to promote the new bylaw, and almost all of these communities (85%, n=17) utilized more than one type of resource which may have included website, newsprint or radio advertising, direct mail or flyer advertising, newsletters, leisure guides, etc.

Budget
- Across all municipalities, by population centres, the cost for the vast majority of municipality bylaws (95%, n=23) came from an existing budget allocation.

Enforcement
- In 39% of municipalities (n=11), Bylaw Enforcement Officers (BEO) were the only individuals that enforced the bylaw within the municipality. In just over half of municipalities (54%, n=15), more than one position/role was designated to enforce the SFOP bylaw. In each of these cases, a bylaw officer was included in this combination.
- In 21% of municipalities (n=5), Tobacco Enforcement Officers from the local Health Authority were engaged in enforcement of the SFOP bylaw.
- More than half of municipalities (57%, n=17) reported that the municipality’s enforcement approach is entirely complaint driven. Almost a quarter (20%, n=6) stated that both routine inspections as well as a complaint driven approach have been implemented.
- Only one municipality across the province had added an additional Bylaw Enforcement Officer following bylaw implementation. Others used existing staff and resources. For the majority of municipalities (88%, n=21) funding had not been re-allocated for bylaw enforcement during rollout.

**Ticketing/Warnings**
- Across the province, the majority of municipalities interviewed (71%, n=17) reported implementing a grace period of issuing warnings rather than tickets.
- Two thirds of municipalities (67%, n=16) reported they had not issued tickets for outdoor smoking infractions. There were also zero tickets reported for electronic cigarette infractions by any municipality across the province. One municipality reported two tickets were challenged in court.

**Clean up costs**
- Many municipalities (63%, n=15) did not differentiate cigarette clean-up costs from other types of general maintenance. Nine municipalities (38%) reported that the cost was zero. For those municipalities that included e-cigarettes within their bylaw (n=6), none indicated that there was a cost associated with e-cigarette waste.

**Fire Risk**
- There was a slight reduction in the number of municipalities reporting cigarette-attributed fires pre and post bylaw implementation. Eight municipalities (33%) indicated that they had received reports of fires caused by cigarettes pre-bylaw; while six (25%) municipalities reported fires attributed to cigarette use after the bylaw. There were fewer fires reported by municipalities post bylaw than prior to the bylaw implementation; however, there was much uncertainty as to exact numbers.

**Community Impact**
- Twenty-one municipalities (88%) indicated that the bylaw had had a positive impact on the community. The others (n=3) indicated the bylaw had neither a positive or negative effect, for various reasons.

**Public Complaints**
- Across the province, a large proportion of municipalities (71%, n=17) had received complaints associated with the bylaw. Among complaints received, many municipalities (76%, n=13) reported that those were mostly about individuals smoking in areas prohibited by the bylaw.
- No municipality has received any issues or complaints regarding their e-cigarette regulations.
- Across the province, all but one (96%, n=23) municipality reported having multiple methods by which people could submit a complaint. The methods available were similar across the province.

**UBCM Resolution B92**
- Many municipalities (42%, n=10) expressed support for UBCM B92 and were frustrated that the provincial government had not taken a lead on the issue. Several others (29%, n=7) felt
their municipality’s current bylaw has already addressed many of the issues within UBCM B92, so it was no longer an issue for them.

Supporting Effective SFOP Legislation

- More than half (54%, n=13) of municipalities reported that education (e.g. public communication campaigns, etc.) was needed, particularly around vaping (n=4) to clear up misconceptions and ensure effective implementation of SVFOP.
- One quarter (25%, n=6) felt that the government needed to pass stronger, standardized provincial legislations and regulations.
- One quarter (25%, n=6) felt that greater resources and support were required by municipalities to implement bylaws; some (17%, n=4) expressed that municipalities needed support around enforcement so they would have greater authority and resources to conduct enforcement activities.
- Three municipalities (13%) indicated that the government needed to act on and pass UBCM B92.

Discussion

In the vast majority of municipalities and regional districts interviewed in BC, smoke-free outdoor bylaws have been implemented largely without significant additional financial cost or human resources. Only one quarter of municipalities interviewed included e-cigarettes in their bylaws, and had not reported any issues or complaints associated with them. The bylaws have been well implemented and well received by communities, without issue surrounding warnings, ticketing or complaints by the general public. The majority of municipalities felt that the bylaw had had positive impacts on the communities involved.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

Reducing the rates of tobacco use among Canadians remains a key public health concern, as it is estimated that approximately 18% of adults are current smokers (5.4 million). Tobacco smoke continues to be a leading cause of preventable death in Canada, and more than 4 million Canadians (almost half a million British Columbians) over the age of 12 report exposure to second-hand smoke (SHS) in vehicles and/or public places. In 2014, 14.3% of British Columbian adults and 12.5% of youth in grades 10-12 smoke, with almost one in three BC youth (in grades 10-12) having tried smoking. Smoking rates range by geography in BC, as do smoke-free places policies that prevent smoking, protect from second-hand smoke and support cessation. The decline in smoking prevalence over the past decade appears to have slowed, suggesting that more comprehensive policy responses are required to support quitting, deter new tobacco users, and protect people from exposure to SHS.

British Columbia’s Tobacco Control Act of 2008 banned smoking in workplaces and indoor public places and in the common areas of multi-unit dwellings. The Act also included certain outdoor places such as school grounds (K to Grade 12), enclosed and semi-enclosed transit shelters, and buffer zones of 3 metres from doors, windows, air intakes of public buildings. September 2016, following implementation of this survey, the Act was renamed the Tobacco and Vapour Products Control Act and was expanded to ban vapour product use in the places where tobacco use is banned. The Act now includes health authority properties and has expanded the buffer zone around public building doors, windows and air intakes to 6 metres.

