

MARKET DEMAND FOR SMOKE-FREE RULES  
IN MULTI-UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES  
&  
LANDLORDS' EXPERIENCES  
WITH SMOKE-FREE RULES

April 2009

Prepared by:

The Massachusetts Smoke-Free Housing Project  
Public Health Advocacy Institute  
Northeastern University School of Law  
Boston, Massachusetts

Massachusetts Smoke-Free Housing Project  
Public Health Advocacy Institute, Inc.  
Northeastern University School of Law  
102 The Fenway, Suite 117  
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

(617) 373-2026  
[www.phaionline.org](http://www.phaionline.org)

# INDEX

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Introduction . . . . .   | 4  |
| Executive Summary and Key Findings. . . . .                                    | 6  |
| Methodology . . . . .  | 8  |
| Research Results and Findings . . . . .  | 10 |
| Respondent Composition in Survey of Residents . . . . .                        | 10 |
| Current Inventory of Smoke-Free Multi-unit<br>Residential Properties . . . . . | 12 |
| Demand for Smoke-Free Multi-unit Residential<br>Housing . . . . .              | 14 |
| Residents' Support for Smoke-Free Rules . . . . .                              | 16 |
| Respondent Composition in Survey of Landlords . . . . .                        | 18 |
| Landlords' Experiences with Smoke-Free Rules . . . . .                         | 19 |
| Conclusion . . . . .   | 21 |
| Appendix . . . . .   | i  |

## INTRODUCTION

In response to the high levels of morbidity and mortality caused by exposure to secondhand smoke, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts prohibited smoking in nearly all work and public places starting in 2004. Passage of this law substantially reduced exposure with some dramatic health benefits. A recent report released by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health demonstrated that there were 577 fewer than expected heart attack deaths each year after the passage of the smoke-free law.<sup>1</sup>

Exposure in the home, however, remains a significant threat to public health. In the 2006 Report entitled *Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke*, the United States Surgeon General concluded that the home is “a major location of secondhand smoke exposure for adults.” The Report found that nonsmokers who are exposed to secondhand smoke at home increase their risk of developing lung cancer by 20% to 30% and their risk of heart disease by 25% to 30%.

The Report also concluded that the “home is the place where children are most exposed to secondhand smoke.” Children exposed to secondhand smoke are more likely to develop bronchitis, pneumonia, asthma and ear infections.<sup>2</sup> In addition, secondhand smoke has been linked to Sudden Infant Death Syndrome.<sup>3</sup> Given these proven health consequences, it is not surprising that secondhand smoke exposure causes a substantial strain on private and public healthcare payers in Massachusetts.

In order to protect children and other vulnerable populations from exposure in the home, the Massachusetts Tobacco Control Program launched the Smoke-Free Families Initiative in the winter of 2008. Consisting of three major components, the initiative strives to raise awareness of secondhand smoke as an issue, integrates that message in to existing protocols within health and human service agencies and encourages landlords and property managers to adopt smoke-free policies within their multi-unit buildings. The Public Health Advocacy Institute is leading the effort to increase the availability of smoke-free housing in the Commonwealth.

While some people are able to avoid exposure by simply prohibiting smoking in their homes, this solution may not be enough to protect residents of multi-unit buildings, as secondhand smoke is often not contained inside an apartment or condominium unit. Instead, the smoke seeps under doors, through ventilation ducts, wall chases, electrical sockets, light fixtures, cracks in building walls or other openings. After seeping into neighboring condominium units or apartments, secondhand smoke can stay in the air for hours, exposing nonsmokers and their families for long periods of time.<sup>4</sup>

In order to provide accurate information on market demand and other economic rationales for smoke-free rules, the Public Health Advocacy Institute conducted two surveys in the summer of 2008. The first of the two surveys measured the supply of and demand for smoke-free multi-unit residential properties. The second survey assessed the experiences of landlords who have implemented smoke-free rules. The findings of both surveys are presented in this Report.

In general, the surveys reveal a strong demand for smoke-free rules among residents of multi-unit residential properties. (For purposes of this Report, the phrase “smoke-free rule” means a building-wide, no smoking rule that prohibits smoking anywhere in or on the property, except for designated smoking areas located outside.) Of the residents who reside in smoke-free properties, 91% support the rule, and just 2% oppose it. Among residents that live in buildings where smoking is currently allowed, 61% would support the immediate implementation of a no smoking rule, and approximately 75% would support the change or remain neutral. The demand is largely consistent across age, educational status, income level and housing type.

Despite the demand, however, just over 29% of multi-unit residential properties are smoke-free. The substantial gap between demand and supply suggests that landlords and condominium associations are in a position to benefit by going smoke-free. Indeed, in the survey of landlords, nearly all of the respondents who had implemented a smoke-free rule reported that it decreased their operating costs, increased demand for their properties and was easy to implement and enforce. Given the potential benefits, it would not be surprising if Massachusetts experienced a substantial increase of smoke-free multi-unit housing.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND KEY FINDINGS

### SURVEY OF RESIDENTS OF MULTI-UNIT PROPERTIES IN MASSACHUSETTS

A 2008 telephonic survey conducted by the Public Health Advocacy Institute reveals a strong demand for smoke-free rules among the residents of multi-unit properties in Massachusetts. Smoke-free rules prohibit smoking everywhere in an apartment building or condominium, except for designated smoking areas located outside. Smoke-free rules are intended to prevent secondhand smoke from drifting from one apartment or condominium unit to another, and thus, prevent involuntary exposure. Smokers may live in the building under a smoke-free rule and often do reside in these properties. They are simply required to refrain from smoking, except in designated smoking areas located outside.

The Survey was funded by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health and administered by SurveyUSA™ between June 20th and June 26th, 2008. The survey includes 1,304 interviews with residents of multi-unit properties in Amherst, Cambridge, Brookline, Easthampton, Hadley, Jamaica Plain, Newton, Northampton, Somerville, Southampton and Watertown. The questionnaire screened respondents to ensure that they resided in a multi-unit rental property or condominium before asking questions designed to measure demand for smoke-free rules. The Survey revealed the following key findings:

- 75% of residents who do not currently live in a smoke-free building would support the immediate implementation of a no smoking rule or remain neutral. The level of support would likely be even higher if the rule were phased in over the period of a year.
- Of the residents who currently live in a smoke-free multi-unit building, 91% support the rule. Just 2% are opposed.
- 81% of prospective residents are immediately less interested in an apartment or condominium unit if they smell tobacco smoke when looking at it.
- 43% of residents are willing to pay more to live in a smoke-free building. Of these residents who are willing to pay more, 26% are willing to pay 20% more, and 63% are willing to pay 10% more.
- 69% of residents of multi-unit properties are more interested in knowing up front, in the property listing that an apartment or condominium unit is located in smoke-free building. Fewer than 20% feel this listing information would make no difference in their decision.
- The levels of support and demand are widely held, remaining consistent across gender, age, educational status, income level and housing type

## SURVEY OF LANDLORDS OF MULTI-UNIT RESIDENTIAL RENTAL PROPERTIES

A 2008 survey by the Public Health Advocacy Institute reveals that 99% of landlords who had implemented a smoke-free rule felt it was a good decision. The respondents reported that implementing the rule increased demand for their property and decreased their operating costs. Two-page questionnaires were mailed to 6,809 landlords in Amherst, Cambridge, Brookline, Easthampton, Hadley, Jamaica Plain, Newton, Northampton, Somerville, Southampton and Watertown. Mailing lists were provided by the assessor's office in each municipality. Although not necessarily representative of landlords in general, the following are the key findings from the survey:

- 99% of the landlords who had implemented a smoke-free rule felt it was a good decision.
- 66% of the landlords reported having to pay \$100 or more extra in smoking-related maintenance costs per apartment compared to an apartment where smoking was not allowed. 33% expended more than \$500 extra.
- 7% of the landlords reported that secondhand smoke has triggered fire alarms.
- 5% of the landlords report that smoking caused a fire in one or more of their residential rental properties.
- 39% of the landlords who had implemented a smoke-free rule reported that it decreased the number of disputes among tenants, and 54% reported no effect on disputes.
- 90% of the landlords who had implemented a smoke-free rule reported that implementation was easy or very easy.
- 93.3% of the landlords who had implemented a smoke-free rule reported that the rule was virtually self-enforcing, the same as enforcing any other rule or easy to enforce. Only 6.7% reported encountering difficulty in enforcement.
- 15% of the landlords who had implemented a smoke-free rule reported that it decreased their vacancy rates, and 77% reported no effect on vacancy rates.
- 19% of the landlords who had implemented a smoke-free rule reported that it decreased their turnover rates, and 78% report no effect on turnover rates.
- 49% of the landlords reported that a smoke-free rule decreased their potential legal liability, and 42% reported no effect.

Despite the apparent benefits of implementing a smoke-free rule, only 29% of multi-unit properties the survey region are smoke-free. The difference suggests that there may be barriers for the implementation of smoke-free rules. One potential barrier is the misperception that smoke-free rules are or may be illegal. Among landlords who had not implemented a smoke-free rule, 19.4% believed that a smoke-free rule was illegal, and 35.8% were unsure of the legality.

# METHODOLOGY

## RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- Gauge the interest in, and market demand for, smoke-free rules in multi-unit properties (including residential rental properties and condominiums).
- Measure the percentage of the multi-unit housing stock with smoke-free rules.
- Assess the experiences of landlords in implementing smoke-free rules.
- Evaluate potential barriers for implementation of smoke-free rules.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

To accomplish the objectives outlined above, the Public Health Advocacy Institute conducted two surveys: an automated, random telephonic survey administered by SurveyUSA™ of 1,304 residents in multi-unit dwellings, and a written survey mailed to 6,809 landlords with a response rate of 5.5 percent (or 372 completed surveys).

Three geographic regions in Massachusetts were selected for the two surveys. The first region was comprised of Cambridge, Somerville and Watertown. The second region was comprised of Brookline, Newton and the Jamaica Plain area of Boston. The third region was comprised of Amherst, Easthampton, Hadley, Northampton and Southampton.

