**4-E-5 Multi-Unit Housing Public Intercept Survey**

**Key Results**

***Introduction***

The purpose of this report is to describe and interpret public intercept survey results to inform strategic intervention activities that will effectively promote the adoption and implementation of policies designating 100% of individual units (including balconies and patios) in multi-unit housing (MUH) complexes and areas at least 30 feet from doors, windows, patios and balconies, as smoke-free. These data include 769 surveys completed by 253 persons residing in Azusa, 265 in Montebello and 251 in South Gate.

The total number of respondents reported in the tables below varies because of questions that were skipped and “decline to state” options.

***Respondent Demographics and Key Results***

Omitting 33 respondents who declined to state their gender and 12 who skipped the question, Table 1 shows the distribution of self-reported gender by jurisdiction. The proportion of male respondents in Montebello is particularly low, as is the proportion of females completing the public intercept survey in South Gate. The underrepresentation of male respondents is typical of surveys conducted in all modalities, but unless it is deliberate, the underrepresentation of females is unusual. The July 2019 U.S. Census population estimate[[1]](#footnote-1) of the female population in Azusa is 52.5% compared to 54.7% in this sample, and 51.3% in the City of Montebello compared to 56.4% in this sample. In contrast, the Census estimates a female population of 51.1% in the City of South Gate, compared to 40.3% in this sample.

**Table 1. Gender by City**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Female** | 134  54.7% | 133  56.4% | 98  40.3% | 365  50.4% |
| **Male** | 110  44.9% | 79  33.5% | 144  59.3% | 333  46.0% |
| **Other** | 1  0.4% | 24  10.2% | 1  0.4% | 26  3.6% |
| **Total** | 245  100.0% | 236  100.0% | 243  100.0% | **724**  **100.0%** |

The difference between cities regarding the distribution of survey respondents by gender is statistically significant; χ² (4, N = 724) = 67.040, *p* < .001.

**How does support for Smoke-Free Multi-Unit Housing Differ by gender?**

Six hundred ninety-three intercept survey respondents answered five questions that began with “How do you feel about people smoking in your building?” (Mark all that apply). In descending order of respondent approval, the items are: “**Not OK anywhere, because I prefer smoke-free**” (N= 399, **57.6%**); “**OK only in Parking Lot**” (N= 109, **15.7%**); “**OK within a unit**” (N= 104, **15.0%**); “**OK only in Outdoor common areas**” (N= 92, **13.3%**); and “**OK in all common areas such as lobby, halls, and stairways**” (N= 61, **8.8%**).

Table 2 depicts the relationship between the selection of “**Not OK anywhere, because I prefer smoke-free**” and gender. Respondents identifying as “Other” gender show the greatest support **(69.2%)**, followed by Females **(57.7%)** and Males **(56.4%)**. The majority in each category prefers smoke-free multi-unit housing, and the differences by gender are not statistically significant.

**Table 2. Preference for Smoke-Free Multi-Unit Housing by Gender**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Not OK Anywhere, Because I Prefer Smoke-Free** | | |
| **Selected** | **Not Selected** | **Total** |
| **Female** | 206  57.7% | 151  42.3% | 357  100.0% |
| **Male** | 184  56.4% | 142  43.6% | 326  100.0% |
| **Other** | 18  69.2% | 8  30.8% | 26  100.0% |
| **Total** | 408  57.5% | 301  42.5% | 709  (100.0%) |

Respondents were asked, **“Would you feel comfortable telling your landlord about any issues with secondhand smoke?’** Three hundred ninety-one (**56.1%**) of the 697 persons who answered this question said, **“Yes,”**  145 **(20.9%)** replied, **“No,”** 161 **(23.1%)** “declined to state” their position. Table 3 shows the differences between genders.