BC is comprised of 189 municipalities and unique aggregation of unincorporated areas. Municipalities have the jurisdictional authority to adopt tobacco bylaws that exceed provincial standards. Currently, 71 communities in BC have committed to smoking restrictions above and beyond the provincial ban. The rationale for some of these policies is to protect citizens from exposure to outdoor tobacco smoke (OTS). Studies have demonstrated that OTS concentrations can be similar to those measured indoors. In addition to protection, some outdoor smoke-free policies were enacted to change social norms around smoking and to support positive role

---

8 http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/health74b-eng.htm
modeling for youth. They make smoking less acceptable, and places to smoke less available, and subsequently prevent young people from initiating tobacco use. A smoke-free environment also supports people in quitting and prevents relapse among individuals who have quit.14

An Ontario-based Community-of-Practice organized by the Program Training and Consultation Centre, which works on advancing outdoor tobacco-free policies,15 identified that an important political barrier to the development and enactment of outdoor smoke-free bylaws is lack of evidence around bylaw enforcement costs. Using this framework, the current study sought to understand strategies used by BC municipalities to promote their outdoor smoke-free policies and measure financial impacts associated with the implementation and enforcement of bylaws (including materials and staffing costs). The current study also aimed to understand the extent to which these bylaws are actively enforced, and if people not in compliance were challenging tickets or citations through municipal courts or other appeal mechanisms.

It will be beneficial to understand how these outdoor smoke-free ordinances have impacted bylaw resources. A primary barrier to advancing further outdoor regulation is quantifying how these policies/ordinances/laws affect municipal capacity, specifically enforcement staff and legal staff.

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the study was:

1) To assess barriers faced by public health practitioners working to advance outdoor smoke-free policies.
2) To provide practice-based evidence to inform BC’s local level and provincial decision makers, as well as decision makers in other jurisdictions across Canada.
3) To document enforcement issues and financial and opportunity costs of outdoor smoke-free bylaws to guide tobacco control advocates and policymakers in BC and across Canada.
4) To document municipal viewpoints on how the Province of BC might help to ensure effective implementation of smoke and vape-free outdoor places.

14 Program Training and Consultation Centre (PTCC). Outdoor Spaces. https://www.ptcc-cfc.on.ca/resources/knowledge_repository/outdoor_spaces/
3.0 METHODS

Survey Development
An interview script was developed by members of the research team, with input from the Canadian Cancer Society, BC & Yukon (the Society). The interview consisted of 21 questions, with an additional prompt at the conclusion of the interview for interviewees to add any final comments not otherwise captured. Questions were grouped into three topic areas: bylaw promotion and awareness, bylaw enforcement, and public response to/satisfaction with the bylaw. Sample interview questions can be seen in Table 1; a complete copy of the Interview Guide can be found in Appendix A.

Table 1. Sample interview questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw Promotion</td>
<td>“Was any public consultation conducted prior to the bylaw implementation?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Did the bylaw have an associated budget or did all expenses come from existing budget allocations?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw Enforcement</td>
<td>“Please describe your municipality’s enforcement approach.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“How many tickets have been issued since the implementation of [smoke-free bylaw]?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Response</td>
<td>“Overall, how has the implementation of this bylaw positively and/or negatively impacted your community?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“In your opinion, how could the Province help in ensuring effective implementation of smoke- and vape-free outdoor places?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample
Between the months of April and July 2016, municipal and regional district staff members from 41 BC communities were invited (via email and/or telephone) to participate in a brief telephone interview regarding their municipality’s smoke-free outdoor places bylaw. These communities had been previously identified by the Society as having a outdoor smoke-free policy that was more extensive than the provincial policy, and that had been in place for one year or more as of June 2016. The identified municipalities ranged in size from smaller cities and towns with populations of 1,000 to 29,000 residents each (~49%); to medium-sized cities of 30,000 to 99,999 residents (~24%); to larger cites of 100,000 or more residents (27%). At least one municipality from each of BC’s five health regions participated in the study (n=8 Vancouver Coastal Health; n=7 Fraser Health; n=6 Interior Health; n=1 Northern Health; n=2 Vancouver Island Health).
Municipal staff participated in an interview containing both closed- and open-ended questions that were administered via telephone by researchers between May and July 2016. In most cases, a single respondent was interviewed for each municipality. Respondents included bylaw officers, parks department managers, policy analysts, and chief administrative officers, and represented a wide variety of perspectives and experiences.

This study received clearance from the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Waterloo on April 28, 2016 (ORE# 21492).

**Analysis**

The data collected from municipality representatives have been analyzed by Population size or as aggregate data.

**By population size, the number of municipalities was:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Centre Size</th>
<th>Number of Municipalities (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Population Centres (1,000 to 29,999)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Population Centres (30,000 to 99,999)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Population Centres (100,000 +)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 RESULTS

Response Rate
Respondents from 24 BC municipalities completed the telephone interview; an additional six municipalities provided limited information via email but declined an interview. Five municipalities declined participation, and contact was not established with three municipalities. Three others were contacted, however two municipalities had forwarded the interview request to undisclosed third parties that did not respond; and one was to provide additional information by email, which was not received. This represents a response rate of 92.7% and an interview participation rate of 58.5%. An average of 3.8 contact attempts was made to each municipality, by phone or email to secure a participation status; an average of nine contact attempts were made to non-responsive municipalities. Interviews lasted an average of 26 minutes.

E- Cigarette Bylaw Coverage
Of all municipalities that participated in an interview, 75% of municipalities’ SFOP bylaws (n=18) did not include provisions regarding the use of e-cigarettes/vape pens.

4.1 Bylaw Promotion and Awareness, and Resources

Public Consultations Prior to Bylaw Adoption
Across the province, several of the municipalities interviewed conducted public consultations (42%, n=11), while several others did not (54%, n=13). A representative from one municipality was uncertain if public consultations were conducted because the bylaw had been passed many years’ prior (n=1). The types of consultations conducted included public meetings, open council meetings, social media, discussion groups, open houses, online discussions, etc.