The regions were selected due to their high demand for housing and large inventory of multi-unit residential properties. The demand for and supply of multi-unit housing in each region was determined by analyzing the 2000 Federal Census, various housing surveys and community assessments were conducted. Interviews of area real estate brokers were also completed.

The telephonic surveys were administered by SurveyUSA.™ Each survey was limited to area codes that cover one or more of survey regions. To confirm that the respondent actually resided in the geographic region, initial screening questions were included. The telephonic surveys were administered separately by region using Interactive Voice Technology™ between June 20, 2008 and June 26, 2008.

The results of the three regions were then combined. To adjust for differences in the sample size for each region, three adjustment weightings based on the total number of adults in the region who lived in multi-unit housing were generated. The appropriate adjustment weighting was then multiplied by the individual respondent weightings provided by SurveyUSA™.

The mail survey was administered by the Public Health Advocacy Institute. Mailing information for landlords was obtained from municipal assessors' offices. If an individual landlord had more than one listing, the extra listings were purged to avoid



duplicate copies being sent to a single individual. Next, the listings were randomized. Lastly, approximately the first 6,800 listings were chosen, which was the maximum number of mailings that could be accommodated under our budget.

Each mailing consisted of a two-page questionnaire printed on the front and back of a single sheet of paper, along with instructions on completing the survey. To encourage responses, a drawing for a \$500 retail gift certificate was offered. The surveys were mailed June 30, 2008, and responses were required to be postmarked by July 25, 2008.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN:

The questionnaire was designed by the Public Health Advocacy Institute with input from the Massachusetts Tobacco Control Program and SurveyUSA.<sup>™</sup> The design process was informed by reviewing secondhand smoke attitudinal surveys used in other states and other surveys measuring demographic information commonly included in smoking and health related surveys.

After screening for eligibility, the resident questionnaire identified respondents' exact housing type, smoking habits, the smoking habits of household members and the awareness of secondhand smoke as a danger. The remainder of the questionnaire was designed to accomplish the objectives outlined above. The questionnaire also gathered general demographic information, which was collected to document future attitudinal shifts within demographic groups and to ensure survey accuracy, which was achieved by comparing data collected here with the demographic data from the 2000 Federal Census.

As the method used to develop the landlord mailing list narrowed the field to only eligible respondents, the questionnaire included only one screening question to verify eligibility. The questionnaire then identified the total number of residential rental properties owned by the respondent and the average size of the properties. The remainder of the questionnaire was designed to achieve the objectives outlined above.

## RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### I. RESPONDENT COMPOSITION IN SURVEY RESIDENTS OF MULTI-UNIT PROPERTIES

Residents of multi-unit rental properties and condominiums located in any of the three survey regions were eligible as respondents. Combined, the three regions include the municipalities of Amherst, Cambridge, Brookline, Easthampton, Hadley, Jamaica Plain, Newton, Northampton, Somerville, Southampton and Watertown.

If the respondent was either a landlord in the property where he resided, or if the respondent owned more than one-half of the units in the condominium where he lived, he was excluded from completing the full questionnaire. These otherwise eligible respondents were excluded because we felt that their opinions would likely deviate significantly from that of most residents of multi-unit properties, and therefore, tend not to accurately reflect market demand.

Also excluded were respondents residing in college dormitories or other housing provided by a college or university. We believed most respondents living in this type of housing are not familiar with the conditions, pricing and policies of market rate multi-unit housing in Massachusetts. College students and college-age individuals who resided off campus were, however, eligible to complete the entire survey unless more than three such individuals lived in the same apartment or condominium unit.

Tables 1A, 1B and 1C display general demographic information on residents who completed the full questionnaire. The demographic information in these three tables closely tracks data available from the 2000 Federal Census, which suggests an accurate sampling was achieved.

| <b>TABLE 1A</b>               |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Gender and Age of Respondents |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Gender                        |        | Age   |       |       |       |       |       |
| Male                          | Female | 18-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+   |
| 45.3%                         | 54.7%  | 12.1% | 38.7% | 16.9% | 12.3% | 8.5%  | 11.7% |

| <b>TABLE 1B</b>                     |         |              |            |         |         |
|-------------------------------------|---------|--------------|------------|---------|---------|
| Education and Income of Respondents |         |              |            |         |         |
| Education                           |         |              |            | Income  |         |
| College +                           | College | Some College | No College | < \$60K | > \$60K |
| 53.1%                               | 21.7%   | 15.2%        | 9.9%       | 49.6%   | 50.4%   |

| TABLE 1C                      |                    |             |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Housing Type of Respondents   |                    |             |
| House Divided into Apartments | Apartment Building | Condominium |
| 15%                           | 52%                | 33%         |

The prevalence of smoking-related health conditions among residents and those who share a household with residents were measured. We felt that residents who have (or live with someone who has) one of these conditions would tend to avoid exposure to secondhand smoke by living in smoke-free properties. Prevalence rates among the survey respondents are displayed in Table 1D. These health conditions were chosen because they are, according to the 2006 Surgeon General’s Report *The Health Consequences of Involuntary Exposure to Tobacco Smoke*, some of the most common smoking-related health conditions.

| TABLE 1D   |                       |                                 |                          |                               |               |        |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Smoking-Related Health Conditions of Respondents |                       |                                 |                          |                               |               |        |
| Child Health Conditions *                        |                       |                                 | Adult Health Conditions* |                               |               |        |
| Asthma   | Chronic Ear Infection | Frequent Respiratory Infections | Asthma                   | Chronic Respiratory Condition | Heart Disease | Stroke |
| 19%  | 7.1%                  | 5.6%                            | 19.6%                    | 10.6%                         | 8.1%          | 4.3%   |

\*Respondents who indicated “Not Sure” are not included.

The residents’ smoking behavior was also measured, as we expected residents who smoke would tend to avoid properties with smoke-free rules. Phrasing for the questions on smoking behavior were taken from the Massachusetts Behavior Risk Statewide Survey, which measures, among other health risk factors, smoking status. The prevalence rates among survey respondents are displayed in Table 1E. In comparison, the statewide average for current smokers is 16.4%.<sup>5</sup>

| TABLE 1E                             |           |                   |           |       |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-------|
| Smoking Behavior of Respondents      |           |                   |           |       |
| 100 Cigarettes in Respondents’ Life* |           | Smoking Frequency |           |       |
| More Than                            | Less Than | Every Day         | Some Days | Never |
| 35.3%                                | 63.9%     | 27.2%             | 12.8%     | 59.9% |

\*Respondents who indicated “Not Sure” are not included.

The resident’s perception of the danger of secondhand smoke was also assessed, as we felt that residents who are aware of the health effects of secondhand smoke are more likely to avoid exposure by living in smoke-free properties. The perception of residents about secondhand smoke is displayed in Table 1G.

| TABLE 1G   |                  |                |             |          |
|--|------------------|----------------|-------------|----------|
| Respondents' Perception of Secondhand Smoke Exposure |                  |                |             |          |
| Very Harmful   | Somewhat Harmful | Minor Nuisance | Not Harmful | Not Sure |
| 66.7%  | 25.4%            | 5%             | 1.9%        | 1%       |

Despite the high level of awareness shown in Table 1G, a relatively low number of residents currently live in multi-unit residential properties with smoke-free rules. This inconsistency is discussed in the following section.

## II. CURRENT INVENTORY OF SMOKE-FREE MULTI-UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES IN MASSACHUSETTS

One factor in assessing market demand for smoke-free housing is the current supply of residential properties with smoke-free rules. We gathered information on smoking rules by asking the following question:

“In the building where you live, is smoking allowed in both common areas and inside individual apartments? Is smoking allowed only in individual units? Or is smoking not allowed in the building at all?”

Respondents were not afforded the opportunity to answer “Not Sure.” By excluding this option, we intended to encourage respondents, even those who might be unfamiliar with the smoking-related rules of their buildings, to make a best guess.

Results indicated that only 28.7% of residents are covered by a smoke-free rule. This percentage is interpreted as meaning that approximately 28.7% of multi-unit residential properties in the survey area are smoke-free. The percentage is largely consistent across the demographic range, including gender, age and income, as indicated in Table 2A.

| TABLE 2A                   |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Smoking-Related Rules      |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|                            | Gender |        | Age   |       |       |       |       |       | Income |        |
|                            | Male   | Female | 18-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | <\$60K | >\$60K |
| 100% No smoking            | 27.2%  | 29.9%  | 47.2% | 27.9% | 25%   | 23.9% | 25%   | 22.1% | 29.5%  | 28.3%  |
| No smoking in Common Areas | 40.2%  | 42.6%  | 25.2% | 44.5% | 46.4% | 40.9% | 44.6% | 42.9% | 39.6%  | 43.4%  |
| No Related Rules           | 32.6%  | 27.5%  | 27.7% | 27.5% | 28.6% | 35.2% | 30.4% | 35.1% | 30.8%  | 28.3%  |

Given a higher smoking prevalence among 18-24 year olds, as compared to other age groups,<sup>6</sup> it is somewhat surprising that the group was also more likely than other respondents to live in a smoke-free building. In response to the question of whether they smoke cigarettes every day, 18-24 year olds responded “Yes” nearly twice as often as any other age group. The finding is suggestive that even smokers, at least those aged 18-24, will not avoid living in properties with smoke-free rules.

Information on resident education level and the existence of a smoke-free rule is shown in Table 2B. As educational level negatively correlates with smoking status in general,<sup>7</sup> it is not surprising that the survey found that residents with higher education levels were more likely to reside in a smoke-free building.

Also presented in Table 2B is data on the existence of smoke-free rules across three types of multi-unit housing type. Just over 52% of smoke-free properties consisted of houses that had been divided into apartments. The fact that divided houses tend to be owner-occupied may suggest that owners tend to establish smoke-free rules to avoid exposing themselves. Additionally, the passive ventilation common to divided houses can contribute to drifting secondhand smoke. Unlike active ventilations systems used in larger buildings to service individual apartments or condominium units, passive ventilation relies on air moving through doorways, hallways and stairways throughout the entire building. (It should be noted that drifting secondhand smoke also occurs in many types of active ventilation systems.)

