

Economics

Well designed, peer-reviewed studies conclude that laws requiring restaurants and bars to be smoke-free have a positive or neutral impact on businesses (1). 100% Clean Indoor Air means that no business will have an advantage over another to attract smoking customers. It's a level playing field, and it's worked in hundreds of cities across the country, even those whose suburbs haven't gone smoke-free yet. Want to know more? Check out summaries of economic studies (PDF) from Fort Wayne, IN; New York City, Chapel Hill, NC; California and others. Employer Savings Workplace smoking causes 81,000,000 lost work days annually according to the US Surgeon General (2). According to a report by the Conference Board of Canada, the average smoking employee costs an employer an additional \$2,565 each year in decreased productivity, increased life insurance premiums, smoking area costs, and increased absenteeism (3). Savings on Maintenance A survey of businesses conducted by the Building Owners and Management Association (BOMA) International found that the elimination of smoking from a building reduced cleaning expenses by an average of 10%. "A property with a no smoking policy would eliminate the need to clean ashtrays and cigarette butts; reduce the number of filter changes and cleaning; reduce the need for wall cleaning and painting; reduce the frequency of all horizontal dustings, and reduce vacuuming frequencies." (4) Smoking is a Safety Hazard A BOMA Fire Safety survey found that smoking was the number one cause of fires. Of fires occurring in non-residential buildings, 26% were attributed to smoking. Speaks Well for Us Clean Indoor Air shows prospective entrepreneurs, families and visitors that health is a priority in our city. When they visit, they'll see that Clean Indoor Air offers a better quality of life for everyone. It'll be an attractive reason to come to the Cleveland area. Avoid A Lawsuit According to the Employees and patrons of smoke-filled establishments may file a legal claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act, "if the smoke has a discriminatory effect by denying a person with a substantial smoke-related impairment access to a publicly accessible facility's goods or services," wrote Clifford E. Douglas in his March 2004 brief, The Americans with Disabilities Act: Effective Legal Protection Against Secondhand Smoke Exposure (PDF): "While the outcome has depended on the specific facts of each case, it is clear that a failure to accommodate a disabled person in a satisfactory manner can result in costly, not to mention avoidable, litigation for the private or public employer, place of public accommodation, or provider of services." (Douglas, 2004 (PDF)) What does the tobacco industry think? In countless cities and states, the tobacco industry has actively tried to scare businesses into opposing Clean Indoor Air Laws. Don't just take our word for it… Here's what Michael Casey, President of the Hotel & Restaurant Employees, Local 2, AFL-CIO, of San Francisco, had to say: "The tobacco industry tried to scare our members into thinking their employers would lose business due to the smoking ban, and that they would lose their jobs. …The restaurants, bars, and hotels where our members work did not suffer any adverse effects from the smoking ban. If anything, it's been good for business and customers as well as for our members." The tobacco industry has even paid researchers to conduct studies that link business losses (PDF) to Clean Indoor Air Laws. These studies use subjective information, like predictions or testimonials, instead of raw economic data like taxable sales receipts, income or employment. Before you believe the stats, be careful to ask how the research was conducted (PDF). All studies that have been published in reputable journals have either found 1. No correlation between economics and Clean Indoor Air Laws, or 2. A positive economic impact attributable to Clean Indoor Air Laws. You be the judge: Check out some of these studies (PDF) Citations Scollo, Lal, Hyland, & Glantz. (2003). Review of the quality of studies on the economic effects of smoke-free policies on the hospitality industry. Tobacco Control, 12, 13-20. Robbins, A., Fonseca, V., Chao, S., Coil, G., Bell, N., & Amoroso, P. (2000). Short term effects of cigarette smoking on hospitalization and associated lost workdays in a young healthy population. Tobacco Control, 9, 389-396. Conference Board of Canada. (1997). Smoking and the Bottom Line: The Costs of Smoking in the Workplace. <http://www.hc-sc-gc.ca/hecs-secs/tobacco/facts/bottomline/about.html> Garland, W.S. "BOMA Supports Smoking Ban in Buildings," <http://www.boma.org/Advocacy/AirQuality/SmokingPositionPaper.htm>, [n.d.].