**Table 3. Comfort Telling Landlord about Issues with Secondhand Smoke by Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **No** | **Decline to State** | **Total** |
| **Female** | 196  **56.3%** | 85  24.4% | 67  19.3% | 348  100.0% |
| **Male** | 191  **59.1%** | 59  18.3% | 73  22.6% | 323  100.0% |
| **Other** | 4  15.4% | 1  3.8% | 21  **80.8%** | 26  100.0% |
| **Total** | 391  56.1% | 145  20.9% | 161  23.1% | 697  (100.0%) |

The majority of females and males reports comfort addressing issues with drift smoke by speaking with one’s landlord. The differences between genders are statistically significant; χ² (4, N = 697) = 54.702, *p* < .001. Though their number is small, the high rate of “Decline to State” among respondents of “other” gender suggests that education and empowerment to increase comfort with self-advocacy regarding secondhand smoke exposure is needed.

Asked directly whether they would support a decision “that your building would have a smoke-free policy, 492 **(65.6%)** replied **“Yes,”** and 54 **(7.2%)** said **“No.”** One hundred eight **(14.4%)** were **“Not Sure,”** and 96 **(12.8%)** **“Declined to State”** a position.

**Table 4. Support for a Smoke-Free Policy in Your Building by Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Yes** | **No** | **Not Sure** | **Decline to State** | **Total** |
| **Female** | 269  **74.7%** | 23  6.4% | 47  13.1% | 21  5.8% | 360  100.0% |
| **Male** | 210  **64.4%** | 25  7.7% | 49  15.0% | 42  12.9% | 326  100.0% |
| **Other** | 3  12.0% | 0  0.0% | 5  20.0% | 17  **68.8%** | 25  100.0% |
| **Total** | 482  67.8% | 48  6.8% | 101  14.2% | 80  11.3% | 711  (100.0%) |

χ² (6, N = 711) = 99.541, *p* < .001.

Strong majorities of both females and males support smoke-free MUH policies in their buildings. The high proportion of “Decline to state” responses among respondents of “Other” gender is difficult to interpret. Qualitative investigation of this preference may be useful.

Responding to the question, “Would you be willing to attend a City Council meeting or write a letter to your Council member to share how secondhand smoke in multi-unit housing has impacted you or your loved ones?” 321 **(42.7%)** answered **“Yes,”** 245 **(32.6%)** answered **“No,”** and 188 **(24.7%)** “Declined to State.” This is the largest proportion of respondents choosing not to answer of the four items gauging support for Smoke-Free MUH policies.

**Table 5. Willing to Attend a City Council Meeting or Write a Letter to Your Council Member**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **No** | **Decline to State** | **Total** |
| **Female** | 184  **50.7%** | 95  26.2% | 84  23.1% | 363  100.0% |
| **Male** | 126  **38.5%** | 144  44.0% | 57  17.4% | 327  100.0% |
| **Other** | 2  7.7% | 1  3.8% | 23  **88.5%** | 26  100.0% |
| **Total** | 391  56.1% | 145  20.9% | 161  23.1% | 716  (100.0%) |

The differences by gender are statistically significant; χ² (4, N = 716) = 90.345, *p* < .001. The higher proportion of females (50.7%) compared to males (38.5%) suggests that intervention activities to promote advocacy to members of city councils should target women. The very high rate of “Decline to State” among respondents of “Other” gender is consistent across these items and points to a need for further investigation.

Table 6 depicts the distribution of survey respondents by race and ethnicity. Each of these cities has a “majority minority” population, and the high proportion (69.0% across cities) of Hispanic/ Latino survey respondents is consistent with the effort to achieve multi-unit housing smoke-free policy adoptions in complexes selected to reduce this subpopulation’s exposure to secondhand smoke. The July 1, 2019 U.S. Census estimate of the Hispanic/ Latino population in Azusa is 63.6%, compared to 70.7% in the sample, in Montebello the Census estimate is 77.9%, compared to 57.4% in the survey sample, and in South Gate the Census estimate 95.0% compared to 79.7% in the sample.

**Table 6. Race/ Ethnicity by City**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Race/ Ethnicity** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **African American** | 5  2.0% | 32  14.2% | 9  3.7% | 46  6.2% |
| **Asian/ Pacific Islander** | 2  0.8% | 25  10.2% | 7  2.8% | 34  4.6% |
| **Hispanic/ Latino** | 174  70.7% | 140  57.4% | 196  79.7% | 510  69.0% |
| **White, Non-Hispanic** | 47  19.1% | 13  5.3% | 28  11.4% | 88  11.9% |
| **Native American/ Alaskan Native** | 11  4.5% | 9  3.7% | 0  0.0% | 20  2.7% |
| **Multiracial** | 5  2.0% | 5  2.0% | 2  0.8% | 12  1.6% |
| **Other** | 2  0.8% | 23  9.3% | 4  1.6% | 29  3.9% |
| **Total** | 246  33.3% | 247  33.4% | 246  33.3% | **739**  **100.0%** |

Differences by race/ ethnicity between jurisdictions in the survey sample are statistically significant; χ² (12, N = 739) = 122.158, *p* < .001.