Another factor that potentially influences the occurrence of smoke-free rules is the implementation process. For landlords or property managers, the implementation process is easy. They can decide unilaterally to institute a smoke-free rule. When they decided to do so, they typically phase in the new smoke-free rule during lease renewal or when new tenants sign their lease, which means that a property will be smoke-free in one year. Where tenants have month-to-month leases, otherwise known as a tenancies-at-will, the property will be smoke-free in about a month. By contrast, making a condominium smoke-free is slightly more complicated. Making a condominium smoke-free requires a vote of unit owners. Typically, 75% or more of unit owners must vote in support of the rule change. (Trustees can make their condominium’s common areas smoke-free without a vote of unit owners.)

| TABLE 2B                   |                           |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------|--------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Smoking-Related Rules      |                           |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|                            | Education                 |         |              |            | Housing Type                  |                    |             |
|                            | College & Graduate School | College | Some College | No College | House Divided into Apartments | Apartment Building | Condominium |
| 100% No smoking            | 29.7%                     | 30.6%   | 28.9%        | 19.5%      | 52.3%                         | 29.5%              | 16.7%       |
| No smoking in Common Areas | 44.2%                     | 39.5%   | 33.5%        | 43.8%      | 19%                           | 40.6%              | 53.3%       |
| No Related Rules           | 26.1%                     | 29.9%   | 37.6%        | 36.7%      | 28.7%                         | 29.9%              | 30%         |

Table 2C compares smoking-related diseases among children and adult residents with the smoking rules for their buildings.

| TABLE 2C                   |                         |                        |                                 |                         |                               |               |        |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Smoking-Related Rules      |                         |                        |                                 |                         |                               |               |        |
|                            | Child Health Conditions |                        |                                 | Adult Health Conditions |                               |               |        |
|                            | Asthma                  | Chronic Ear Infections | Frequent Respiratory Infections | Asthma                  | Chronic Respiratory Condition | Heart Disease | Stroke |
| 100% No smoking            | 21.1%                   | 27.3%                  | 17.6%                           | 32%                     | 25.9%                         | 22.9%         | 38.6%  |
| No smoking in Common Areas | 42.1%                   | 31.8%                  | 11.8%                           | 42.2%                   | 36.7%                         | 47.6%         | 49.1%  |
| No Related Rules           | 36.8%                   | 40.9%                  | 70.6%                           | 25.8%                   | 37.4%                         | 29.5%         | 12.3%  |

### III. DEMAND FOR SMOKE-FREE MULTI-UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES

The survey assessed the effect of providing prospective residents with information up front in a property listing on whether an apartment or condominium unit is located in a smoke-free building. Over 69% of prospective residents are more interested in a property listing in a smoke-free building. In total, 80% of prospective residents are more interested in knowing in a listing whether or not the apartment or condominium unit is in a smoke-free building.

Additionally, this level of interest is consistent across a broad range of prospective residents. Table 3A displays the levels of interest by gender, age and income level. In all cases, the majority of prospective residents would be more interested in knowing the smoking policy in the listing.

| TABLE 3A                                       |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Demand for Smoking-Related Listing Information |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|  | Gender |        | Age   |       |       |       |       |       | Income |        |
|  | Male   | Female | 18-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | <\$60K | >\$60K |
| More Interested                                | 70.2%  | 68.5%  | 54.7% | 71.5% | 74.5% | 65.2% | 68.5% | 70.5% | 67%    | 71.8%  |
| Less Interested                                | 10.3%  | 12.1%  | 15.7% | 9.2%  | 11.4% | 14.9% | 11.7% | 11.5% | 14.8%  | 7.4%   |
| No Difference                                  | 18.4%  | 17.8%  | 28.9% | 18.1% | 13.2% | 16.1% | 18.9% | 17.9% | 17.4%  | 19.1%  |
| Not Sure                                       | 1%     | 1.5%   | .6%   | 1.2%  | .9%   | 3.7%  | .9%   | 0%    | .8%    | 1.6%   |

Table 3B similarly shows a consistent level of interest across educational level and housing type. Indeed, in nearly every demographic breakdown shown in Tables 3A and 3B, three-quarters or more of the prospective residents would prefer property listings to include information on whether the building is smoke-free or not. The only two exceptions are residents who are 18-24 years of age and residents with no college education. Yet, even among these two groups, approximately 70% would prefer to have smoking information in the property listing.

| TABLE 3B                                       |                           |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|--|---------------------------|---------|--------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Demand for Smoking-Related Listing Information |                           |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|  | Education                 |         |              |            | Housing Type                  |                    |             |
|  | College & Graduate School | College | Some College | No College | House Divided into Apartments | Apartment Building | Condominium |
| More Interested                                | 77.1%                     | 67.6%   | 59.4%        | 47.7%      | 67.7%                         | 67.3%              | 73.3%       |
| Less Interested                                | 7.8%                      | 8.5%    | 16.8%        | 26.6%      | 11.3%                         | 12.7%              | 9.1%        |
| No Difference                                  | 14.3%                     | 22.1%   | 21.8%        | 25%        | 19.5%                         | 19.2%              | 16%         |
| Not Sure                                       | .7%                       | 1.8%    | 2%           | .8%        | 1.5%                          | .9%                | 1.6%        |

The prospective resident's willingness to pay more to rent an apartment or purchase a condominium unit in a smoke-building was also assessed in the survey. Over 43% of prospective residents would be willing, in general, to pay more. Of those willing to pay more, 25% would pay 20% more and 75% would be willing to pay 10% more. As shown in Tables 3C and 3D, the willingness to pay more is relatively consistent across the various demographic breakdowns.

The prospective resident may be willing to pay more to avoid the possibility of prolonged exposure to secondhand smoke or the potential of having to relocate, if the exposure is not remedied. For prospective a condominium owner, the transaction cost of relocating can be substantial because it potentially involves selling his or her unit.

| TABLE 3C  |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Willingness to Pay More for Smoke-Free Property |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | Gender |        | Age   |       |       |       |       |       | Income |        |
|   | Male   | Female | 18-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | <\$60K | >\$60K |
| Willing to Pay More                             | 44.3%  | 42%    | 34.6% | 42.2% | 46.1% | 39%   | 46.8% | 48.1% | 36.1%  | 49.2%  |
| 20% More  | 22.7%  | 28.6%  | 19.3% | 20.2% | 29.8% | 35.1% | 25%   | 31%   | 25.1%  | 27.1%  |
| 10% More  | 59.2%  | 65.9%  | 80.7% | 61.1% | 58.7% | 61%   | 58.9% | 67%   | 61.8%  | 64.4%  |

| TABLE 3D  |                             |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|---|-----------------------------|---------|--------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Willingness to Pay More for Smoke-Free Property |                             |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|   | Education                   |         |              |            | Housing Type                  |                    |             |
|   | College and Graduate School | College | Some College | No College | House Divided into Apartments | Apartment Building | Condominium |
| Willing to Pay More                             | 50%                         | 37.9%   | 30.1%        | 37.2%      | 42.9%                         | 39.7%              | 48.6%       |
| 20% More  | 26.7%                       | 20%     | 24.7%        | 35.3%      | 32.6%                         | 21.9%              | 28.3%       |
| 10% More  | 65.9%                       | 56%     | 60.3%        | 62.7%      | 67.4%                         | 63.8%              | 59.5%       |

The presence of tobacco smoke also impacts the prospective resident's interest an apartment or condominium unit. As shown in tables 3E and 3F, the majority of prospective residents are immediately less interested in a property if they smell tobacco

smoke. This reaction is relatively consistent across gender, income level, age and housing type.

| <b>TABLE 3E</b>                                       |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Effect of Prospective Resident Smelling Tobacco Smoke |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | Gender |        | Age   |       |       |       |       |       | Income |        |
|   | Male   | Female | 18-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | <\$60K | >\$60K |
| More Interested                                       | 5.4%   | 7.2%   | 4.4%  | 5.2%  | 4.5%  | 6.9%  | 9%    | 6.5%  | 9.8%   | 3%     |
| Less Interested                                       | 82.2%  | 80.8%  | 76.7% | 87.3% | 89.1% | 71.2% | 74.8% | 74%   | 74.6%  | 88.3%  |
| No Difference   | 11.3%  | 11.2%  | 18.2% | 6.6%  | 5.9%  | 21.9% | 15.3% | 16.9% | 14.8%  | 7.6%   |
| Not Sure  | 1%     | .8%    | .6%   | 1%    | .5%   | 0%    | .9%   | 2.6%  | .8%    | 1.1%   |

| <b>TABLE 3F</b>                                       |                             |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|---|-----------------------------|---------|--------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Effect of Prospective Resident Smelling Tobacco Smoke |                             |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|   | Education                   |         |              |            | Housing Type                  |                    |             |
|   | College and Graduate School | College | Some College | No College | House Divided into Apartments | Apartment Building | Condominium |
| More Interested                                       | 3.8%                        | 6.4%    | 9.1%         | 16.2%      | 3.1%                          | 7.9%               | 5.4%        |
| Less Interested                                       | 91.8%                       | 84.8%   | 64%          | 45.4%      | 84.1%                         | 76.5%              | 88.1%       |
| No Difference   | 4.2%                        | 8.5%    | 23.4%        | 36.2%      | 12.3%                         | 14.3%              | 6.1%        |
| Not Sure  | .3%                         | .4%     | 3.6%         | 2.3%       | .5%                           | 1.3%               | .5%         |

#### IV. RESIDENT SUPPORT FOR SMOKE-FREE RULES

When asked how they felt about living in a building that is entirely smoke-free, 91% of residents indicated that they supported it. Just 2% opposed it. As shown in Tables 4A and 4B, this level of support is relatively consistent across gender, income level, age, housing type and education level.