Smaller population centres seemed to engage in community consultations more than the larger population centres, with 67% (n=6) of smaller centres conducting consultations vs. 37.5% (n=3) of medium and 29% (n=2) of larger population centres.

In smaller population centres, several changes resulted from public consultations including outdoor patio restrictions where business owners could opt for an entirely smoke-free place or limit usage to 19+ with signage; a 6-month grace period was added for posting signage; a 7.5-metre perimeter applied to public entrances only, not staff entrances, which had to comply with provincial regulations. A change to smoke-free parks legislation was made where a 7.5-metre distance from walking paths, playgrounds and fields was added, instead of the entire park area.

Reported changes in the bylaw from medium population centres included a transition to completely banning smoking in the plan that originally included smoking rooms. It was also reported that public input strengthened one municipality’s bylaw by making it more “rigid or harsh,” and helped other municipalities by raising discussions around what constitutes a park (municipal vs. federal); and issues around bus stops and bus shelters.
In larger population centres, one municipality reported that a public hearing process (considered a form of public consultation) affected the definition of a public place.

**Communications—Message Framing**

The majority of municipalities across BC (67%, n=16) included Protection in their communication messages to the public, (e.g. clean air, health, and second-hand smoke exposure). Many municipalities (46%, n=11) combined more than one message (i.e. Prevention or Environment) in addition to Protection: one quarter of municipalities (25%, n=6) indicated that Environmental issues (e.g., reduced litter, fire risk, environmental protection) were part of their messaging. For another 21% (n=5), Prevention messages were used in communicating the bylaw to the public.

**Signage**

The majority of municipalities interviewed (83%, n=20) indicated that they had posted signage to communicate the new bylaw. Only 4 (17%) of municipalities had not posted any signage.

The number of signs posted by each municipality varied significantly. In smaller population centres, the number of signs ranged from “a couple” to approximately 200 signs. The budget for these ranged from approximately $250 to $10,000. In medium population centres, as few as 7-8 signs were used, up to an extensive number (unknown) throughout the municipality. The range in costs were “minimal” to about $19,000, which encompassed all associated costs such as signage, travel, educational resources, promo items, event costs, staff supplies/equipment. In larger population centres, fewer than 66 signs were used in one municipality, up to a couple of thousand signs in another.

Several municipalities (25%, n=6) indicated that the budget for signs was unknown, as in many cases it was absorbed into an existing budget for the municipality or paid for in part by a non-government organization. The average cost per sign (among those that provided numbers and costs) was $43 (n=966 signs; $41,020).

**Staff Presentations**

Over half of the municipalities (54%, n=13) reported that staff had conducted presentations in some capacity to the community about the bylaw. Presentations varied in formality, from internal presentations (e.g., departmental staff) to formal presentations (e.g., public or city council). The most common target audience across population centres was city council.

Among small population centres, two thirds (67%, n=6) of municipalities had conducted presentations, primarily to city Council (n=4), other department staff (n=2), at public meetings (n=1), or to official community plan (OCP) members (n=1). Half of medium-centred population areas (50%, n=4) conducted presentations. These were directed towards business owners in advance of public hearings; internally to corporate administrative and leadership teams; recreation department staff; regional parks workers; community groups, including homeless, transit authority; and at public events, libraries, festivals and markets. In larger population centres, fewer than half (43%, n=3) of municipalities presented to target groups such as
departmental staff, parks, recreation and culture commission (appointed by council), as well as city council (n=3).

**Public Meetings**

Municipalities were asked if any public meetings were held regarding the bylaw. One third of municipalities (33%; n=8) reported holding at least one public meeting with the community. Very little or no costs were associated with conducting these public meetings, which were typically seen as part of standard operating procedures and were typically absorbed by the municipality.

**Materials utilized**

Almost half (45%, n=11) of the municipalities reported using promotional materials (pamphlets, brochures, posters) to communicate the new bylaw. A significant portion of the municipalities’ promotional materials (38%, n=9) were produced in house; therefore, the costs were minimal or unknown. For some municipalities that indicated costs, expenditures ranged from $750 (for 100 Business Guides) up to $2000 for unknown numbers of flyers or handouts.

Smaller centres produced/disseminated 12 to 150 brochures; Medium population centres produced 200 to 5000 brochures that were sent to business owners. Larger centres distributed significant numbers of materials but were uncertain of exact amounts.

**Additional Resources**

The majority of municipalities interviewed across the province (83%, n=20) had used additional resources in order to promote the new bylaw, and almost all of these communities (85%, n=17) utilized more than one type of resource. These resources included the municipality website, newsprint or radio advertising, direct mail or flyer advertising, newsletters, among others.

In the smaller population centres, 89% (n=8) used additional resources for bylaw promotion. Of these, 75% (n=6) of municipalities reported using their website; some (63%, n=5) used newsprint advertising, one of these (13%) was reported as earned media as opposed to purchased media; and one indicated using radio in addition to newsprint. One quarter (25%, n=2) utilized direct mail or flyer advertising. Other forms included community newsletters (n=1), postings at buildings (n=1), or hand-delivered information by bylaw officers (n=1). For half of the organizations (50%, n=4), additional resources attributed no cost due to website postings being internally absorbed. For advertising, two organizations paid $150-$200, and $2000, respectively.