**How does support for Smoke-Free Multi-Unit Housing Differ by Race/Ethnicity?**

Three hundred ninety-nine (57.6%) respondents selecting “**Not OK anywhere, because I prefer smoke-free**” in response to the question “How do you feel about people smoking in your building?”

Focusing on the racial/ethnic groups with 20 or more respondents, in descending order of the proportions endorsing this statement, the data are **62.1%** among 29 persons of **“Other” race**; **60.6%** among 33 persons identifying as **“Asian or Pacific Islander,” 60%** among 498 **Hispanic/ Latino** respondents; **54%** of 87 **Non-Hispanic Whites**; and **33.3%** of 45 **African Americans**. These are statistically significant differences.

Positive responses to the statement, **“Would you feel comfortable telling your landlord about any issues with secondhand smoke?”** were reported by 32 of 43 **(74.4%)** of **African Americans**; 22 of 33 **(66.7%)** **“Asian or Pacific Islanders,”** 278 of 490 **(56.7%) Hispanic/ Latino** survey respondents, 39 of 86 **(45.3%)** **Non-Hispanic Whites**, and five of 29 **(17.2%)** persons of **“Other”** race.

Counting “Yes,” “No” and “Not Sure” responses, the question **“Would you support a decision that your building would have a smoke-free policy”** was answered in the affirmative by **over** **75%** of each racial/ethnic group excluding persons of ”Other” race. In this group, just one of eight (12.5%) answered “Yes” and seven answered “Not Sure.”

Wide differences between racial/ethnic groups are observed in response to the question, **“Would you be willing to attend a City Council meeting or write a letter to your Council member to share how secondhand smoke in multi-unit housing has impacted you or your loved ones?”** In descending order of the proportion of “Yes” responses among groups with 20 or more respondents, the data show 14 of 20 **(70%) Native American/Alaskan Native** respondents answering in the affirmative, 29 of 45 **(64.4%) African Americans**, 231 of 506 **(45.7%) Hispanic/ Latinos**, 13 of 34 **(38.3%) Asian/ Pacific Islander** respondents, 16 of 85 **(18.8%) Non-Hispanic Whites**, and five of 29 **(17.2%) persons of “Other” race**. These differences are statistically significant.

**Rent vs. Own and Housing Type by Jurisdiction**

Table 7 on the following page shows the proportions of survey respondents that rent their residences by city. In descending order, that proportion is **82.9% in Azusa**, **80.7% in Montebello**, and **79.8% in South Gate**. The most frequently rented housing type is apartments (77.4% of all rentals) (See Table 8). Table 8 shows that 77.2% of survey respondents in Montebello reside in apartments, compared to 54% in Azusa, and 53.1% in South Gate.

**Table 7. Rent vs. Own by City**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rent or Own** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Rent** | 203  82.9% | 213  80.7% | 189  79.7% | 605  81.1% |
| **Own** | 42  17.1% | 51  19.3% | 48  20.3% | 141  18.9% |
| **Total** | 245  100.0% | 264  100.0% | 237  100.0% | **746**  **100.0%** |

**Table 8. Housing Type by City**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Housing Type** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Apartment Building** | 135  54.0% | 203  77.2**%** | 130  53.1% | 468  61.7% |
| **Condominium** | 30  12.0% | 19  7.2% | 16  6.5% | 65  8.6% |
| **Duplex or in-law unit** | 29  11.6% | 25  9.5% | 16  6.5% | 70  9.2% |
| **Townhome, single or multifamily home** | 56  22.4% | 16  6.1% | 83  33.9% | 155  20.4% |
| **Total** | 250  100.0% | 263  100.0% | 245  100.0% | **758**  **100.0%** |