| <b>TABLE 4A</b>                       |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|---------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Resident Support for Smoke-free Rule* |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|                                       | Gender |        | Age   |       |       |       |       |       | Income |        |
|                                       | Male   | Female | 18-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | <\$60K | >\$60K |
| Strongly Support                      | 81.8%  | 84%    | 82.7% | 82.1% | 81.5% | 89.5% | 81.5% | 100%  | 81.6%  | 83.2   |
| Somewhat Support                      | 8.8%   | 8%     | 17.3% | 5%    | 13%   | 2.6%  | 11.1% | 0%    | 11.4%  | 4.5%   |
| Neutral                               | 8.2%   | 3.8%   | 0%    | 10 %  | 1.9%  | 5.3%  | 3.7%  | 0%    | 2.2%   | 10.1%  |
| Somewhat Oppose                       | .6%    | 1.9%   | 0%    | 2.1%  | 1.9%  | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 1.6%   | 1.7%   |
| Strongly Oppose                       | .6%    | .9%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 2.6%  | 3.7 % | 0%    | 1.6%   | .6%    |

\* The answers for "Not Sure" are excluded from this Table.



| TABLE 4B                              |                           |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------|--------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Resident Support for Smoke-free Rule* |                           |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|                                       | Education                 |         |              |            | Housing Type                  |                    |             |
|                                       | College & Graduate School | College | Some College | No College | House Divided into Apartments | Apartment Building | Condominium |
| Strongly Support                      | 90.8%                     | 78.2%   | 70.2%        | 60%        | 83.5%                         | 81.8%              | 84.7%       |
| Somewhat Support                      | 3.9%                      | 10.3%   | 14%          | 24%        | 5.83%                         | 10.6%              | 6.9%        |
| Neutral                               | 2.9%                      | 9.2%    | 12.3%        | 0%         | 8.7%                          | 4.5%               | 4.2%        |
| Somewhat Oppose                       | 1.5%                      | 0%      | 0%           | 8%         | 0%                            | 2%                 | 1.4%        |
| Strongly Oppose                       | 1%                        | 1.1%    | 0%           | 4%         | 0%                            | .5%                | 2.8%        |

\* The answers for "Not Sure" are excluded from this Table.

Of residents who are not currently living in a smoke-free property, over 74% would support the immediate implementation of a smoke-free rule or remain neutral on the issue. As shown in tables 4C and 4D, the level of support remains fairly consistent across a range of demographics.

| TABLE 4C   |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Resident Support for Immediate Change to Smoke-free* |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|  | Gender |        | Age   |       |       |       |       |       | Income |        |
|  | Male   | Female | 18-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | <\$60K | >\$60K |
| Strongly Support                                     | 41.2%  | 47.8%  | 23.8% | 47.9% | 49.1% | 43.8% | 36.9% | 48.3% | 42.8%  | 46.7%  |
| Somewhat Support                                     | 14.7%  | 16.9%  | 19%   | 20.5% | 12.1% | 9.1%  | 15.5% | 10%   | 13%    | 18.1%  |
| Neutral  | 16.5%  | 11.2%  | 26.2% | 8.3%  | 15.2% | 10.7% | 21.4% | 18.3% | 14.6%  | 12.8%  |
| Somewhat Oppose                                      | 12.1%  | 10.6%  | 17.9% | 10.8% | 11.5% | 13.2% | 9.5%  | 6.7%  | 12.6%  | 9.3%   |
| Strongly Oppose                                      | 14.9%  | 13.3%  | 13.1% | 12.5% | 10.9% | 22.3% | 15.5% | 16.7% | 16.5%  | 12.8%  |

\* The answers for "Not Sure" are excluded from this Table.

| TABLE 4D  |                             |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|---|-----------------------------|---------|--------------|------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Resident Support for Immediate Change to Smoke-free |                             |         |              |            |                               |                    |             |
|   | Education                   |         |              |            | Housing Type                  |                    |             |
|   | College and Graduate School | College | Some College | No College | House Divided into Apartments | Apartment Building | Condominium |
| Strongly Support                                    | 46.6%                       | 47.7%   | 42.6%        | 35%        | 48.9%                         | 43.7%              | 44.7%       |
| Somewhat Support                                    | 17.9%                       | 16.4%   | 8.5%         | 14.6%      | 8.5%                          | 16.5%              | 17%         |
| Neutral   | 13.4%                       | 8.7%    | 17.7%        | 17.5%      | 12.8%                         | 13.8%              | 13.7%       |
| Somewhat Oppose                                     | 10.1%                       | 13.3%   | 9.2%         | 14.6%      | 6.4%                          | 10.3%              | 14%         |
| Strongly Oppose                                     | 11.3%                       | 13.3%   | 21.3%        | 18.4%      | 23.4%                         | 14.9%              | 10.3%       |

\* The answers for "Not Sure" are excluded from this Table.

Note that the level of support for smoke free rules shown in Tables 4A and 4B is higher in comparison to Tables 4C and 4D. The difference may be attributable to the fact that the rule change shown in Tables 4C and 4D would be implemented immediately. In practice, landlords and property managers can implement smoke-free rules over the period of several months or a year, giving residents a chance to adjust to the rule or, for some residents, the chance to make alternative arrangements, should they wish to relocate. However, once the rule is implemented, the levels of support shown in Tables 4A and 4B are what landlords, property managers and condominium trustees should expect.

## V. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS IN SURVEY OF LANDLORDS

An assessment of landlords and property managers’ attitudes towards smoke-free rules was also conducted in this Survey. Landlords and property managers with properties located the municipalities of Amherst, Cambridge, Brookline, Easthampton, Hadley, Jamaica Plain, Newton, Northampton, Somerville, Southamptton and Watertown were eligible. Listings of landlords and property managers were obtained from municipal assessors’ offices. Given that survey response rate was 5.5%, the results are not necessarily representative of landlord experiences in general.

The number of units managed or owned by each respondent is shown in Table 5A. Just over 84% of respondents managed 5 or fewer units, classifying them as small landlords. Over 90% of respondents managed their own properties, as opposed to 9.4% who retained employees or contractors to manage their properties.

| TABLE 5A  |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |                     |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------------|
| Percentage of Number of Rental Units Owned/Managed by Respondents |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |                     |
| 1 Unit  | 2 Units | 3 Units | 4 Units | 5 Units | 6 Units | 7 Units | 8 Units | 9 Units | 10+ Units*          |
| 14%   | 44.9%   | 14.3%   | 5.2%    | 4.1%    | 3%      | 2.5%    | .8%     | 1.1%    | All others under 1% |

\* The respondents who had 10 or more units make up approximately 10% of the total number of respondents.

The percentage of respondents who have implemented a smoke-free rule is displayed in Table 5B. Note that Table 5B does not accurately reflect the percentage of the multi-unit housing stock in the survey region with smoke-free rules. The survey of landlords was not intended to provide this measurement. As discussed in Section II of this Report, the actual percentage is 28.7%.

| TABLE 5B  |                              |                              |       |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|
| Percentage of Respondents Who Have Implemented Smoke-free Rules |                              |                              |       |
| All Properties  | More than Half of Properties | Less than Half of Properties | None  |
| 50.4%   | 2.2%                         | 2.2%                         | 45.2% |

VI. LANDLORDS' EXPERIENCES WITH AND PERCEPTION OF SMOKE-FREE RULES

Over 99% of all of the respondents who had actually implemented a smoke-free rule believed that it was a “good decision.” For maintenance costs, 65% of respondents reported having to pay \$100 or more extra in smoking-related maintenance costs per apartment when compared to an apartment where smoking was not allowed. Over 19% reported paying \$100 to \$300 extra, 14% reported paying \$300 to \$500 extra and 33% reported paying more than \$500 extra. Typical repairs include patching or replacing carpets, linoleum countertops and linoleum flooring with cigarette burn. Landlords also report having to abate the odor of tobacco smoke and repaint yellow stains in walls and ceilings.

Table 6A shows how implementation of smoke-free rules affected the respondents’ rental property businesses. The phrase “vacancy rate” in Table 6A means the average number of available units that are not rented throughout the year. The phrase “turnover rate” means how often existing tenants are replaced by new tenants. To maximize profits, landlords want to achieve the lowest possible rates of occurrence for all of the variables shown in Table 6A.

| TABLE 6A   |              |               |                                 |                              |                          |                           |                          |              |
|--|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Effect of Smoke-free Rule on Rental Business for Landlords Who Had Implemented a Smoke-Free Rule |              |               |                                 |                              |                          |                           |                          |              |
|  | Vacancy Rate | Turnover Rate | Disputes Over Security Deposits | Resources Required to Manage | Disputes Between Tenants | Potential Legal Liability | Maintenance/Repair Costs | Risk of Fire |
| Increase   | 6.7%         | 3.6%          | 7.3%                            | 8.3%                         | 6.7%                     | 8.5%                      | 9.2%                     | 9.6%         |
| No Change  | 77.4%        | 77.7%         | 64.6%                           | 57.8%                        | 54.4%                    | 42.3%                     | 29.7%                    | 73.1%        |
| Decrease   | 15.9%        | 18.7%         | 28.1%                           | 33.9%                        | 38.9%                    | 49.2%                     | 61%                      | 17.3%        |

Table 6B displays the perceived benefit of implementing a smoke-free rule by landlords who had not implemented such rules.

| TABLE 6B  |              |               |                                 |                             |                          |                           |                            |              |
|---|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Effect of Smoke-free Rule on Rental Business Variables for Landlord Who Had Not Implemented a Smoke-Free Rule |              |               |                                 |                             |                          |                           |                            |              |
|   | Vacancy Rate | Turnover Rate | Disputes Over Security Deposits | Resource Required to Manage | Disputes Between Tenants | Potential Legal Liability | Maintenance / Repair Costs | Risk of Fire |
| Increase  | 13.7%        | 10.4%         | 8.1%                            | 14.5%                       | 17.5%                    | 15.1%                     | 9.9%                       | 10.6%        |
| No Change   | 80.1%        | 77.9%         | 77%                             | 61%                         | 59.4%                    | 54.7%                     | 39.5%                      | 16.8%        |
| Decrease  | 6.2%         | 11.7%         | 14.9%                           | 24.5%                       | 23.1%                    | 30.2%                     | 50.6%                      | 72.7%        |

When asked specifically about the risk of fire, approximately 7% of respondents reported that secondhand smoke had triggered fire alarms. Over 4.5% reported that smoking had caused a fire in one or more of their properties.