In medium population centres, 75% (n=6) used additional resources to promote the bylaw. The majority of these (83%, n=5) used their website. Many (67%, n=4) used newspaper advertising; while 33% (n=2) reported using social media. Other forms of promotion included newsletters, info sheets, and the provision of signs to business owners. Costs associated with resources ranged from zero (33%, n=2), due to costs being absorbed as part of web maintenance, to about $2,000 (n=1) in the first few weeks after implementation. One municipality spent less than $5000, and another spent $40,000 before bylaw implementation and during the first year, and an additional $10,000 after bylaw initiation.
In the larger centres, 85% of municipalities (n=6) reported using additional resources, with the majority of these including website (83%, n=5), newspaper advertising/earned media (67%, n=4), direct mail distribution of flyers or Leisure Guide (33%, n=2), and social media (17%, n=1). Among the municipalities in these larger centres, 83% (n=5) reported that costs were low, insignificant or absorbed internally. One was unsure because the advertising was not specific to the smoking bylaw.

**Associated Budget**

Across all municipalities, by population centres, the cost for the vast majority of municipality bylaws (95%, n=23) came from an existing budget allocation. Only one medium-sized population centre reported that their bylaw had an associated budget, primarily because the municipality and local health authority had shared the costs associated with the bylaw. One municipality mentioned that the costs of the bylaw were absorbed by their operating budget, which cost less than $10,000 (medium centre). A municipality from a larger centre stated that their Health Authority covered some costs, but still operated from an existing budget.

**4.2 Bylaw Enforcement**

**Designated Bylaw Enforcement**

*Email responses are included in these calculations (n= 24 interview responses; n=4 by email).

In just over half of municipalities (54%, n=15), more than one position /role was designated to enforce of the SFOP bylaw. In each of these cases, a bylaw officer was included in this combination. In 39% of municipalities (n=11), Bylaw Enforcement Officers (BEO) were the only individuals that enforced the bylaw within the municipality. In 21% of municipalities interviewed (n=5), Tobacco Enforcement Officers from the Health Authority were engaged in SFOP bylaw enforcement.

In smaller population centres, BEOs made up 58% (n=11) of those enforcing the bylaw, along with local police service in 10% (n=2) of municipalities, RCMP in 10% (n=2) of municipalities. Other support came from operators of businesses (n=1), managers of any department (n=1), some municipality staff with “oath of office” (n=1), and the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), (n=1) of a municipality.

In medium population centres, all of the municipalities (100%, n=8) included BEOs to enforce the bylaw. All but one municipality (n=7) included other approaches. These included Local Police Services (38%, n=3), Tobacco Enforcement Officers from the Health Unit (63%, n=5), and RCMP officers (38%, n=3). One municipality employed both BEOs and Tobacco Enforcement officers for slightly differing purposes, whereby BEOs oversaw municipal property infractions and Tobacco Enforcement officers oversaw private/commercial property infractions. Others included the Medical Officer of Health; while another municipality was “unsure” if the police in their community enforced the bylaw.
In larger population centres, most municipalities (86%, n=6) employed BEOs to enforce the SFOP bylaw. In addition to BEOs, one municipality also reported that the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture as the signatory on enforcement could enforce the bylaw. Another municipality indicated that they also use summer students to patrol beaches and ask people to "butt out." The one municipality (that did not use BEOs) had appointed Park officers (rangers, supervisors, some senior staff) to enforce the bylaw.

**Enforcement Approach**

*Email responses are included with interview responses (n=24 interview responses; n=6 email)*

Across all population centres, more than half of municipalities (57%, n=17) reported that the municipality’s enforcement approach is entirely complaint driven. Almost a quarter (20%, n=6) stated that both routine inspections as well as a complaint driven approach have been implemented.

In smaller population centres, the enforcement approach is divided between an entirely complaint-driven approach (50%, n=7) and a combined approach involving both regular patrols and a response to complaints (21%, n=3). Other responses include providing education rather than ticketing (n=1), using a combination of regular patrols and seeking voluntary compliance/education (n=1). Another municipality simply enforces as they encounter violations (n=1). One municipality indicated that they had “no real approach.”

In medium population centres, two thirds of municipalities (67%, n=6) reported using a complaint-driven approach, with one individual stating that “it is a challenge for bylaw staff to issue tickets in BC since it requires asking for ID and would require significant increase in resources.” Another stated that they currently use a complaint-driven approach but were starting educational patrols using interns/summer students. Two municipalities (22%) indicated that they have adopted both approaches; one conducts site visits to businesses using an educational approach (n=1), while the other has rangers patrol the beach, while also responding to complaints. Other responses included taking an educational approach only and not any active enforcement (n=1).

In larger population centres, 57% (n=4) of the municipalities interviewed indicated their approach was entirely complaint-driven, while one (14%, n=1) reported that they used a combined approach of routine inspection and response to complaints. Other approaches included a combined approach of random patrols and responses to complaints (n=1), while another reported using “education as their first approach in the first year, along with mentoring, peer pressure and voluntary compliance (n=1).”

**Timeframe for warnings**

Across the province, the majority of municipalities interviewed (71%, n=17) reported implementing a grace period of issuing warnings rather than tickets. Once the grace period was completed, approximately 41% (n=7) of municipalities reported they continued to only issue warnings rather than tickets.
In the smaller population centres, 77% (n=7) implemented a grace period where warnings were issued. The grace period lasted anywhere from 4 weeks to 8 months or were ongoing, whereby only education and warnings are provided. The number of warnings issued varied from 0 to 6; however, one municipality tracked 831 “interactions” with people regarding smoking in parks. Another municipality did not track any incidents, and only provided verbal warnings rather than formally written warnings. The remaining municipalities (29%, n=2) reported they were working towards compliance and issued only warnings from the onset of the bylaw.

In medium population centres, 75% (n=6), the grace periods implemented for issuing warnings ranged from 3 to 6 months (n=3), and were “ongoing” for others (n=3). The number of warnings ranged from 2 to 3 for some municipalities (n=3), to fewer than 12 from 2007-2016 (n=1), and up to 20 for one municipality, which tracked specific locations (4 in parks; 2 in public square; 3 in pubs/restaurants; 3 grocery stores/markets; 8 various other businesses).