**Table 9. Rent/Own by Housing Type**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rent or Own** | **Housing Type** | | | | |
| **Apartment** | **Condominium** | **Duplex/ In-Law** | **Townhome, single or multi-family** | **Total** |
| **Rent** | 465  99.6% | 35  57.4% | 33  47.8% | 58  55.8% | 601  81.4% |
| **Own** | 2  0.4% | 26  42.6% | 36  52.2% | 46  44.2% | 137  18.6% |
| **Total** | 467  100.0% | 61  100.0% | 69  100.0% | 104  100.0% | **738**  **100.0%** |

**Household Composition by Jurisdiction**

Table 10 depicts household composition by age group and city of residence. Twenty-nine (3.8%) of 769 survey respondents either live alone or declined to share information regarding their cohabitants by age group and pets. Four hundred sixty-two (62.4%) of the 740 respondents who answered the questions selected just one of the four age group and single “pets” options. One hundred ninety (25.7%) individuals selected two options to describe their households, 76 (10.3%) chose three options, four survey respondents (1.4%) selected four of the five available responses, and two (0.3%) selected all five Since multiple selections were made by respondents in age-diverse households, the totals reported in Table 10 exceed the number of survey respondents. The denominator (the total number of respondents selecting one or more options) in Azusa is 244. In Montebello, the denominator is 255, and in South Gate, it is 241. Proportions in the rightmost “Total” column are computed based on all 740 respondents who selected one or more of the “Who do you live with?” options.

**Table 10. Household Composition by Age Group and Pets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Household Composition by Age Group/ Pets** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Other Adults 18 to 64** | 198  81.1% | 126  49.4% | 180  74.5% | 504  68.1% |
| **Children 0 to 7 years of age** | 60  24.6% | 34  13.3% | 51  21.1% | 145  19.6% |
| **Children 8 to 17** | 73  29.9% | 63  23.7% | 91  37.8% | 227  30.7% |
| **Adults older than 65** | 13  5.3% | 35  13.7% | 22  9.1% | 70  9.5% |
| **Pets** | 49  20.1% | 54  21.2% | 71  29.5% | 174  23.5% |

Adding together the proportions of respondents who reside with children 0 to seven and eight to 17 sums to **58.9%** of respondents’ households **in South Gate**, **54.5%** **in Azusa**, and **37.0%** **in Montebello**. These data support intervention activities emphasizing the danger of children’s exposure to secondhand smoke in South Gate and Azusa. A higher proportion (**13.7%**) of Intercept survey respondents from Montebello also live with adults older than 65, and the proportion (**29.5%**) of survey respondents that live in households with pets in South Gate is much higher than in Azusa (20.1%) and Montebello (21.2%).

**Current Tobacco Use**

Eighty-one (10.5%) survey respondents “declined to state” an answer the question, “Do you currently use any tobacco?” and twelve (1.6%) skipped this item totaling 93 who did not describe their use of tobacco. Among the 676 who did answer, 61 (**9.0%**) selected, “**Yes, on a regular basis**,” 77 (**11.4%**) selected, “**Yes, but only occasionally**,” 130 (**19.2%**) endorsed “**No, but I am a former smoker**,” and 408 (**60.4%**) answered, “**No, I have never used tobacco**.” Table 11 presents the distribution of these responses by city of Residence.

**Table 11. Current Tobacco Use**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Currently use tobacco?** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Yes, on a regular basis** | 13  5.4% | 37  18.9% | 11  4.6% | 61  9.0% |
| **Yes, occasionally** | 20  8.3% | 36  18.4% | 21  8.9% | 77  11.4% |
| **No, but I am a former smoker** | 34  14.1% | 38  19.4% | 58  24.3% | 130  19.2% |
| **No, have never used tobacco** | 174  **72.2%** | 85  **43.4%** | 149  **62.3%** | 408  60.4% |
| **Total** | 241  100.0% | 196  100.0% | 239  100.0% | **676**  **100.0%** |

The difference between cities is statistically significant; χ² (6, N = 676) = 63.181, *p* < .001. Comparatively fewer (**43.4%**) survey respondents residing in **Montebello** **have never used tobacco**, as opposed to (**62.3%**) in **South Gate**, and to (**72.2%**) in **Azusa**. These proportions are important because multi-unit housing residents who use tobacco have different perceptions about the harm of secondhand smoke exposure and the desirability of smoke-free policies.