Although there is a high demand for smoke-free properties, only 28.7% of the multi-unit housing stock is currently smoke-free. The apparent gap between the supply and demand for smoke-free properties may suggest that there are barriers to change. One of the potential barriers is the perception that implementation is difficult. However, the survey found that the opposite was true. As shown in Table 6C, over 90% of landlords who had implemented a rule reported that implementation was easy or very easy. Landlords generally phase in smoke-free rules when existing leases renew and new tenants sign their leases. In properties with month-to-month tenants, otherwise known as tenancies-at-will, the implementation period can be as short as one month.

| <b>TABLE 6C</b>        |           |       |           |
|------------------------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| Implementation of Rule |           |       |           |
| Very Difficult         | Difficult | Easy  | Very Easy |
| 3.6%                   | 6.1%      | 37.2% | 53.1%     |

Another potential barrier is the perception that enforcement would be difficult. Landlords are very likely to weigh the difficulty of enforcing a new rule against its purported benefits. If enforcement of a rule would be too difficult, time consuming or expensive, a landlord is less likely to use it. As shown in Table 6D, over 93% of landlords who had implemented a rule did not find it difficult.

| <b>TABLE 6D</b>           |       |                     |                          |
|---------------------------|-------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Difficulty of Enforcement |       |                     |                          |
| Difficult                 | Easy  | Same as other rules | Virtually Self Enforcing |
| 6.7%                      | 20.1% | 23.2%               | 50%                      |

Furthermore, landlords may incorrectly believe that instituting a smoke-free rule is either illegal or legally questionable. (It should be noted that it is entirely legal to make rental properties smoke-free.) As shown in Table 6E, 76.5% of landlords who implemented a rule believed it was legal. As shown in table 6F, only 44.8% of landlords who have not implemented a rule held the same belief.

| <b>TABLE 6E</b>   |           |   |          |
|---|-----------|---|----------|
| Perceived Legality of Rule of Landlords Who Had Implemented a Smoke-Free Rule |           |   |          |
| Legal   | Not Legal | Some Units Must Be Designated for Smoking | Not Sure |
| 76.5%   | 3%        | 2%  | 18.5%    |

| <b>TABLE 6F</b>   |           |   |          |
|---|-----------|---|----------|
| Perceived Legality of Rule of Landlords Who Had Not Implemented a Smoke-Free Rule |           |   |          |
| Legal   | Not Legal | Some Units Must Be Designated for Smoking | Not Sure |
| 44.8%   | 18.2%     | 1.2%                                      | 35.8%    |

## CONCLUSION

This Report provides several economic reasons for going smoke-free. First, there is a strong demand among residents for apartments and condominium units located in smoke-free buildings. Second, relatively few properties are currently smoke-free, which suggests that the demand for smoke-free properties is largely unmet. Lastly, smoke-free rules appear to reduce the operating costs of residential rental businesses.

Another important reason for going smoke-free is the dramatic health effects caused by exposure to secondhand smoke. The owners and managers of multi-unit residential properties provide housing for a large segment of our population. Accordingly, they make decisions that dramatically affect the public's health. By going smoke-free, landlords and property managers will help reduce secondhand smoke-related diseases.

## ENDNOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> See Lives Saved by Smoke Free Workplace Law, Massachusetts Tobacco Control Program, Massachusetts Dep't of Public Health (Nov. 2008), available at [http://www.mass.gov/Eeohhs2/docs/dph/tobacco\\_control/secondhand\\_smoke\\_heart\\_attack\\_factsheet.pdf](http://www.mass.gov/Eeohhs2/docs/dph/tobacco_control/secondhand_smoke_heart_attack_factsheet.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> J. DiFranza et al., *Prenatal and Postnatal Environmental Tobacco Smoke Exposure and Children's Health*, *Pediatrics* 113 (4 Supp.) 1007-15 (April 2004).

<sup>3</sup> H. S. Klonoff-Cohen et al., *The Effects of Passive Smoking and Tobacco Exposure Through Breast Milk on Sudden Infant Death Syndrome*, 273(10) *JAMA* 818 (March 1995)

<sup>4</sup> CA Env'tl. Prot. Agency, Identification of Environmental Tobacco Smoke as a Toxic Air Contaminant (2005).

<sup>5</sup> See Stephen Smith, Adult Smoking Rate Plunges in Mass., *The Boston Globe* (July 31, 2008).

<sup>6</sup> Just over 22% individuals 18 to 24 currently smoke. See Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Cigarette Smoking Among Adults --- United States, 2007, 57(45) *MORBIDITY & MORTALITY WKLY. REP.* 1221 (Nov. 14, 2008), available at <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/PDF/wk/mm5745.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup> See *id.*

## APPENDIX

The Appendix redisplay all of the tables of this report with the number of respondents (“N”) included. The percentages of the total population surveyed for this study (1,304 interviews) are accurate by a margin of plus or minus approximately 1.5 to 2.5 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. Sampling tolerances vary depending on the size of the subgroup analyzed as well as the percentage of respondents giving a particular response. The table directly below indicates the sampling tolerances for the total sample and for subgroups of various sizes at different percentages. These tolerances reflect error due to sampling error, and do not reflect error due to other factors.

| Sample Size | 10% | 20%  | 30%  | 40%  | 50%  | 60%  | 70%  | 80%  | 90% |
|-------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 1500        | 1.5 | 2.0  | 2.3  | 2.5  | 2.5  | 2.5  | 2.3  | 2.0  | 1.5 |
| 1000        | 1.9 | 2.5  | 2.8  | 3.0  | 3.1  | 3.0  | 2.8  | 2.5  | 1.9 |
| 900         | 2.0 | 2.6  | 3.0  | 3.2  | 3.3  | 3.2  | 3.0  | 2.6  | 2.0 |
| 750         | 2.1 | 2.8  | 3.3  | 3.5  | 3.6  | 3.5  | 3.3  | 2.8  | 2.1 |
| 700         | 2.2 | 3.0  | 3.4  | 3.6  | 3.7  | 3.6  | 3.4  | 3.0  | 2.2 |
| 650         | 2.3 | 3.1  | 3.5  | 3.7  | 3.8  | 3.7  | 3.5  | 3.1  | 2.3 |
| 600         | 2.4 | 3.2  | 3.7  | 3.9  | 4.0  | 3.9  | 3.7  | 3.2  | 2.4 |
| 550         | 2.5 | 3.3  | 3.8  | 4.1  | 4.2  | 4.1  | 3.8  | 3.3  | 2.5 |
| 500         | 2.6 | 3.5  | 4.0  | 4.3  | 4.4  | 4.3  | 4.0  | 3.5  | 2.6 |
| 450         | 2.7 | 3.7  | 4.2  | 4.5  | 4.6  | 4.5  | 4.2  | 3.7  | 2.7 |
| 400         | 2.9 | 3.9  | 4.5  | 4.8  | 4.9  | 4.8  | 4.5  | 3.9  | 2.9 |
| 350         | 3.1 | 4.2  | 4.8  | 5.1  | 5.2  | 5.1  | 4.8  | 4.2  | 3.1 |
| 300         | 3.4 | 4.5  | 5.2  | 5.5  | 5.7  | 5.5  | 5.2  | 4.5  | 3.4 |
| 250         | 3.8 | 5.0  | 5.7  | 6.1  | 6.3  | 6.1  | 5.7  | 5.0  | 3.8 |
| 200         | 4.2 | 5.5  | 6.4  | 6.8  | 6.9  | 6.8  | 6.4  | 5.5  | 4.2 |
| 150         | 4.8 | 6.4  | 7.3  | 7.8  | 8.0  | 7.8  | 7.3  | 6.4  | 4.8 |
| 100         | 5.9 | 7.8  | 9.0  | 9.6  | 9.8  | 9.6  | 9.0  | 7.8  | 5.9 |
| 75          | 6.8 | 9.0  | 10.4 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 10.4 | 9.0  | 6.8 |
| 50          | 8.3 | 11.1 | 12.7 | 13.6 | 13.9 | 13.6 | 12.7 | 11.1 | 8.3 |

| TABLE 1A                      |        |               |       |       |       |       |       |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Gender and Age of Respondents |        |               |       |       |       |       |       |
| Gender<br>N=1304              |        | Age<br>N=3255 |       |       |       |       |       |
| Male                          | Female | 18-24         | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+   |
| 45.3%                         | 54.7%  | 12.1%         | 38.4% | 16.9% | 12.3% | 8.6%  | 11.8% |
| N=591                         | N=713  | N=158         | N=502 | N=220 | N=160 | N=111 | N=152 |

| TABLE 1B                            |         |              |            |                  |        |
|-------------------------------------|---------|--------------|------------|------------------|--------|
| Education and Income of Respondents |         |              |            |                  |        |
| Education<br>N=3200                 |         |              |            | Income<br>N=2987 |        |
| College +                           | College | Some College | No College | <\$60K           | >\$60K |
| 53.1%                               | 21.7%   | 15.2%        | 9.9%       | 49.6%            | 50.4%  |
| N=1503                              | N=634   | N=654        | N=409      | N=623            | N=632  |

| TABLE 1C                      |                    |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Housing Type of Respondents   |                    |              |
| House Divided into Apartments | Apartment Building | Condominium  |
| 15%<br>N=196                  | 52%<br>N= 679      | 33%<br>N=430 |