In the larger population centres, 57% (n=4) of municipalities issued warnings over a grace period of either 3 months (n=1), 6 months to a year (n=1), or on an ongoing basis (n=2). One municipality reported issuing less than 20 warnings over a 4-year period, since the implementation of the bylaw. Others (n=2) reported not having issued any warnings, and one was unsure of the number issued.

**Tickets/fines**

*Email responses included with interview responses (n=24)*

Across the province, two thirds of municipalities (67%, n=16) reported they had not issued tickets for outdoor smoking infractions. There were also zero tickets reported for electronic cigarette infractions by any municipality across the province.

In the smaller population centres, 80% of municipalities (n=8) had not issued any tickets, one had issued four tickets in total, and another was uncertain how many had been issued.

In medium population centres, half of the municipalities (50%, n=4) reported issuing zero tickets. One of these municipalities reported issuing zero tickets despite the fact that there had been 5260 inspections in 2015/16. Other medium-sized municipalities had issued a few tickets (n=3), while another had issued about 50 tickets. Among those that had issued tickets, one municipality had two tickets challenged in court, under the municipal adjudication process.

In the larger population centres, 57% (n=4) had not issued any tickets; one had not issued “many at all” but was unsure of the number. Two others were also uncertain whether their municipality had issued any.

**Enforcement Staff**

Almost all municipalities (96%, n=23) indicated that no additional bylaw enforcement officers were hired as a result of the SFOP bylaw implementation. One municipality had added an additional 1.48 FTE following the bylaw implementation.
**Enforcement Resources**

For the majority of municipalities (88%, n=21) funding had not been re-allocated for bylaw enforcement during rollout. Three municipalities (13%) indicated that resources had been re-allocated for enforcement purposes, one of which was added for the first 90 days only. One municipality reported using general officers and staff from existing programs for enforcement. For another municipality, funding for enforcement had not changed since 2010.

**Clean up costs**

Many municipalities (63%, n=15) indicated that clean-up costs are not differentiated from other types of general clean-up and maintenance, therefore the costs for specific cigarette butt waste clean-up are unknown. Nine municipalities (38%) reported that the cost was zero.

Three quarters of municipalities (75%, n=18) stated that the clean-up costs do not differ from those prior to the bylaw implementation. One indicated that the clean-up costs decreased after the bylaw was passed.

For those municipalities that include e-cigarettes within their bylaw (n=6), none indicated that there was a cost associated with e-cigarette waste. There was also no change in this cost from pre-bylaw implementation.

**Fire Risk**

**Pre-bylaw implementation**

For half of the municipalities across the province (50%, n=12), no fires were reported to be caused by cigarettes pre-bylaw. Eight municipalities (33%) indicated that they had received reports of fires caused by cigarettes pre-bylaw; however, five (21%) of these municipalities were unsure how many were reported. Among those that reported fires, one municipality reported that there had been “a few fires” (3 to 5) reported over the years, which was “part of the impetus for looking at such a bylaw”. Another reported there had been one or two fires. A third municipality reported three fires related to cigarette use for certain, with five others that “were probably related to cigarette use between 2010 and 2015 and that had caused more than $7000 insurance loss.” A fourth municipality indicated that cigarette-related fires did occur, but they were rare and that the municipality had not maintained good statistics.

**Post bylaw implementation**

After bylaw implementation, 13 municipalities (54%) reported they did not have any fires reportedly caused by cigarettes, while six (25%) reported that there had been fires attributed to cigarette use after the bylaw. One of these municipalities indicated there had been four fires in 2015 due to the drought, but believed things had improved post-bylaw; another reported one suspected fire post-implementation. Several other municipalities were unsure whether there had been any fires post-bylaw implementation.
4.3 Public Satisfaction and Support for bylaw

**Impact on the Community**

Of the 24 municipalities that participated in the interview process, 21 (88%) indicated that the bylaw had had a positive impact on the community, for various reasons. Those that did not report a positive impact (n=3) indicated that the bylaw had neither a positive nor a negative effect because: “the community was not a smoking community,” because it was simply “business as usual as no complaints were received.” One municipality indicated the bylaw had had no major impact because it became a “books bylaw” as opposed to well-known and well-enforced one.

Below are some comments provided by participants:

“Generally positive; has had groups that want a stricter bylaw to prohibit smoking altogether in certain areas. e.g., one commercial/residential group involving 25 businesses wanted more restrictions, however these cannot be enforced. Municipality has proposed a policy change for this group only (1 yr. pilot) to impose a no-smoking zone in their area. Can't be enforced, but hope more people will abide.”

“Most people saying thanks for doing it (implementing the bylaw), but haven’t had any complaints.”

“Positive feedback when people became aware that smokers had to be further from doors; negative feedback from smokers, who were forced out from covered areas and into the rain.”

“Positively - people embraced it, but had a few letters at outset re: rights infringement (not really complaining), same with e-cig restrictions.”

“Positively impacted community - feedback from the public and business owners has been good. Business owners are happy with the bylaw.”

“Anecdotally - generally positive, esp. in parks where we saw a big change in the # of smokers in parks: March 2015= 18.9 smokers per 1000 park users observed (crude rate); April-Oct 2015 combined rate of 9.0 smokers per 1000 park users; 11 out of 12 parks showed a decline in observed smoking rates. Biggest issue is the bus stops.”

**Public Complaints**

Across the province, the majority of municipalities (71%, n=17) had received complaints associated with the bylaw. Nine (38%) municipalities reported that the complaints came from multiple sources. Two municipalities indicated that many complaints came from the same individuals calling repeatedly, but they also came from multiple sources. Two other municipalities reported being unsure. Among complaints received, many municipalities (76%, n=13) reported that the most commonly reported issue was about individuals smoking in areas prohibited by the bylaw.
In small population centres, 67% (n=6) of municipalities reported a small number of complaints associated with the bylaw. The number ranged from 2 to 6 per year and the complaints were generally about individuals smoking in prohibited areas (n=3) (e.g., <7.5 metres from entrances or on patios). Other complaints were enquiries as to why the bylaw was not stricter (n=2), or as to where people were allowed to smoke (n=1).

