



CITY HALL

California's Center for Tobacco Policy & Organizing

## Center Polling and Policy Data for the CX Needs Assessment August 2009

The Center for Tobacco Policy & Organizing has a number of resources, including polling and policy data, to assist local lead agencies (LLAs) in completing their Communities of Excellence (CX) needs assessment. In order to help LLAs and coalitions more efficiently utilize these resources, the Center has compiled all of the relevant data from our various resources into this one document.

### Data Available

The Center has data available for three categories of Community Indicators: (a) 1.1 indicators related to tobacco industry campaign contributions and lobbying; (b) 2.2 indicators related to secondhand smoke; and (c) 3.1 and 3.2 indicators related to reducing the availability of tobacco.

The data available fits into three of the attributes used for the CX needs assessment: Public Awareness, Public Support and Legislated Policy. The bulk of this data comes from scientific surveys commissioned by the Center, which includes public awareness and public support data on outdoor secondhand smoke, smokefree housing and tobacco retailer licensing policies. For the Legislated Policy attribute, data includes lists of cities and counties with ordinances highlighted in the Center's local policy matrices and the American Lung Association in California's State of Tobacco Control (SOTC) Report. Finally, campaign contributions and lobbying expenditures figures of tobacco interests are included from the Center's Tobacco Money in California Politics report.

### How to Use this Document

The table on the following pages contains all of the Center data organized by CX indicator. Simply find the indicator for which you are completing the CX needs assessment to review all the data that is available (please note: some indicators appear more than once). Copy any data that is relevant for your city/county needs assessment into your *CX Indicator Rating Worksheet*. For each data point in the table, the source is listed in parentheses. A complete reference list of sources with appropriate website links is included on page 2. For data on legislated policies, you will need to go to the actual source to determine the totals for your county.

**List of Sources**

- Source 1: Tobacco Money in California Politics: Report for the 2007-2008 Election Cycle, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/tobaccomoney](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/tobaccomoney) and [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/database](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/database) (to search for legislators by county), June 2009
- Source 2: Survey of California Voters about Secondhand Smoke Policies, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polling-shs](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polling-shs), conducted by Goodwin Simon Victoria Research, November 2008
- Source 3: Survey of California Rural and Small Town Voters, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polling-rural](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polling-rural), conducted by Goodwin Simon Victoria Research, March 2008
  - There is also regional data in this document for all the data that comes from the Center’s Survey of California Rural and Small Town Voters. The rural counties in the survey were divided into three regions (Central Valley, Sierra and Northern) with an equal number of voters surveyed in each region. The Central Valley region includes Kern, Kings, Merced, San Benito and Tulare counties. The Sierra region includes Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Inyo, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, Sierra and Tuolumne counties. The Northern region includes Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity and Yuba counties.
- Source 4: Survey of California Latino Renters, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polls-latinorenters](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polls-latinorenters), conducted by Goodwin Simon Victoria Research, July 2006
- Source 5: Survey of California Apartment Owners and Managers, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polls-ownermanager](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polls-ownermanager), conducted by Goodwin Simon Victoria Research, June 2005
- Source 6: Survey of California Renters, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polls-carenters](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/polls-carenters), conducted by Goodwin Simon Victoria Research, August 2004
- Source 7: Comprehensive Outdoor Secondhand Smoke Ordinances, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/localpolicies-outdoorareas](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/localpolicies-outdoorareas), updated July 2009
- Source 8: American Lung Association in California, State of Tobacco Control: Local Grades, [www.californialung.org/sotc-ca-local](http://www.californialung.org/sotc-ca-local), January 2009
- Source 9: Matrix of Local Smokefree Housing Policies, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/localpolicies-smokefreehousing](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/localpolicies-smokefreehousing), updated July 2009
- Source 10: Listing of Communities that Restrict Smoking in Outdoor Common Areas of Multi-Unit Housing, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/localpolicies-smokefreehousing](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/localpolicies-smokefreehousing), updated July 2009
- Source 11: Matrix of Strong Local Tobacco Retailer Licensing Ordinances, [www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/localpolicies-licensing](http://www.center4tobaccopolicy.org/localpolicies-licensing), updated May 2009