| TABLE 1D   |                       |                                 |                                    |                               |               |              |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Smoking-Related Health Conditions of Respondents |                       |                                 |                                    |                               |               |              |
| Child Health Conditions *<br>N=299               |                       |                                 | Adult Health Conditions*<br>N=1303 |                               |               |              |
| Asthma   | Chronic Ear Infection | Frequent Respiratory Infections | Asthma                             | Chronic Respiratory Condition | Heart Disease | Stroke       |
| 19%<br>N=57                                      | 7.1%<br>N=21          | 5.6%<br>N=17                    | 19.6%<br>N=256                     | 10.6%<br>N=138                | 8.1%<br>N=105 | 4.3%<br>N=56 |

| TABLE 1E                                       |                |                            |               |                |
|--|----------------|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Smoking Behavior of Respondents                |                |                            |               |                |
| 100 Cigarettes in Respondents' Life*<br>N=1303 |                | Smoking Frequency<br>N=470 |               |                |
| More Than                                      | Less Than      | Every Day                  | Some Days     | Never          |
| 35.3%<br>N=461                                 | 63.9%<br>N=833 | 27.2%<br>N=128             | 12.8%<br>N=60 | 59.9%<br>N=282 |

| TABLE 1G   |                  |                |              |            |
|--|------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Respondents' Perception of Secondhand Smoke Exposure<br>N=1303 |                  |                |              |            |
| Very Harmful   | Somewhat Harmful | Minor Nuisance | Not Harmful  | Not Sure   |
| 66.7%<br>N=869   | 25.4%<br>N=330   | 5%<br>N=66     | 1.9%<br>N=25 | 1%<br>N=13 |

| TABLE 2A                   |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |               |                 |                 |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Smoking-Related Rules      |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |               |                 |                 |
|                            | Gender         |                 | Age            |                |                |                |                |               | Income          |                 |
|                            | Male<br>N=592  | Female<br>N=713 | 18-24<br>N=159 | 25-34<br>N=501 | 35-44<br>N=220 | 45-54<br>N=159 | 55-64<br>N=112 | 65-74<br>N=77 | <\$60K<br>N=623 | >\$60K<br>N=632 |
| 100% No Smoking            | 27.2%<br>N=161 | 29.9%<br>N=213  | 47.2%<br>N=75  | 27.9%<br>N=140 | 25%<br>N=55    | 23.9%<br>N=38  | 25%<br>N=28    | 22.1%<br>N=17 | 29.5%<br>N=184  | 28.3%<br>N=179  |
| No Smoking in Common Areas | 40.2%<br>N=238 | 42.6%<br>N=304  | 25.2%<br>N=40  | 44.5%<br>N=223 | 46.4%<br>N=102 | 40.9%<br>N=65  | 44.6%<br>N=50  | 42.9%<br>N=33 | 39.6%<br>N=247  | 43.4%<br>N=274  |
| No Related Rules           | 32.6%<br>N=193 | 27.5%<br>N=196  | 27.7%<br>N=44  | 27.5%<br>N=138 | 28.6%<br>N=63  | 35.2%<br>N=56  | 30.4%<br>N=34  | 35.1%<br>N=27 | 30.8%<br>N=192  | 28.3%<br>N=179  |

| TABLE 2B                   |                                    |                  |                       |                     |  |                             |                      |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Smoking-Related Rules      |                                    |                  |                       |                     |  |                             |                      |
|                            | Education                          |                  |                       |                     | Housing Type                           |                             |                      |
|                            | College & Graduate School<br>N=690 | College<br>N=281 | Some College<br>N=197 | No College<br>N=128 | House Divided into Apartments<br>N=195 | Apartment Building<br>N=679 | Condominium<br>N=430 |
| 100% No Smoking            | 29.7%<br>N=205                     | 30.6%<br>N=86    | 28.9%<br>N=57         | 19.5%<br>N=25       | 52.3%<br>N=102                         | 29.5%<br>N=200              | 16.7%<br>N=72        |
| No smoking in Common Areas | 44.2%<br>N=305                     | 39.5%<br>N=111   | 33.5%<br>N=66         | 43.8%<br>N=56       | 19%<br>N=37                            | 40.6%<br>N=276              | 53.3%<br>N=229       |
| No Related Rules           | 26.1%<br>N=180                     | 29.9%<br>N=84    | 37.6%<br>N=74         | 36.7%<br>N=47       | 28.7%<br>N=56                          | 29.9%<br>N=203              | 30%<br>N=129         |

| TABLE 2C                   |                                  |                                |   |                                   |  |                        |                |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------|
| Smoking-Related Rules      |                                  |                                |   |                                   |  |                        |                |
|                            | Child Health Conditions<br>N=299 |                                |   | Adult Health Conditions<br>N=1304 |  |                        |                |
|                            | Asthma<br>N=57                   | Chronic Ear Infections<br>N=22 | Frequent Respiratory Infections<br>N=17 | Asthma<br>N=256                   | Chronic Respiratory Condition<br>N=139 | Heart Disease<br>N=105 | Stroke<br>N=57 |
| 100% No Smoking            | 21.1%<br>N=12                    | 27.3%<br>N=6                   | 17.6%<br>N=3                            | 32%<br>N=82                       | 25.9%<br>N=36                          | 22.9%<br>N=24          | 38.6%<br>N=22  |
| No Smoking in Common Areas | 42.1%<br>N=24                    | 31.8%<br>N=7                   | 11.8%<br>N=2                            | 42.2%<br>N=108                    | 36.7%<br>N=51                          | 47.6%<br>N=50          | 49.1%<br>N=28  |
| No Related Rules           | 36.8%<br>N=21                    | 40.9%<br>N=9                   | 70.6%<br>N=12                           | 25.8%<br>N=66                     | 37.4%<br>N=52                          | 29.5%<br>N=31          | 12.3%<br>N=7   |

| TABLE 3A                                       |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |               |                 |                 |
|--|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Demand for Smoking-Related Listing Information |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |               |                 |                 |
|  | Gender         |                 | Age            |                |                |                |                |               | Income          |                 |
|  | Male<br>N=591  | Female<br>N=712 | 18-24<br>N=159 | 25-34<br>N=502 | 35-44<br>N=220 | 45-54<br>N=161 | 55-64<br>N=111 | 65-74<br>N=78 | <\$60K<br>N=662 | >\$60K<br>N=632 |
| More Interested                                | 70.2%<br>N=415 | 68.5%<br>N=488  | 54.7%<br>N=87  | 71.5%<br>N=359 | 74.5%<br>N=164 | 65.2%<br>N=105 | 68.5%<br>N=76  | 70.5%<br>N=55 | 67%<br>N=417    | 71.8%<br>N=454  |
| Less Interested                                | 10.3%<br>N=61  | 12.1%<br>N=86   | 15.7%<br>N=25  | 9.2%<br>N=46   | 11.4%<br>N=25  | 14.9%<br>N=24  | 11.7%<br>N=13  | 11.5%<br>N=9  | 14.8%<br>N=92   | 7.4%<br>N=47    |
| No Difference                                  | 18.4%<br>N=109 | 17.8%<br>N=127  | 28.9%<br>N=46  | 18.1%<br>N=91  | 13.2%<br>N=29  | 16.1%<br>N=26  | 18.9%<br>N=21  | 17.9%<br>N=14 | 17.4%<br>N=108  | 19.1%<br>N=121  |
| Not Sure                                       | 1%<br>N=6      | 1.5%<br>N=11    | .6%<br>N=1     | 1.2%<br>N=6    | .9%<br>N=2     | 3.7%<br>N=6    | .9%<br>N=1     | 0%<br>N=0     | 1.6%<br>N=5     | 1.2%<br>N=10    |

| TABLE 3B                                       |                                    |                  |                       |                     |  |                             |                      |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Demand for Smoking-Related Listing Information |                                    |                  |                       |                     |  |                             |                      |
|  | Education                          |                  |                       |                     | Housing Type                           |                             |                      |
|  | College & Graduate School<br>N=691 | College<br>N=281 | Some College<br>N=197 | No College<br>N=128 | House Divided into Apartments<br>N=195 | Apartment Building<br>N=678 | Condominium<br>N=430 |
| More Interested                                | 77.1%<br>N=533                     | 67.6%<br>N=190   | 59.4%<br>N=117        | 47.7%<br>N=61       | 67.7%<br>N=132                         | 67.3%<br>N=456              | 73.3%<br>N=315       |
| Less Interested                                | 7.8%<br>N=54                       | 8.5%<br>N=24     | 16.87%<br>N=33        | 26.6%<br>N=34       | 11.3%<br>N=22                          | 12.7%<br>N=89               | 9.1%<br>N=39         |
| No Difference                                  | 14.3%<br>N=99                      | 22.1%<br>N=62    | 21.8%<br>N=43         | 25%<br>N=32         | 19.5%<br>N=38                          | 19.2%<br>N=130              | 16%<br>N=69          |
| Not Sure                                       | .7%<br>N=5                         | 1.8%<br>N=5      | 2%<br>N=4             | .8%<br>N=1          | 1.5%<br>N=3                            | .9%<br>N=6                  | 1.6%<br>N=7          |



| TABLE 3C  |                        |                        |                       |                        |                        |                       |                     |                     |                        |                        |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Willingness to Pay More for Smoke-free Property |                        |                        |                       |                        |                        |                       |                     |                     |                        |                        |
|   | Gender                 |                        | Age                   |                        |                        |                       |                     |                     | Income                 |                        |
|   | Male<br>N=591          | Female<br>N=712        | 18-24<br>N=159        | 25-34<br>N=502         | 35-44<br>N=219         | 45-54<br>N=159        | 55-64<br>N=111      | 65-74<br>N=77       | <\$60K<br>N=623        | >\$60K<br>N=632        |
| Willing to Pay More                             | 44.3%<br>N=262         | 42%<br>N=299           | 34.6%<br>N=55         | 42.2%<br>N=212         | 46.1%<br>N=101         | 39%<br>N=62           | 46.8%<br>N=52       | 48.1%<br>N=37       | 36.1%<br>N=225         | 49.2%<br>N=311         |
| 20% More*                                       | N=304<br>22.7%<br>N=69 | N=343<br>28.6%<br>N=98 | N=57<br>19.3%<br>N=11 | N=247<br>20.2%<br>N=50 | N=121<br>29.8%<br>N=36 | N=77<br>35.1%<br>N=27 | N=56<br>25%<br>N=14 | N=42<br>31%<br>N=13 | N=275<br>25.1%<br>N=69 | N=343<br>27.1%<br>N=93 |
| 10% More**                                      | 59.2%<br>N=180         | 65.9%<br>N=226         | 80.7%<br>N=46         | 61.1%<br>N=151         | 58.6%<br>N=71          | 61%<br>N=47           | 58.9%<br>N=20       | 67%<br>N=28         | 61.8%<br>N=170         | 64.4%<br>N=221         |

\*This question was asked of those who would be willing to pay more in general or who were not sure if they would pay more. The "N" value provided before the percentages shown in this row includes those who are willing to pay more in general or are unsure whether or not they would pay more.

