

# THE TOBACCO INSTITUTE

1225 8TH STREET, SUITE 220  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

BONNIE HULSE  
State Director  
916 446-3543

November 20, 1980

TO: ROGER MOZINGO  
FR: BONNIE HULSE  
RE: POST ELECTION REPORT  
TAN/C.A.R.E. - NO ON PROP 10 CAMPAIGN

On November 4, 1980, the voters in California rejected Proposition 10 (the state wide anti-smoking initiative) by a vote of 54% NO - 46% YES. Proposition 10 was defeated in 53 of the 58 California counties; those counties that voted Yes on 10 were Alameda, Alpine, Fresno, Santa Cruz, and Yolo counties.

While the C.A.R.E. campaign staff must be given the large share of credit for a very effective campaign, the TAN grass roots campaign clearly made a significant political impact on the outcome of the No on 10 campaign.

California TAN volunteers have demonstrated during the past four months that their volunteer political involvement can have a significant impact when put to effective use.

The following is an up-date and final status report on TAN activity as outlined in my memo of October 25, 1980: PROGRESS REPORT #2.

1. Distribution of Campaign Literature (First & Second Version)

As of mid-October the following shipments of both the first and second version No on 10 brochures have been sent direct from the printer to member company locations:

<u>TOTAL QUANTITY</u>	<u>MEMBER COMPANY</u>
390,000	R.J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO CO.
320,000	PHILIP MORRIS, USA
240,000	U.S. TOBACCO
260,000	LORILLARD
201,600	BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOBACCO
100,000	LIGGETT & MYERS TOBACCO
<u>1,451,600</u> TOTAL	

680046813

The following represents the quantity of brochures sent from the California TAN office to industry locations:

<u>TOTAL QUANTITY</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
60,000	LORILLARD (NO. CA. Office)
6,000	L&M DISTRIBUTORS
6,000	GEORGE BENSEN & SON
6,000	PHILIPS & KING CIGAR
6,000	WM. BARRON CANDY CO.
6,000	CAPITOL CIGAR
6,000	ROWE VENDING
10,000	ROWE AUTOMATIC VENDORS
15,000	CA. GROCERS CONVENTION/NEVADA
<u>121,000</u> TOTAL	

The following represents the quantity of brochures sent from the printer direct to industry locations:

<u>TOTAL QUANTITY</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
24,000	BERCOVICH CIGAR
24,000	MELVIN SOSNICK CO.
24,000	L.B. BALL & CO.
24,000	ROYAL WHOLESALE
12,000	PALISADE WHOLESALE
12,000	FRED STICKLER & SON
6,000	L&M DISTRIBUTORS
6,000	GEORGE BENSEN & SON
6,000	PHILLIPS & KING CIGAR
6,000	WM. BARRON CANDY CO.
6,000	CAPITOL CIGAR
6,000	ROWE VENDING
10,000	ROWE AUTOMATIC VENDING
<u>166,000</u> TOTAL	

TOTAL NUMBER OF BROCHURES SHIPPED EITHER FROM THE PRINTER OR STATE TAN OFFICE TOTALS: 1,738,600. Balance of the brochures were shipped to miscellaneous locations and used to fill requests that were received in the TAN office from other industry locations and used in TAN and/or campaign mailings from the TAN office to TAN volunteers.

TAN volunteers participated in two literature distribution programs as outlined in the original request from the C.A.R.E. staff. This program was evenly distributed throughout California and brochures were displayed in varied degrees. No major problems resulted from this program and it is my opinion, based on feed-back from TAN volunteers, that this program was very well received throughout the industry.

**680046814**

The only area of concern regarding distribution of campaign materials dealt with the area of No on 10 Bumper Stickers. It was a campaign decision that only a limited supply of No on 10 bumper stickers would be printed. The initial supply that was allotted to TAN was divided among member company locations and major wholesalers. Following this distribution (for TAN volunteers) I received a flood of requests for more bumper stickers for distribution outside the immediate tobacco family. TAN volunteers were requesting that bumper stickers be sent to retailers and also used as a distribution program for gas stations, etc. These valid requests were forwarded to the campaign staff, but it was determined that no additional bumper stickers would be printed.

With the help of Jack Kelly, I was able to secure a small second supply of No on 10 bumper stickers that were again distributed to member company locations and major wholesalers. But this supply in no way came near to filling the requests and aims of the TAN volunteers with regards to bumper stickers.

2. NO on PROP 10 MAILINGS TO TAN VOLUNTEERS

As indicated in my memo of October 25, 1980: PROGRESS REPORT #2; a number of NO on PROP 10 mailings were completed to the California TAN volunteers, all California R.J. Reynolds employees, and all TAN prospects in California. These mailings were timely, informative, and were the vehicle by which the TAN volunteers were kept up-to-date on the status of the NO on 10 campaign.

3. TAN PHONE BANK ACTIVITY

The most complex and ambitious program that TAN volunteers participated in during the No on 10 campaign was without a doubt the vital "Get Out The Vote" phone bank activity.

Six locations were selected throughout the state for phone banks. Each location contained 10-14 phones and was staffed for three hours the evenings of Oct. 28-30 by TAN volunteers. This equates to 216 TAN volunteers donating 648 off-work hours to contact 1,800 TAN volunteers and 15,000 registered voters located in high priority precincts in California.

It was the responsibility of the State TAN Director to secure staffing for each phone bank location each evening of the phone bank schedule. Member company volunteers responded enthusiastically to this request and staffing was completed in record time. Grass roots efforts such as this do make a difference, just ask the 216 TAN volunteers who volunteered their off hours to help in this time of need.

680046815

November 20, 1980  
RE: POST ELECTION REPORT  
Page 4

I have completed a post election mailing to all TAN volunteers who participated in the "Get Out The Vote" phone bank, thanking them for volunteering.

Please refer to my memo of October 25, 1980: PROGRESS REPORT #2, which details phone bank locations, hours, staffing and responsibilities. The only exception to this information would be the two problem areas that we encountered. 1) The precinct lists were not available for night 1 of the phone bank and on night 2 and 3 the C.A.R.E. staff provided us with precinct walk sheets; 2) the San Diego location had to be moved after the first night, but this did not have a negative impact, and was handled smoothly.

NOTE:

It is difficult to outline the various duties and responsibilities that are part and parcel of any election campaign. In reflecting back over the past four months, I can remember times that I felt TAN could and should do more and times when I felt that the C.A.R.E. staff should make better use of the fine TAN volunteers in California. The campaign was a success, Prop 10 was defeated and TAN volunteers can be very proud of a job well done.

Due to Prop 10 and Prop 5 before it, TAN volunteers in California have demonstrated their ability to respond to state wide issues in a positive way. TAN volunteers in California have distributed campaign literature, walked precincts, worked campaign phone banks, monitored the media, distributed campaign information outside their industry, worked with speakers bureaus regarding issues, and attended TAN seminars. They have done all this time and again, and volunteered many off work hours to complete these important projects. Should the industry face another Prop 5 or Prop 10 in the future, maybe TAN should be given more responsibility and direct control over its many activities.

PROJECTION: Following the results of the November 4, 1980, election; GASP has announced that they will spend 1981 concentrating on local city and county anti-smoking legislation. The five counties that voted Yes on 10 are targeted for immediate action. TAN volunteers will monitor these five counties and a plan will be developed to counter any activity by GASP in this area. GASP representatives have indicated that they are "fragmented" after the election and local chapters will have to carry the burden on local levels.

BH/

680046816