Although 138 intercept survey respondents acknowledged their current use of tobacco and 130 reported former use (a total of 268), *296 selected one or more of six options in response to the question, “If yes, which tobacco products do you use?”* Table 12 presents all 311 of their selections by city of residence. The percentages are computed based upon the total responses provided (43 from Azusa, 177 from Montebello, 60 from South Gate), not on the number of survey respondents.

**Table 12. Count and Proportion of Tobacco Products Currently Used by City among Respondents Reporting Use of One or More Types of Tobacco**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tobacco Product** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Cigarettes** | 37  68.5% | 79  44.6% | 45  69.2% | 161  47.9% |
| **Cigars** | 14  29.6% | 24  13.6% | 22  33.8% | 70  20.8% |
| **Pipe** | 4  7.4% | 15  8.5% | 6  9.2% | 25  7.4% |
| **Chew/ Dip** | 0  0.0% | 15  8.5% | 1  1.5% | 16  4.7% |
| **E-cigarettes or another electronic nicotine delivery device** | 6  11.1% | 13  7.3% | 3  5.0% | 22  6.5% |
| **Other** | 3  5.6% | 37  20.9% | 3  4.6% | 43  12.8% |
| **Total** |  |  |  | **336**  **100.0%** |

As might be expected, support for Smoke-Free MUH Policies differs between tobacco users and those who do not use tobacco. The proportions responding “**Not OK anywhere, because I prefer smoke-free**” in response to the question “How do you feel about people smoking in your building?” is 343 of 459 **(74.7%)** among respondents who **report using** **no tobacco products**, compared to 90 of 289 **(31.1%)** of persons **reporting tobacco use**. It is interesting that three of ten smokers prefer a Smoke-Free building.

Two hundred seventy-four **(59.7%)** of 459 persons who report **no tobacco use** provided a **”Yes”** response to the statement, **“Would you feel comfortable telling your landlord about any issues with secondhand smoke?”** compared to 127 **(46.7%)** of respondents **reporting the use of one or more types of tobacco**.

Counting “Yes,” “No” and “Not Sure” responses, the question **“Would you support a decision that your building would have a smoke-free policy”** was **answered in the affirmative** by 353 **(82.5%)** of 428 respondents that **report no tobacco use**, and by 139 **(61.5%)** of 226 tobacco users.

The question, **“Would you be willing to attend a City Council meeting or write a letter to your Council member to share how secondhand smoke in multi-unit housing has impacted you or your loved ones?”** was answered **“Yes”** by nearly identical proportions of **tobacco users (43.0%)** and **respondents who report no tobacco use (42.5%).**

**Exposure to Secondhand Smoke**

Fourteen intercept survey respondents did not answer the question, “In the past year, have you been exposed to secondhand smoke while in your unit?” Of the 755 persons who replied, 364 (**48.2%**) indicated that they **had been exposed**, 266 (**35.2%**) that they **had not**, and 125 (**16.6%**) that they **weren’t sure**.

**Table 13. Exposure to Secondhand Smoke by City**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rent or Own** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Yes** | 126  **50.6%** | 126  **49.2%** | 112  **44.8%** | 364  48.2% |
| **No** | 85  34.1% | 70  27.3% | 111  44.4% | 266  35.2% |
| **Not Sure** | 38  15.3% | 60  23.4% | 27  10.8% | 125  16.6% |
| **Total** | 249  100.0% | 256  100.0% | 250  100.0% | **755**  **100.0%** |

More than half (**50.6%**) of the intercept survey respondents residing in Azusa report exposure to secondhand smoke, closely followed by respondents residing in Montebello with a somewhat lower proportion (**44.8%**) in South Gate. The fact that more than one in five respondents from Montebello (**23.4%**) are not sure whether they were exposed to secondhand smoke may indicate a need in that city for education about tobacco products and the effects of their use.