\*\*This question was asked of those who would be willing to pay more in general or who were not sure if they would pay more, but would not be willing to pay 20% or 15%.

| TABLE 3D  |                                      |                      |                       |                       |  |                             |                        |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Willingness to Pay More for Smoke-free Property |                                      |                      |                       |                       |  |                             |                        |
|   | Education                            |                      |                       |                       | Housing Type                           |                             |                        |
|   | College and Graduate School<br>N=690 | College<br>N=280     | Some College<br>N=196 | No College<br>N=129   | House Divided into Apartments<br>N=196 | Apartment Building<br>N=678 | Condominium<br>N=430   |
| Willing to Pay More                             | 50%<br>N=345                         | 37.9%<br>N=106       | 30.1%<br>N=59         | 37.2%<br>N=48         | 42.9%<br>N=84                          | 39.7%<br>N=269              | 48.6%<br>N=209         |
| 20% More*                                       | N=393<br>26.7%<br>N=105              | N=125<br>20%<br>N=25 | N=73<br>24.7%<br>N=18 | N=51<br>35.3%<br>N=18 | N=95<br>32.6%<br>N=31                  | N=315<br>21.9%<br>N=69      | N=237<br>28.3%<br>N=67 |
| 10% More**                                      | 65.9%<br>N=259                       | 56%<br>N=70          | 60.3%<br>N=44         | 62.7%<br>N=32         | 67.4%<br>N=64                          | 63.8%<br>N=201              | 59.5%<br>N=141         |

\*This question was asked of those who would be willing to pay more in general or who were not sure if they would pay more. The "N" value provided before the percentages shown in this row includes those who are willing to pay more in general or are unsure whether or not they would pay more.

\*\*This question was asked of those who would be willing to pay more in general or who were not sure if they would pay more, but would not be willing to pay 20% or 15%.

| TABLE 3E  |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |               |                 |                 |
|---|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Effect of Perspective Resident Smelling Tobacco Smoke |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |               |                 |                 |
|   | Gender         |                 | Age            |                |                |                |                |               | Income          |                 |
|   | Male<br>N=591  | Female<br>N=712 | 18-24<br>N=159 | 25-34<br>N=502 | 35-44<br>N=220 | 45-54<br>N=160 | 55-64<br>N=111 | 65-74<br>N=77 | <\$60K<br>N=623 | >\$60K<br>N=632 |
| More Interested                                       | 5.4%<br>N=32   | 7.2%<br>N=51    | 4.4%<br>N=7    | 5.2%<br>N=26   | 4.5%<br>N=10   | 6.9%<br>N=11   | 9%<br>N=10     | 6.5%<br>N=5   | 9.8%<br>N=61    | 3%<br>N=19      |
| Less Interested                                       | 82.2%<br>N=486 | 80.8%<br>N=575  | 76.7%<br>N=122 | 87.3%<br>N=438 | 89.1%<br>N=196 | 71.2%<br>N=114 | 74.8%<br>N=83  | 74%<br>N=57   | 74.6%<br>N=465  | 88.3%<br>N=558  |
| No Difference   | 11.3%<br>N=67  | 11.2%<br>N=80   | 18.2%<br>N=29  | 6.6%<br>N=33   | 5.9%<br>N=13   | 21.9%<br>N=35  | 15.3%<br>N=17  | 16.9%<br>N=13 | 14.8%<br>N=92   | 7.6%<br>N=48    |
| Not Sure  | 1%<br>N=6      | .8%<br>N=6      | .6%<br>N=1     | 1%<br>N=5      | .5%<br>N=1     | 0%<br>N=0      | .9%<br>N=1     | 2.6%<br>N=2   | .8%<br>N=5      | 1.1%<br>N=7     |

| TABLE 3F  |                                      |                  |                       |                     |  |                             |                      |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Effect of Perspective Resident Smelling Tobacco Smoke |                                      |                  |                       |                     |  |                             |                      |
|   | Education                            |                  |                       |                     | Housing Type                           |                             |                      |
|   | College and Graduate School<br>N=691 | College<br>N=282 | Some College<br>N=197 | No College<br>N=130 | House Divided into Apartments<br>N=195 | Apartment Building<br>N=680 | Condominium<br>N=429 |
| More Interested                                       | 3.8%<br>N=26                         | 6.4%<br>N=18     | 9.1%<br>N=18          | 16.2%<br>N=21       | 3.1%<br>N=6                            | 7.9%<br>N=54                | 5.4%<br>N=23         |
| Less Interested                                       | 91.8%<br>N=634                       | 84.8%<br>N=239   | 64%<br>N=126          | 45.4%<br>N=59       | 84.1%<br>N=164                         | 76.5%<br>N=520              | 88.1%<br>N=378       |
| No Difference   | 4.2%<br>N=29                         | 8.5%<br>N=24     | 23.4%<br>N=46         | 36.2%<br>N=47       | 12.3%<br>N=24                          | 14.3%<br>N=97               | 6.1%<br>N=26         |
| Not Sure  | .3%<br>N=2                           | .4%<br>N=1       | 3.6%<br>N=7           | 2.3%<br>N=3         | .5%<br>N=1                             | 1.3%<br>N=9                 | .5%<br>N=2           |

| TABLE 4A*                            |                |                 |               |                |               |               |               |               |                 |                 |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Resident Support for Smoke-free Rule |                |                 |               |                |               |               |               |               |                 |                 |
|                                      | Gender         |                 | Age           |                |               |               |               |               | Income          |                 |
|                                      | Male<br>N=159  | Female<br>N=213 | 18-24<br>N=75 | 25-34<br>N=140 | 35-44<br>N=54 | 45-54<br>N=38 | 55-64<br>N=27 | 65-74<br>N=16 | <\$60K<br>N=185 | >\$60K<br>N=179 |
| Strongly Support                     | 81.8%<br>N=130 | 84%<br>N=179    | 82.7%<br>N=62 | 82.1%<br>N=115 | 81.5%<br>N=44 | 89.5%<br>N=34 | 81.5%<br>N=22 | 100%<br>N=16  | 81.6%<br>N=151  | 83.2%<br>N=149  |
| Somewhat Support                     | 8.8%<br>N=14   | 8%<br>N=17      | 17.3%<br>N=13 | 5%<br>N=7      | 13%<br>N=7    | 2.6%<br>N=1   | 11.1%<br>N=3  | 0%<br>N=0     | 11.4%<br>N=21   | 4.5%<br>N=8     |
| Neutral                              | 8.2%<br>N=13   | 3.8%<br>N=8     | 0%<br>N=0     | 10%<br>N=14    | 1.9%<br>N=1   | 5.3%<br>N=2   | 3.7%<br>N=1   | 0%<br>N=0     | 2.2%<br>N=4     | 10.1%<br>N=18   |
| Somewhat Oppose                      | .6%<br>N=1     | 1.9%<br>N=4     | 0%<br>N=0     | 2.1%<br>N=3    | 1.9%<br>N=1   | 0%<br>N=0     | 0%<br>N=0     | 0%<br>N=0     | 1.6%<br>N=3     | 1.7%<br>N=3     |
| Strongly Oppose                      | .6%<br>N=1     | .9%<br>N=2      | 0%<br>N=0     | 0%<br>N=0      | 0%<br>N=0     | 2.6%<br>N=1   | 3.7%<br>N=1   | 0%<br>N=0     | 1.6%<br>N=3     | .6%<br>N=1      |

\* The answers for "Not Sure" are excluded from this Table.

| TABLE 4B*                            |                                    |                 |                      |                    |  |                             |                     |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Resident Support for Smoke-free Rule |                                    |                 |                      |                    |  |                             |                     |
|                                      | Education                          |                 |                      |                    | Housing Type                           |                             |                     |
|                                      | College & Graduate School<br>N=206 | College<br>N=87 | Some College<br>N=57 | No College<br>N=25 | House Divided into Apartments<br>N=103 | Apartment Building<br>N=198 | Condominium<br>N=72 |
| Strongly Support                     | 90.8%<br>N=187                     | 78.2%<br>N=68   | 70.2%<br>N=40        | 60%<br>N=15        | 83.5%<br>N=86                          | 81.8%<br>N=162              | 84.7%<br>N=61       |
| Somewhat Support                     | 3.9%<br>N=8                        | 10.3%<br>N=9    | 14%<br>N=8           | 24%<br>N=6         | 5.83%<br>N=6                           | 10.6%<br>N=21               | 6.9%<br>N=5         |
| Neutral                              | 2.9%<br>N=6                        | 9.2%<br>N=8     | 12.3%<br>N=7         | 0%<br>N=0          | 8.7%<br>N=9                            | 4.5%<br>N=9                 | 4.2%<br>N=3         |
| Somewhat Oppose                      | 1.5%<br>N=3                        | 0%<br>N=0       | 0%<br>N=0            | 8%<br>N=2          | 0%<br>N=0                              | 2%<br>N=4                   | 1.4%<br>N=1         |
| Strongly Oppose                      | 1%<br>N=2                          | 1.1%<br>N=1     | 0%<br>N=0            | 4%<br>N=1          | 0%<br>N=0                              | .5%<br>N=1                  | 2.8%<br>N=2         |