The majority of medium-sized municipalities (88%, n=7) reported complaints from the community. Several reported only a few complaints (n=4), while another reported fewer than 20 complaints (n=1). One municipality reported about 40 calls over the last 2 years and another received 138 calls, only 20 of which were substantiated. The nature of the complaints varied, with several municipalities (n=6) reporting that complaints were primarily regarding individuals smoking in prohibited areas. Additional complaints were due to missing signage (n=1), or from individuals seeking clarification around private dwellings. Other complaints came from community-pubs that wanted to allow smoking on patios similar to the Legions and Veteran’s Associations, who had been grandfathered to allow smoking on patios. One complaint also came from a smoker about not having any place to smoke outdoors.

In larger population centres, just over half (57%, n=4) of municipalities received complaints regarding the bylaw. These municipalities received a range from none (n=1), to just a few (n=2), to 1-2 complaints per week (one municipality received this many calls initially but had not received any complaints in some time). The nature of the complaints involved individuals smoking in areas prohibited by the bylaw (patios, trails) (n=4); one complaint was in regards to enforcement and why more was not being done.

Method for submitting complaints

Across the province, all but one (96%, n=23) municipality (from a smaller population centre) reported multiple methods by which people could submit a complaint. The methods for issuing complaints were similar across centres; most municipalities had multiple methods by which people could issue complaints.

In smaller centres, six municipalities (67%) used a form-field submission on a website, 3 (38%) used email, and 2 (22%) used in-person complaint submissions. In medium population centres, all the municipalities (n=8) used email to receive complaints. One municipality also used social media and twitter, which were handled by their communications department. Two also (22%) used a website form. One (11%) received complaints in-person to either the City Council or the Mayoral offices. Lastly, one municipality also accepted complaints in writing because bylaw officers were obligated to respond to those. In larger population centres, almost all (86%, n=6) reported using an online or website system for complaints. In addition, 43% (n=3) of municipalities used email, 29% of municipalities (n=2) used in-person contact so that people could issue complaints/dispute fines more easily, one (11%) used written or faxes, another (11%) used Facebook, and lastly, one municipality (11%) used a smart phone application.

UBCM Resolution B92

Many municipalities (42%, n=10) expressed support for and frustration over UBCM B92, and the fact that the provincial government has not taken a lead role over this issue. Several others
(29%, n=7) felt that their municipality’s current bylaw has already addressed many of the issues within UBCM B92, so it was no longer an issue. Two individuals indicated that they had no comment on the issue, one of whom was unfamiliar with the ordinance.

Some comments provided by municipal staff:

In support of UBCM B92:

“[UBCM B92] is not something municipalities should have to deal with individually; the uncertainty is unfair to smokers if the rules are different from community to community. It's a public health issue that needs a higher sphere of influence.”

“Should be moved forward, would save staff time on their end; B92 would be great!”

“Municipal bylaw is the exact same as the UBCM B92, so it is very detailed and has many components; municipality has struggled with the province not taking the leadership role on this issue. Public Health has had to deal with cessation on its own; and the Municipality has had to deal with enforcement, etc.”

“Would be good if province could show more leadership on the issue.”

Other comments:

“Many of the resolution items already exist in our municipality so it doesn't impact us.”

“We're fine with it because it's not a huge issue.”

“Individual communities have taken it on themselves and it seems to be working well. I don’t know what the province is not doing with respect to smoke-free outdoor bylaws- I’m not sure what the provincial legislation is.”

“[We] don’t think it’s a priority.”

Opinion on Province’s Support for Effective SFOP bylaw implementation

There were many opinions shared regarding how the province could help ensure effective implementation of smoke and vape-free outdoor places. All interview participants (n=24) responded to this question. Just over half (54%, n=13) of municipality representatives reported that education (through public communication campaigns or other means) was required, and specifically, greater understanding around vaping (n=4) was an important way that the province could assist with clearing up misconceptions to ensure effective implementation of SVFOP.

One quarter of municipalities (25%, n=6) felt that the government needed to pass stronger, standardized provincial legislations and regulations. In this regard, one individual stated that the province has a "duty of care and an avenue of opportunity" when it comes to providing more funding and regulation, and “to pass legislation for Crown Land and provincial property that applies universally (reduces need for signage, etc. if everything is consistent).” One quarter
(25%, n=6) also felt that greater resources and support were required by municipalities to implement bylaws. One of these individuals felt this was necessary because “so much was being downloaded to municipal governments.” Some municipalities (17%, n=4) expressed that municipalities needed to be supported around enforcement in particular so they would have greater authority and resources to conduct enforcement activities. Three municipalities (13%) indicated that the government needed to act on and pass UBCM B92, with one person stating, “people are ready for it—the government just needs to do it already!”

Other comments provided:

"The provincial gov’t needs to educate the average person, implement public campaigns targeted toward the general public/clients of business owners who have to do their own policing on the smoking issue. It's a challenge for smokers too—fewer places to smoke; dealing with the Tobacco Industry that markets to increase smoking."

"[The government needs to…] address patchwork legislation as a starting point, aligning all municipalities up with same legislation. Providing more education re SHS in outdoor spaces."

“Provide own enforcement or give municipalities that power (can't regulate health—issues with Ministry of Health)"

"As far as the bylaw goes, everything has been fine. There has not been much impact on staffing. The public has been pretty receptive. This bylaw more than others has been used as an educational tool more than anything else, about getting the word out, creating smoke-free spaces and environments and it really did that."