In descending order, the proportion of respondents reporting exposure to secondhand smoke by housing type is: Condominium (**58.7%**); Apartment Building (**52.2%**); Single Family Home (**39.0%**); Duplex or In-law unit (**35.3%**); and Townhome (**26.3%**).

Although 364 respondents reported exposure to secondhand smoke while in their units, an additional 29 persons answering the question, “How frequently do you notice secondhand smoke drifting into your unit?” characterized the frequency of their exposure. Disregarding the “Not Sure” responses, 90 (**22.9%**) reported that they noticed **secondhand smoke drifting into their unit every day**; 93 (**23.7%**) reported exposure **almost every day**, 127 (**32.3%**) **1-2 times per week**; and 83 (**21.1%**) noticed secondhand smoke drifting into their units **once per month or less**.

Restricting the analysis to the 364 intercept survey respondents who reported that they had been exposed to secondhand smoke, 167 (**45.9%**) indicated that the smoke originated in another unit, 165 (**45.3%**) that it came from outside, and 29 (**8.0%**) that they were not sure.

Of these 364 respondents, 232 (**63.7%**) identified the irritant as **tobacco smoke**, 172 (**47.3%**) described it as **marijuana smoke**, and 63 (**17.3%**) as **the mix from an electronic smoking device**. Fifty-eight of the 364 respondents (**15.9%**) were not sure what kind of smoke they were exposed to. These percentages sum to more than 100.0% because some respondents identified multiple types of secondhand smoke.

Asked whether they had been exposed to secondhand smoke in four areas, 751 intercept survey respondents identified between one and four areas or indicated “None of the above.”

In descending order of frequency, these areas are: **Balconies or Patios** (**32.5%**), **Parking areas** (**31.4%**), **Outdoor common areas** including the play area and courtyard pool (**29.3%**) and **Indoor common areas** including the laundry, lobby, stairs, and hallways (**19.6%**). These proportions sum to more than 100.0% because some respondents reported exposure to secondhand smoke in more than one area. Two hundred thirty-one (**30.8%**) respondents indicated “**None of the above**.”

In response to the questions, “How do you feel about people smoking in your building?” 62 **(8.3%)** of 748 respondents endorsed the option, “OK In all common areas such as the lobby, halls, and stairways, 100 **(13.4%)** agreed that smoking is “OK only in outdoor common areas,” 109 **(14.6%)** are “OK with smoking within a unit,” 120 **(16.0%)** of 748 are “OK with smoking only in the parking lot, and the majority 433 **(57.9%)** of 748 endorsed, **“Not OK anywhere because I prefer smoke-free.”**

**Signage and Policies**

Seven hundred forty-five intercept survey respondents provided one or more answers to the question, “Are there any “No Smoking” signs around the shared space/ common areas of your building? (Mark all that apply). Two hundred eighty-six persons (**38.4%**) reported “No Signs,” and two hundred twenty-six (**30.3%**) replied “Not Sure.” Two hundred fifty-nine (**34.8%**) respondents reported between one and three signs in the following locations: **Indoor common areas** (N= 116, **44.8%** of all signage reported); **Sign on Entry Door** (N= 82, **31.7%** of all signage reported); and **Outdoor common areas** (N= 81, **31.3%** of all signage reported. These proportions exceed 100% because some respondents reported “No Smoking” signs in more than one location.

In response to the question, “To your knowledge, does your building have any non-smoking policies?” 155 (**20.8%**) answered “**Yes**,” 265 (**35.6%**) reported “**No**” and 325 (**43.6%**) were “**Not Sure.”**

Omitting the respondents who were not sure whether their building had a non-smoking policy, Table 14 indicates respondents’ knowledge regarding the presence of a multi-unit housing smoking policy by city.

**Table 14. MUH No-Smoking Policy by City.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rent or Own** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Yes** | 49  **35.3%** | 75  **54.7%** | 31  **21.5%** | 155  36.9% |
| **No** | 90  64.7% | 62  45.3% | 113  78.5% | 265  63.1% |
| **Total** | 249  100.0% | 256  100.0% | 250  100.0% | **420**  **100.0%** |

Twenty-three **(63.9%)** of 36 respondents who live in **condominiums** reported MUH No-Smoking policies, compared to 100 **(37.9%)** of 264 who live in **apartments**, 11 **(29.7%)** of 37 respondents residing in **duplex or in-law units**, and to 20 **(25.0%)** of 80 who reside in Townhomes, single, or multi-family homes.

