



## NOVEMBER 2018

There is a growing body of scientific evidence that documents the harmful effects of secondhand smoke exposure, including the US Surgeon General's finding that there is no risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke, and the California Air Resources Board designation of secondhand smoke as a toxic air contaminant. Yet Californians are still exposed to secondhand smoke in multi-unit housing. Secondhand smoke drifts from neighboring units, patios, balconies and outdoor common areas into nonsmoking units through open windows, doors and shared ventilation systems.

In August 2018, the American Lung Association's Center for Tobacco Policy & Organizing commissioned a survey of nearly 600 California voters and an over sampled survey of nearly 350 California rural voters to gauge the level of support for policies restricting smoking in various areas of multi-unit housing and arguments in favor of smokefree housing policies. This document reports survey highlights and key findings.

### Survey Methodology

Goodwin Simon Victoria Research conducted a dual mode survey of California voters. First, a main sample of 600 voters (including urban, suburban, and rural) was drawn from a list of registered voters in California. Then pollsters over sampled an additional 274 rural voters. Combined samples provide results for a total of 362 rural voters. Rural voters were identified via a combination of census data and the Nielsen Claritas Prizm database. Interviews were completed online and by land line and wireless telephones, and in English and Spanish. Fielding took place between August 6 and August 17, 2018. The margin of error for the main study is +/- 4% and +/- 5.5% for rural only at a 95% confidence level.

### Resources

The Center for Tobacco Policy & Organizing has many resources on smokefree housing policies including additional survey results available at

[www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/tobacco-policy/smokefree-multi-unit-housing/](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/tobacco-policy/smokefree-multi-unit-housing/).

For model ordinance language for many of the policies in the survey, visit the website of the Change Lab Solutions at

[www.changelabsolutions.org/](http://www.changelabsolutions.org/).

# Summary of Key Findings



## 1. Attitudes about Secondhand Smoke in Multi-Unit Housing

Both California voters and California rural voters show about the same support for many types of policies to protect people from secondhand smoke exposure in multi-unit housing:

CA Voters		Rural
68%	Recall being bothered by secondhand smoke from tobacco products such as cigarettes or cigars	68%
65%	Support a law to restrict smoking in outdoor common areas of apartments	65%
55%	Support a law to restrict smoking in all areas of apartment buildings, including apartment units and balconies as well as outdoor areas.	57%
55%	Support a law to restrict smoking marijuana in all areas of apartment buildings, including apartment units and balconies as well as outdoor areas.	53%
61%	Believe that secondhand smoke from marijuana is harmful to those who are exposed to it	63%
74%	Feel a person moving into an apartment should be told if a tenant next door smokes	74%



## 2. Arguments in Favor of Smokefree Multi-Unit Housing Policies

California voters and California rural voters are receptive to the arguments in support of restricting smoking in multi-unit housing. Below are the top four reasons California voters were more likely to support smoking restrictions.

CA Voters		Rural
73%	Children are not protected from secondhand smoke exposure in apartment buildings and this can cause asthma and lung disease in children	76%
69%	Scientific studies prove that secondhand smoke is harmful in apartment buildings and nonsmokers are exposed to dangerous secondhand smoke in the one place where they spend the most time	70%
66%	Restricting smoking in apartment buildings will reduce the risk of fire	71%
60%	It will be less costly to clean and prepare for rental, there will be less damage to the units, and it could lead to lower security deposits and rent for tenants	32%