

Appendix 1. Level of Government Targeted to Advance Safe Consumption Site Policy

	Description of Approach	Quotations Explaining Approach
City or county	All five jurisdictions were pursuing local government policy mechanisms to establish safe consumption sites (e.g., health department approval, emergency declaration, city ordinance). Two jurisdictions focused exclusively on policy mechanisms available at the city/county level because state government level support was not feasible. Both had executive branch support (i.e., mayor, health department). One jurisdiction's city council had allocated funding for a safe consumption site.	<p>“We advocated not to do [state legislation] because we knew that it couldn't pass the legislature because of split control. . . . [There was] concern that having a bill fail can create the impression that without that bill, you can't do it, but that's not true. The public health department can do it without the bill so we were afraid of detrimental effects from a failed bill.”</p> <p>“The mayor could declare a public health emergency. This is how they established syringe services. Another mechanism could be an ordinance from the city council that would be renewed in perpetuity.”</p>
State legislation	In three of the five jurisdictions, state legislators had introduced bills authorizing safe consumption sites. None had passed at the time of this study, but sponsors were planning to re-introduce bills in subsequent legislative sessions. Participants from the two jurisdictions in states that had not introduced legislation authorizing safe consumption sites opted not to do so given the political composition of their state legislatures.	<p>“In [X state], the long game is to get legislation passed . . . if it passes, it will be a game changer on this issue for the state and the country.”</p> <p>“We could have introduced the [state] legislative package and tried to build movement in [X city], but I don't think [X city] is conducive to that. . . . [Other cities planning to implement safe consumption sites] are the biggest tax generators in their state. . . . [X city] can't do its own thing in the same way that those [jurisdictions] can.”</p>
Multiple pathways	In the three jurisdictions pursuing state legislation, the state legislation was part of a broader strategy that involved pursuing local-level policy change as well. Advocates in one jurisdiction also were working to push the state executive branch (i.e., governor and state health department) to authorize safe consumption site implementation as pilot research.	<p>“[T]he legislative push is supporting the [research] pilot push. . . . In our mind, of course we want to pass legislation. The legislation supports the pilot efforts and the pilot efforts support the legislation.”</p> <p>“[There is a] whole other conversation to be had about the state legislation we're running—a state bill to create authorization for the city to create [safe consumption sites] and protect the city from state law.”</p>

Bracketed text indicates editing by the authors either to clarify the context of the quotation or to substitute potentially identifying information with more generic language.