**Perceptions regarding the harm of Secondhand Smoke**

Just 13 (1.7%) of 769 survey respondents skipped the question, “Do you believe that breathing secondhand smoke is harmful to people’s health?” Overall, **82.5%** answered, “**Yes**,” **6.1**% answered, “**No**” and **11.4**% replied, “**Not Sure**.” Table 15 depicts the distribution of responses by city of residence. Even though **71.9%** of the intercept survey respondents in **Montebello** believe that secondhand smoke is harmful, that is the lowest proportion across three cities, compared to **87.3%** in Azusa and to **88.7%** in South Gate. The proportion (**18.4%**) that appears to have **insufficient information to decide whether secondhand smoke is harmful** in **Montebello signals a need for education**.

**Table 15. Secondhand smoke is harmful to people’s health**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Is SHS harmful?** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Yes** | 220  87.3% | 184  71.9% | 220  88.7% | 624  82.5% |
| **No** | 10  4.7% | 25  9.8% | 7  3.0% | 42  6.0% |
| **Not Sure** | 18  8.5% | 47  **18.4%** | 19  8.2% | 84  12.0% |
| **Total** | 213  100.0% | 256  100.0% | 231  100.0% | **700**  **100.0%** |

Table 16 presents respondents’ views of the dangers of secondhand smoke. Notice the **comparatively low proportions among Montebello residents** who identify respiratory irritation and coughing, asthma, lung cancer and heart disease as dangers of secondhand smoke.

**Table 16.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dangers of SHS** | **City of Residence** | | | |
| **Azusa** | **Montebello** | **South Gate** | **Total** |
| **Respiratory irritation and coughing** | 182  76.2% | 104  **40.5%** | 188  79.0% | 474  20.9% |
| **Asthma** | 211  88.3% | 132  **51.4%** | 211  88.7% | 554  24.4% |
| **Lung cancer** | 196  82.0% | 110  **42.8%** | 211  88.7% | 517  22.7% |
| **Heart disease** | 109  45.6% | 82  **31.9%** | 129  54.2% | 320  14.1% |
| **Sudden infant death syndrome** | 66  27.6% | 96  37.4% | 57  23.9% | 219  9.6% |
| **Skin cancer** | 54  22.6% | 65  25.3% | 70  29.4% | 189  8.3% |



**Thirdhand Smoke**

Opening with the explanation, that “Thirdhand smoke is nicotine and other chemicals left on clothing and indoor surfaces such as table tops and upholstered furniture,” respondents were asked, “Do you believe that thirdhand smoke is harmful to your health and the health of others?” Of 751 answers, 533 (**71.0%**) were “**Yes,**” 89 (**11.9%**) were “**No,**” and 129 (**17.2%**) declined to answer the question.

**Medical Condition**

Responding to the question “Do you or anyone who lives with you have a medical condition that is made worse by exposure to secondhand smoke (e.g. allergies asthma lung disease high blood pressure pregnant etc.)?” 243 (**33.1%**) of the 734 persons who answered replied, “**Yes**” and 491 **(66.9%)** answered **“No.”**

Medical Conditions are not equally distributed by jurisdiction. 122 **(50.0%)** of 244 respondents in **Montebello** replied “**Yes,**” compared to 62 **(25.4%)** of 244 respondents in **South Gate**, and to 59 **(24.0%)** of 246 in **Azusa.**

Who the respondents reporting living with is also associated with “**Yes**” responses to medical conditions made worse by exposure to secondhand smoke were reported by 54 **(38.6%)** of 140 respondents who live with **children 0 to 7** years of age; 25 **(38.2%)** of 68 respondents who live with adults **over 65**; 72 **(32.6%)** of those living with **children 8 to 17** years of age; and 155 **(31.8%)** of 488 respondents who live with other **adults ages 18 to 64**.

1. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/southgatecitycalifornia,montebellocitycalifornia,azusacitycalifornia/PST045219> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)