**Table of Center Data for CX Needs Assessment**

Indicator	Indicator Description	CX Attribute	Data (Source)
1.1.10	Tobacco Industry Contributions		Tobacco interests made campaign contributions to 60 of the 120 members of the California Legislature during the 2007-2008 election cycle (Source 1)
1.1.10	Tobacco Industry Contributions		Tobacco interests made campaign contributions to 18 political committees during the 2007-2008 election cycle (1)

1.1.13	Tobacco Industry Lobbying		Tobacco interests spent \$2.66 million to lobby 18 different bills during the 2007-2008 legislative session (1)
All 2.2	Secondhand Smoke	Public Awareness	<p>97% of California voters believe secondhand smoke is harmful to those who inhale it (Source 2)</p> <p>86% of California rural and small town voters believe secondhand smoke is harmful to those who inhale it (Source 3)</p> <p>86% of Central Valley rural and small town voters believe secondhand smoke is harmful to those who inhale it (3)</p> <p>84% of Sierra rural and small town voters believe secondhand smoke is harmful to those who inhale it (3)</p> <p>86% of Northern California rural and small town voters believe secondhand smoke is harmful to those who inhale it (3)</p> <p>98% of California Latino renters believe secondhand smoke is harmful to those who inhale it (Source 4)</p> <p>86% of California apartment owners &amp; managers believe secondhand smoke is harmful to those who inhale it (Source 5)</p> <p>90% of California renters believe secondhand smoke is harmful to those who inhale it (Source 6)</p>
2.2.1	Smoking Ban in Home	Public Support	<p>95% of California Latino renters do not allow smoking in their home (4)</p> <p>80% of California renters do not allow smoking in their home (6)</p>
2.2.5 2.2.6 2.2.7 2.2.8 2.2.9 2.2.16	Outdoor Secondhand Smoke	Public Awareness	<p>88% of California voters believe secondhand smoke is harmful to those who inhale it outdoors (2)</p> <p>65% of California voters were bothered by secondhand smoke exposure outdoors in the past year (2)</p>
2.2.22 2.2.24		Public Support	73% of California voters support a law with a comprehensive ban on outdoor smoking in all areas accessible to the public except for designated smoking areas (2)

2.2.26			
2.2.27		Legislated Policy	As of July 2009, 25 cities and counties in California have a comprehensive outdoor secondhand smoke ordinance that prohibits smoking in at least 5 of the 7 major outdoor areas (Source 7)
2.2.6	Outdoor Dining	Public Awareness	60% of California voters were bothered by secondhand smoke exposure in outdoor dining in the past year (2)
		Public Support	56% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking in outdoor areas of bars and restaurants, such as patios and outdoor eating areas (2)
		Legislated Policy	In the 30 counties included in the State of Tobacco Control (SOTC) report, there are 53 cities and counties with an ordinance that restricts smoking in outdoor dining (Source 8)
2.2.7	Outdoor Worksites	Public Support	46% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking in outdoor worksites, such as construction zones (2)
2.2.8	Entryways	Public Support	77% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking in front of doors and windows into offices, restaurants and other buildings (2)
		Legislated Policy	In the 30 counties included in the SOTC report, there are 69 cities and counties with an ordinance that restricts smoking in entryways to buildings (8)
2.2.9	Outdoor Public Areas not for Recreational Use	Public Support	69% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking at farmer's markets (2)
			60% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking in outdoor areas of malls and shopping centers (2)
			57% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking in outdoor areas of college campuses (2)
			56% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking at bus stops (2)
			49% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking in outdoor areas of downtown business zones (2)
			66% of California rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in downtown areas (3)

---

71% of Central Valley rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in downtown areas (3)

62% of Sierra rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in downtown areas (3)

65% of Northern California rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in downtown areas (3)

44% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking on public sidewalks (2)

40% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking in parking lots (2)

---

Legislated Policy

In the 30 counties included in the SOTC report, there are 46 cities and counties with an ordinance that restricts smoking at public events (8)

In the 30 counties included in the SOTC report, there are 55 cities and counties with an ordinance that restricts smoking in service areas (8)

