

**Minutes of the
Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee (TEROC)
Monday, October 17, 2016**

Main Location:

California Department of Public Health
Feather River Room (74.451)
1616 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814

Alternate Location #1:

University of Southern California
2001 N Soto Street
Conference Room 301
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Alternate Location #2:

CIVIC Communications
5425 E. 4th Street
Long Beach, CA 90814

Alternate Location #3:

Stanislaus County Office of Education
Fishbowl Room
1100 H Street
Modesto, CA 95354

Alternate Location #4:

University of California, San Francisco
Center for Tobacco Control Research & Education
Suite 366, Library
530 Parnassus Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94143

Alternate Location #5:

University of California, Los Angeles
Conference Room 730
10940 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Alternate Location #6:

American Lung Association in California
2020 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92108

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dr. Michael Ong (Chair), Dr. Mark Starr, Dr. Robert Oldham, Dr. Lourdes Baézconde-Garbanati, Mr. Richard Barnes, Ms. Patricia Etem, and Ms. Vicki Bauman.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Dr. Alan Henderson (Vice-Chair), Dr. Claradina Soto, Dr. Pamela Ling, Dr. Wendy Max, Ms. Mary Baum, and Ms. Debra Kelley.

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Andrea Zvonicek, California Department of Public Health (CDPH)/California Tobacco Control Program (CTCP)
April Roeseler, CTCP
Carol McGruder, African American Tobacco Control Leadership Council (AATCLC)
Dr. Phillip Gardner, Tobacco Related Disease Research Program/ AATCLC
Dr. Catrina Taylor, CTCP
Dr. Valerie Yerger, AATCLC

Dr. Xueying Zhang, CTCP
Francisco Michel, CTCP
Frank Ruiz, CTCP
Greg Oliva, CDPH
John Lagomarsino, CDE
Linda Dornseif, CTCP
Nadine Roh, CTCP
Richard Kwong, CTCP
Sarah Planche, CDE
Tim Gibbs, American Cancer Society-Cancer Action Network
Tom Herman, CDE
Tonia Hagaman, CTCP

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTION

The TEROC Chair, Dr. Ong, called the meeting to order at 9:14 a.m. TEROC members and guests introduced themselves.

2. PROPOSITION 56

Dr. Ong began the discussion by indicating that passage of Proposition 56 (Prop 56) would represent fulfillment of one of the key objectives in the TEROC Master Plan. Dr. Ong asked Mr. Gibbs from the American Cancer Society-Cancer Action Network to provide an update on the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign.

Mr. Gibbs reported there was a significant increase in the amount of advertising by the “No on Prop 56” campaign and the types of media channels being utilized. Mr. Gibbs added that at this point in the election cycle, the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign was in a stronger position than the previous two tobacco tax initiatives, with more television advertising on the air. In addition, the campaign has received endorsements from all major newspapers in the state with the exception of the Orange County Register and the Riverside Press-Enterprise newspapers.

Mr. Gibbs reported the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign was outpacing the opposition in earned media, with several news events taking place. This included an event in front of the Altria Building in Sacramento where the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign dumped 5,600 toe tags into a coffin decorated with the Marlboro logo. The toe tags represent the number of children who would start smoking in 2016 and die from tobacco-related diseases. A web advertisement was developed from the event and placed on the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign website. This event will be repeated in other cities including, Chico, Eureka and Salinas.

Mr. Gibbs stated that although the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign was making progress, they were still contending with efforts from the tobacco industry to defeat the tobacco tax. The industry recently contributed an additional \$10 million dollars for the “No on Prop 56” campaign, for a total of \$66 million. Mr. Gibbs added there was a new “No on 56” ad that tried to obscure the ad disclaimer (at the end of the ad) by using white lettering on a white background, which is illegal. The ad falsely claimed the campaign was exempting itself from auditing requirements, which is false. The “Yes on Prop 56” campaign was considering taking action against the “No on Prop 56” campaign.

Mr. Gibbs acknowledged that in response to TEROC members expressing concern at the September 29, 2016 meeting that activation of tobacco control networks for the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign was insufficient, proactive outreach was done.

Mr. Gibbs indicated the key strategy to support the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign was to participate in phone banking. The voluntary health agencies and Planned Parenthood had made approximately 50,000 phone calls and had spoken to 15,000 voters.

General Discussion:

Dr. Ong acknowledged the importance of reaching out to voters, adding that Proposition 29 was defeated by fewer than 30,000 votes. He added that it appeared to him that previous concerns about the direction of the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign at the September meeting had been resolved.

Dr. Starr asked about the strategy to counter tobacco industry claims in the “No on 56” ads. Specifically, he wanted to know how much effort should go towards countering tobacco industry claims vs. pushing the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign’s own messages.

Mr. Gibbs responded the “Yes on Prop 56” campaign initially focused on a “softer” approach pushing positive messages about what Prop 56 would accomplish. However, with the increase in the opposition’s advertising campaign, it had become important to also counter the misleading and false claims that the “No on Prop 56” campaign has been pushing.

Action Items:

There were no action items.

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:59 a.m.