\* The answers for "Not Sure" are excluded from this Table.

| TABLE 4C*  |                |                 |               |                |                |                |               |               |                 |                 |
|--|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Resident Support for Immediate Change to Smoke-free Property |                |                 |               |                |                |                |               |               |                 |                 |
|  | Gender         |                 | Age           |                |                |                |               |               | Income          |                 |
|  | Male<br>N=430  | Female<br>N=498 | 18-24<br>N=84 | 25-34<br>N=361 | 35-44<br>N=165 | 45-54<br>N=121 | 55-64<br>N=84 | 65-74<br>N=60 | <\$60K<br>N=437 | >\$60K<br>N=454 |
| Strongly Support   | 41.2%<br>N=177 | 47.8%<br>N=238  | 23.8%<br>N=20 | 47.9%<br>N=173 | 49.1%<br>N=81  | 43.8%<br>N=53  | 36.9%<br>N=31 | 48.3%<br>N=29 | 42.8%<br>N=187  | 46.7%<br>N=212  |
| Somewhat Support   | 14.7%<br>N=63  | 16.9%<br>N=84   | 19%<br>N=16   | 20.5%<br>N=74  | 12.1%<br>N=20  | 9.1%<br>N=11   | 15.5%<br>N=13 | 10%<br>N=6    | 13%<br>N=57     | 18.1%<br>N=82   |
| Neutral  | 16.5%<br>N=71  | 11.2%<br>N=56   | 26.2%<br>N=22 | 8.3%<br>N=30   | 15.2%<br>N=25  | 10.7%<br>N=13  | 21.4%<br>N=18 | 18.3%<br>N=11 | 14.6%<br>N=64   | 12.8%<br>N=58   |
| Somewhat Oppose  | 12.1%<br>N=52  | 10.6%<br>N=53   | 17.9%<br>N=15 | 10.8%<br>N=39  | 11.5%<br>N=19  | 13.2%<br>N=16  | 9.5%<br>N=8   | 6.7%<br>N=4   | 12.6%<br>N=55   | 9.3%<br>N=42    |
| Strongly Oppose  | 14.9%<br>N=64  | 13.3%<br>N=66   | 13.1%<br>N=11 | 12.5%<br>N=45  | 10.9%<br>N=18  | 22.3%<br>N=27  | 15.5%<br>N=13 | 16.7%<br>N=10 | 16.5%<br>N=72   | 12.8%<br>N=58   |

\* The answers for "Not Sure" are excluded from this Table.

| TABLE 4D*  |                                    |                  |                       |                     |                                       |                             |                      |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Resident Support for Immediate Change to Smoke-free Property |                                    |                  |                       |                     |                                       |                             |                      |
|  | Education                          |                  |                       |                     | Housing Type                          |                             |                      |
|  | College & Graduate School<br>N=485 | College<br>N=195 | Some College<br>N=141 | No College<br>N=103 | House Divided into Apartments<br>N=94 | Apartment Building<br>N=478 | Condominium<br>N=358 |
| Strongly Support   | 46.6%<br>N=226                     | 47.7%<br>N=93    | 42.6%<br>N=60         | 35%<br>N=36         | 48.9%<br>N=46                         | 43.7%<br>N=209              | 44.7%<br>N=160       |
| Somewhat Support   | 17.9%<br>N=87                      | 16.4%<br>N=32    | 8.5%<br>N=12          | 14.6%<br>N=15       | 8.5%<br>N=8                           | 16.5%<br>N=79               | 17%<br>N=61          |
| Neutral  | 13.4%<br>N=65                      | 8.7%<br>N=17     | 17.7%<br>N=25         | 17.5%<br>N=18       | 12.8%<br>N=12                         | 13.8%<br>N=66               | 113.7%<br>N=49       |
| Somewhat Oppose  | 10.1%<br>N=49                      | 13.3%<br>N=26    | 9.2%<br>N=13          | 14.6%<br>N=15       | 6.4%<br>N=6                           | 10.3%<br>N=49               | 14%<br>N=50          |
| Strongly Oppose  | 11.3%<br>N=55                      | 13.3%<br>N=26    | 21.3%<br>N=30         | 18.4%<br>N=19       | 23.4%<br>N=22                         | 14.9%<br>N=71               | 10.3%<br>N=37        |

\* The answers for "Not Sure" are excluded from this Table.

| TABLE 5A   |                |               |              |              |            |             |            |             |                             |
|--|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Percentage of Number of Rental Units Owned/Managed by Respondents<br>N=363 |                |               |              |              |            |             |            |             |                             |
| 1 Unit   | 2 Units        | 3 Units       | 4 Units      | 5 Units      | 6 Units    | 7 Units     | 8 Units    | 9 Units     | 10+ Units                   |
| 13.4%<br>N=51  | 44.9%<br>N=163 | 14.3%<br>N=52 | 5.2%<br>N=19 | 4.1%<br>N=15 | 3%<br>N=11 | 2.5%<br>N=9 | .8%<br>N=3 | 1.1%<br>N=4 | All others under 1%<br>N=36 |

| TABLE 5B   |                              |                              |                |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Percentage of Respondents Who Have Implemented Smoke-free Rules<br>N=365 |                              |                              |                |
| All Properties   | More than Half of Properties | Less than Half of Properties | None           |
| 50.4%<br>N=184   | 2.2%<br>N=8                  | 2.2%<br>N=8                  | 45.2%<br>N=165 |

| <b>TABLE 6A</b>  |                       |                        |  |                                       |                                   |                                    |                                   |                       |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Effect of Smoke-free Rule on Rental Business for Landlords Who Had Implemented a Smoke-Free Rule |                       |                        |  |                                       |                                   |                                    |                                   |                       |
|  | Vacancy Rate<br>N=195 | Turnover Rate<br>N=193 | Disputes Over Security Deposits<br>N=192 | Resources Required to Manage<br>N=192 | Disputes Between Tenants<br>N=193 | Potential Legal Liability<br>N=189 | Maintenance/Repair Costs<br>N=195 | Risk of Fire<br>N=197 |
| Increase   | 6.7%<br>N=13          | 3.6%<br>N=7            | 7.2%<br>N=14                             | 8.3%<br>N=16                          | 6.7%<br>N=13                      | 8.5%<br>N=16                       | 9.2%<br>N=18                      | 9.6%<br>N=19          |
| No Change  | 77.4%<br>N=151        | 77.7%<br>N=150         | 64.6%<br>N=124                           | 28.1%<br>N=111                        | 54.4%<br>N=105                    | 42.3%<br>N=93                      | 29.7%<br>N=58                     | 73.1%<br>N=34         |
| Decrease   | 15.9%<br>N=31         | 18.7%<br>N=36          | 30.2%<br>N=54                            | 33.9%<br>N=65                         | 38.9%<br>N=75                     | 49.2%<br>N=80                      | 61%<br>N=119                      | 17.3%<br>N=144        |

| <b>TABLE 6B</b>  |                       |                        |  |                                      |                                   |                                    |                                     |                       |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Effect of Smoke-free Rule on Rental Business Who Had Not Implemented a Smoke-Free Rule |                       |                        |  |                                      |                                   |                                    |                                     |                       |
|  | Vacancy Rate<br>N=161 | Turnover Rate<br>N=163 | Disputes Over Security Deposits<br>N=161 | Resource Required to Manage<br>N=159 | Disputes Between Tenants<br>N=160 | Potential Legal Liability<br>N=159 | Maintenance / Repair Costs<br>N=162 | Risk of Fire<br>N=161 |
| Increase   | 13.7%<br>N=22         | 10.4%<br>N=17          | 8.1%<br>N=13                             | 14.5%<br>N=23                        | 17.5%<br>N=28                     | 15.1%<br>N=24                      | 9.9%<br>N=16                        | 10.6%<br>N=17         |
| No Change  | 80.1%<br>N=129        | 77.9%<br>N=127         | 77%<br>N=124                             | 61%<br>N=97                          | 59.4%<br>N=95                     | 54.7%<br>N=87                      | 39.5%<br>N=64                       | 16.8%<br>N=27         |
| Decrease   | 6.2%<br>N=10          | 11.7%<br>N=19          | 14.9%<br>N=24                            | 24.5%<br>N=39                        | 23.1%<br>N=37                     | 30.2%<br>N=48                      | 50.6%<br>N=82                       | 72.7%<br>N=117        |

| <b>TABLE 6C</b>                 |              |               |                |
|---------------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Implementation of Rule<br>N=196 |              |               |                |
| Very Difficult                  | Difficult    | Easy          | Very Easy      |
| 3.6%<br>N=7                     | 6.1%<br>N=12 | 37.2%<br>N=73 | 53.1%<br>N=104 |

| <b>TABLE 6D</b>                    |               |                     |                          |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Difficulty of Enforcement<br>N=194 |               |                     |                          |
| Difficult                          | Easy          | Same as other rules | Virtually Self Enforcing |
| 6.7%<br>N=13                       | 20.1%<br>N=39 | 23.2%<br>N=45       | 50%<br>N=97              |

| <b>TABLE 6D</b>  |           |   |               |
|--|-----------|---|---------------|
| Perceived Legality of Rule of Landlords Who Had Implemented a Smoke-Free Rule<br>N=200 |           |   |               |
| Legal  | Not Legal | Some Units Must Be Designated for Smoking | Not Sure      |
| 76.5%<br>N=153   | 3%<br>N=6 | 2%<br>N=4                                 | 18.5%<br>N=37 |

| <b>TABLE 6E</b>  |               |   |               |
|--|---------------|---|---------------|
| Perceived Legality of Rule of Landlords Who Had Not Implemented a Smoke Free Rule<br>N=165 |               |   |               |
| Legal  | Not Legal     | Some Units Must Be Designated for Smoking | Not Sure      |
| 44.8%<br>N=74  | 18.2%<br>N=30 | 1.2%<br>N=2                               | 35.8%<br>N=59 |