In the 30 counties included in the SOTC report, there are 7 cities and counties with an ordinance that restricts smoking on sidewalks (8)

2.2.10	Health Care Facilities	Public Support	70% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking in outdoor areas of nursing homes, hospitals and long-term care facilities (2)
2.2.13	Units of Multi-Unit Housing	Public Awareness	86% of California Latino renters believe secondhand smoke can drift from apartment to apartment (4) 69% of California apartment owners and managers believe secondhand smoke can drift from apartment to apartment (5) 59% of California renters believe that secondhand smoke can drift from apartment to apartment (6) 82% of California Latino renters believe secondhand smoke can drift from outside into an apartment (4) 80% of California apartment owners and managers believe secondhand smoke can drift from outside into an apartment (5)

---

---

72% of California renters believe secondhand smoke can drift from outside into an apartment (6)

63% of California Latino renters have experienced secondhand smoke drift into their apartment (4)

44% of California apartment owners and managers have had tenants complain about secondhand smoke drifting into their apartments (5)

46% of California renters have experienced secondhand smoke drift into their apartment (6)

63% of California Latino renters are bothered by secondhand smoke drifting into their apartment (4)

---

Public Support

78% of California voters support a law requiring apartment buildings to offer nonsmoking sections (2)

75% of California rural and small town voters support a law requiring apartments to offer nonsmoking sections (3)

77% of Central Valley rural and small town voters support a law requiring apartments to offer nonsmoking sections (3)

74% of Sierra rural and small town voters support a law requiring apartments to offer nonsmoking sections (3)

74% of Northern California rural and small town voters support a law requiring apartments to offer nonsmoking sections (3)

82% of California Latino renters support a law requiring apartments to offer nonsmoking sections (4)

57% of California apartment owners and managers support a law requiring apartments to offer nonsmoking sections (5)

69% of California renters support a law requiring apartments to offer nonsmoking sections (6)

---

---

74% of California voters support a law requiring 50 percent of apartment units to be nonsmoking (2)

58% of California voters support a law requiring 75 percent of apartment units to be nonsmoking (2)

42% of California voters support a law requiring 100 percent of apartment units to be nonsmoking (2)

56% of California voters feel that a law requiring apartment buildings to offer nonsmoking sections should apply to condominiums as well (2)

---

Legislated Policy

As of July 2009, 8 cities and counties in California have an ordinance that requires apartment buildings to designate nonsmoking sections (Source 9)

2.2.16

Outdoor  
Recreational  
Facilities

Public Support

65% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking at nature areas, trails and campgrounds (2)

62% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking at outdoor concerts and sporting events (2)

59% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking at beaches (2)

55% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking at city and regional parks (2)

55% of California rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in parks, trails and recreation areas (3)

58% of Central Valley rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in parks, trails and recreation areas (3)

51% of Sierra rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in parks, trails and recreation areas (3)

58% of Northern California rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in parks, trails and recreation areas (3)

55% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking at fairs and rodeos (2)

			<p>70% of California rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking at outdoor events (3)</p> <p>71% of Central Valley rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking at outdoor events (3)</p> <p>67% of Sierra rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking at outdoor events (3)</p> <p>71% of Northern California rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking at outdoor events (3)</p>
		Legislated Policy	<p>In the 30 counties included in the SOTC report, there are 124 cities and counties with an ordinance that restricts smoking in recreational areas (8)</p> <p>In the 30 counties included in the SOTC report, there are 46 cities and counties with an ordinance that restricts smoking at public events (8)</p>
2.2.18	Child Care and Foster Care Homes	Public Support	77% of California voters support having child care protective agencies require foster homes to be nonsmoking (2)
2.2.23	Disclosure	Public Support	<p>70% of California voters think that a person moving into an apartment should be told if the tenant next door smokes (2)</p> <p>61% of California renters support a law requiring landlords to inform new tenants that a person who smokes lives in a unit next door to the one the new tenant is about to rent (6)</p>
		Legislated Policy	As of July 2009, 11 cities and counties in California have an ordinance that requires prospective tenants to be informed of the location of smoking units prior to signing a lease (9)
2.2.24	Nuisance	Public Support	58% of California voters support a law that declares secondhand smoke to be a public nuisance (2)
2.2.25	American Indian Casinos	Public Support	90% of California voters would either be more inclined to visit or would be unaffected if smoking were prohibited in California Indian casinos (2)