Regarding e-cigarettes: The government needs to…

“Review legislation re: vaping—categorize same as cigarette smoking and strengthen regulations”

“Increase education and awareness around vaping/youth.”

“Provide more education, information and regulations re: vaping; assisting in facilitating process to make research more accessible to public, dialogue/debate...”

“Focus more on public education, especially in regards to vaping and vape-free outdoor spaces (a lot of misunderstanding that vape smoke isn't smoke, etc.)”

Additional thoughts

Q22. Is there anything else that you would like us to know about the implementation of your SFOP bylaw that has not been covered in these questions?

A large number of municipalities (83%, n=20) responded to this question. Among those that did respond, 6 communities (30%) reported that their bylaw was working well and that there were few or no public complaints about it. In support of the bylaw, one individual stated, “We weren't
the initiators of Smoke-Free Communities. Many other communities have taken the lead on this as well. We saw value in creating healthy lifestyles and want to ensure that every citizen has the right to good health.”

Another municipality shared the advice that “most helpful for us was a Stakeholder Working group - extremely helpful to have broad representation: i.e. Parks, Transit, CCS, Quit Now, among many others. We met regularly leading up to the implementation, helped to get people and groups on board [with the bylaw].”

A few participants discussed bylaw enforcement, with some indicating that they were experiencing some challenges with enforcement or that it was difficult to enforce. Others stated that “obtaining community buy-in” or the “goal of voluntary compliance” made enforcement a lot easier. Three other participants (15%) indicated that they were considering amending the bylaw in the future to accommodate various issues such as increasing the distance smoking was allowed from air intakes or to include provisions for marijuana and e-cigarette smoking restrictions.

**General comments:**

"After bylaw was passed, an info letter was sent to all businesses outlining key points that differed from previous version of bylaw. Also informed them of the 6-month grace period/timeframe they had to purchase/post their own signs. Surprised there were no complaints. Municipality doesn't actively enforce signage with businesses. When those few complaints were issued, they checked on signs, and all had them."

“It’s socially awkward/uncomfortable to approach someone who is smoking and threaten them with a ticket since it’s been okay for so long; it’s why having a lot of warnings and public information is important (make it common knowledge); getting buy-in makes enforcement easier”

“The business community has been their primary focus. It’s a small municipality and they haven't received any public complaints regarding other outdoor public places.”

**Comments regarding resource issues:**

"The Bylaw was promoted by citizens with good intentions and these types of health related bylaws are encouraged by our local health authority. Unfortunately, there is a BIG disconnect between the regulations and our resources (ability to enforce them). I believe most of our council was aware of the disconnect when they adopted the bylaw; but nevertheless they wanted the bylaw."

“Lacking budget to have communication strategy to get public informed/educated.”

“Need outside help for implementation—the presentation [by CCS that kicked off the whole thing] was positive but need more 3rd party advocates and resources.”

“Difficult to monitor/enforce”
The findings from this study indicate that across BC, outdoor smoke-free bylaws have been implemented by municipalities largely without significant additional financial or human resources. For example, only one of the 24 municipalities (4%) had hired additional enforcement (1.48 FTE) to support bylaw requirements. The implementation, promotion, and enforcement of these bylaws have required municipal staff time and in most cases involved promotional costs, but these have come from existing budgets using existing staff.

Regarding enforcement, more than half of municipalities interviewed reported that their enforcement approach primarily involved responding to complaints and that no additional enforcement officers were required, which keeps costs low. Although most communities reported that they are not actively ticketing offenders, some are. Two thirds of municipalities reported having issued zero tickets for outdoor smoking infractions. There were also zero tickets issued for electronic cigarette infractions by any municipality across the province. It is important to note that the number of reported incidents of ticket challenges in the court system or other system was very low (n=2 tickets), therefore requiring minimal additional staff time. In addition, most municipalities provided warnings and education over ticketing, implying that the bylaw is self-enforcing; and is an approach that has been received with great success.

There were also few costs associated with implementing the bylaw, although costs were often not tracked because they were primarily absorbed internally or provided in-kind by existing staff members. Signage was used by a large number of municipalities, which may serve to empower the public to take a stance against smoking in restricted areas. Regarding the complaints received by municipalities, individuals smoking in prohibited areas was the most commonly reported issue, indicating that signage is effective in conveying information to the public.

Many municipalities expressed support for UBCM B92, and felt that the government has not taken a lead role on this issue. Many shared the opinion that the province could help with effective implementation of smoke and vape-free outdoor places. It was suggested this could be done through greater education and public health campaigns particularly regarding vaping. Some individuals felt that the government needed to pass stronger, standardized and consistent provincial regulations. Others felt that greater resources and support were required by municipalities to implement bylaws. Some expressed that support was needed around enforcement in particular so they would have greater authority and resources to conduct enforcement activities.

Overall, the vast majority of municipalities reported that their current municipal bylaw had had a positive impact on communities, and for some municipalities, they bylaw had been implemented seamlessly and was not deemed an issue by community members or municipalities.
A: Interview Guide

We have several questions to ask about your municipality’s bylaw. It should only take about 10 to 15 minutes. To start, will you please confirm the bylaw number which specifies the outdoor smoke-free policy and which outdoor environments are regulated by the bylaw.

BYLAW # _______________________________________________________

Does the smoke-free bylaw include or restrict areas where e-cigarettes may be used?
1 YES
2 NO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The first few questions ask about the bylaw promotion and awareness, including resources allocated toward it:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>a) Was any public consultation conducted prior to the bylaw implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YES 2 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) If yes, what type(s) of consultations took place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Surveys/ Polls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Community Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Public Enquiries- email or phone line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Other ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Did the public consultation process influence changes to your draft bylaw?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YES 2 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) If so, what changes did you make? [OPEN TEXT RESPONSE]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How did you frame your communications about the bylaw to the public? For example:

1. **Protection (such as clean air)**
2. **Cessation (supporting smokers to quit)**
3. **Prevention (positive role modelling)**
4. **Environmental (reduced litter, fire risk, environmental protection)**
5. **Other? ________________**

3. a) Did the community use signs to communicate the new bylaw?
   1 YES
   2 NO
   
   b) If yes, How many? __________ (number)
   
   c) What was the cost to produce and post those signs? _________ ($)

4. a) Did staff do presentations?
   1 YES
   2 NO
   
   b) If yes, to whom? [open text or see prompt]

   PROMPT
   1. Departmental staff
   2. Other municipal departmental staff?
   3. Partner organizations/Collaborators?
   4. Other? __________

5. a) Did the community hold public meetings?
   1 YES
   2 NO
   
   b) If yes, do you know how many? __________ (number 1+)
   
   c) Was there a cost associated with these meetings?
   1 YES
   2 NO
   
   d) What was the cost to holding these public meetings? ________ ($)

6. a) Did the community use pamphlets, brochures and/or posters to communicate the new bylaw?
   1 YES
   2 NO
   
   b) If yes, how many? __________ (number 1+)
c) What was the cost to print and post these?
________ ($)

7. a) Were any other resources used to **promote** the new bylaw?
1 YES
2 NO
b) Other possible uses of resources to promote bylaw might be:
1 Advertising- newspaper, radio
2 Website
3 Flyer/ mail distribution
4 Other _________
c) If yes, what was the approximate cost of each of the resources that were allocated towards promotion and awareness of (Bylaw No.)?
________ ($)

8. a) Did the by-law have an associated budget or did all expenses come from existing budget allocations?
1 Bylaw had an associated budget
2 Expenses came from existing budget allocations

Did you have to move thing around within the existing budge, or were there committed funds? (can be both)

---

*The next few questions ask who is responsible for enforcing the outdoor smoke-free bylaw in your municipality, their enforcement approach, and the number of warnings and tickets that have been issued.*

9. In your municipality, who is designated to enforce the bylaw?

1. By law Enforcement Officer for Municipality
2. Local police service
3. Tobacco Enforcement Officer from the Health Unit
4. RCMP
5. Fire Department
6. Combination of these – Please explain:
7. Other? ________________________

10. The next question asks you to describe your municipality’s enforcement approach. Please indicate if your approach includes any of the following:

1. **Routine inspections**
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Responding to complaints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Other – Please specify:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. a) Did your community have a set period where there was a policy of issuing warnings instead of tickets – or other grace period?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) – If yes, for how long? _____ (# of weeks/months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) How many warnings have been issued since the implementation of (Bylaw No.)? ___________ (number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. a) How many tickets have been issued since the implementation of (Bylaw No.)? ___________ (number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) How many of these tickets/fines have been challenged in municipal courts or other appeal processes? _______ (0 or more)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) (If applicable) Were any of these related to e-cigarette use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In terms of resources allocated to your city/municipality’s enforcement staff, how many additional bylaw officers were hired as a result of the implementation of (Bylaw No.) in terms of Full-Time Equivalents (FTE)? _______ (0+ number of FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Did your municipality re-allocate resources initially <strong>to enforce</strong> this by-law during its rollout?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. a) What was the cost that was allocated towards clean up of cigarette butt waste? ___________ ($ amount)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Does this differ from before the bylaw was passed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) If yes, how does it differ? [OPEN TEXT]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) What was the cost that was allocated towards clean up of e-cigarette waste (e.g. battery-disposal, if applicable)? ____($)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Does this differ from before the bylaw was passed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) If yes, how does it differ? [OPEN TEXT]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 16. | a) Were there any fires in your municipality reported to be caused by cigarettes: |
|     | Before the Bylaw?                                    |
|     | 1 YES                                                 |
|     | 2 NO                                                  |
| b) | If yes, do you know how many? ________                |
| c) | After the Bylaw?                                     |
| 1 YES |                                                                 |
| 2 NO |                                                                 |
| d) | If yes, do you know how many? ________                |

**These next questions deal with public satisfaction including support for the bylaw or any reported complaints.**

| 17. | Overall, how has the Implementation of this bylaw positively and/or negatively impacted your community? |
|     | [OPEN TEXT]                                           |

| 18. | a) Have you received any calls regarding public complaints associated with (Bylaw No.) or outdoor smoking in general? |
|     | 1 YES                                                 |
|     | 2 NO                                                  |
| b) | Do you know how many? ________                        |
| c) | What was the nature of the complaints? [OPEN TEXT]    |
| d) | Are you able to tell me how many of these complaints came from multiple sources or the same people calling multiple times? |

| 19. | a) Is there another method by which people can submit a complaint? |
|     | 1 YES                                                 |
|     | 2 NO                                                  |
| b) | If yes, what is this method? [OPEN TEXT]              |
20. In thinking about the *UBCM Resolution B92* that was passed in 2012, how do you feel about the fact that no action has been taken by the provincial government to move that forward on this resolution?

[OPEN TEXT]

[For context: UBCM= Union of BC Municipalities

B92: Smoke Free Outdoor Public Places

B92 would see smoking banned on patios, in parks and playgrounds, on beaches, at public events and at least 7.5 meters from each of these locations as well as from doors, windows and air intakes of public buildings.]

21. Lastly, in your opinion, how could the Province help in ensuring effective implementation of smoke- and vape-free outdoor places?

[OPEN TEXT]

22. Is there anything else that you would like us to know about the implementation of your SFOP bylaw that has not been covered in these questions?

[OPEN TEXT]

Would you be interested in receiving a copy of the final report from this project?

☐ YES ☐ NO

IF YES, confirm email/mailing address. ____________________________________________

Thank you very much for taking the time to contribute to this research – we greatly appreciate it!
The Propel Centre for Population Health Impact was founded by the Canadian Cancer Society and the University of Waterloo.