			69% of California voters feel that employees in California Indian casinos should have the same protections from secondhand smoke as other employees in California (2)
2.2.26	Indoor and Outdoor Common Areas	Public Awareness	64% of California Latino renters are bothered by secondhand smoke in indoor common areas (4)  58% of California Latino renters are bothered by secondhand smoke in outdoor common areas (4)
		Public Support	69% of California voters support a law to prohibit smoking in outdoor common areas of apartments (2)  68% of California rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in outdoor common areas of apartment buildings (3)  68% of Central Valley rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in outdoor common areas of apartment buildings (3)  69% of Sierra rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in outdoor common areas of apartment buildings (3)  66% of Northern California rural and small town voters support a law prohibiting smoking in outdoor common areas of apartment buildings (3)  85% of California Latino renters support a law prohibiting smoking in outdoor common areas of multi-unit housing (4)  67% of California apartment owners and managers support a law prohibiting smoking in outdoor common areas of multi-unit housing (5)  67% of California renters support a law prohibiting smoking in outdoor common areas of multi-unit housing (6)
		Legislated Policy	As of July 2009, 23 cities and counties in California have an ordinance that prohibits smoking in indoor and outdoor common areas of apartment buildings (Source 10)
3.1.1 3.1.11 3.2.1	Reducing Sales of Tobacco Products to	Public Awareness	50% of California rural and small town voters feel that it is easy for minors to buy cigarettes at local retail stores (3)

3.2.2 3.2.10	Minors	<p>55% of Central Valley rural and small town voters feel that it is easy for minors to buy cigarettes at local retail stores (3)</p> <p>50% of Sierra rural and small town voters feel that it is easy for minors to buy cigarettes at local retail stores (3)</p> <p>45% of Northern California rural and small town voters feel that it is easy for minors to buy cigarettes at local retail stores (3)</p> <p>75% of California rural and small town voters think reducing teen smoking should be a high priority of local government (3)</p> <p>76% of Central Valley rural and small town voters think reducing teen smoking should be a high priority of local government (3)</p> <p>75 % of Sierra rural and small town voters think reducing teen smoking should be a high priority of local government (3)</p> <p>74% of Northern California rural and small town voters think reducing teen smoking should be a high priority of local government (3)</p> <p>73% of California rural and small town voters think reducing teen use of chewing tobacco should be a high priority of local government (3)</p> <p>73% of Central Valley rural and small town voters think reducing teen use of chewing tobacco should be a high priority of local government (3)</p> <p>73% of Sierra rural and small town voters think reducing teen use of chewing tobacco should be a high priority of local government (3)</p> <p>72% of Northern California rural and small town voters think reducing teen use of chewing tobacco should be a high priority of local government (3)</p>
3.2.1	Tobacco Retailer Licensing Ordinances      Public Support	<p>78% of California rural and small town voters support a law requiring store owners to get a license to sell cigarettes (3)</p> <p>83% of Central Valley rural and small town voters support a law requiring store owners to get a license to sell cigarettes (3)</p>

---

76 % of Sierra rural and small town voters support a law requiring store owners to get a license to sell cigarettes (3)

75 % of Northern California rural and small town voters support a law requiring store owners to get a license to sell cigarettes (3)

70% of California rural and small town voters support having store owners pay a fee of a few hundred dollars a year for a license to sell cigarettes (3)

77 % of Central Valley rural and small town voters support having store owners pay a fee of a few hundred dollars a year for a license to sell cigarettes (3)

68% of Sierra rural and small town voters support having store owners pay a fee of a few hundred dollars a year for a license to sell cigarettes (3)

68% of Northern California rural and small town voters support having store owners pay a fee of a few hundred dollars a year for a license to sell cigarettes (3)

81% of California rural and small town voters support having a store owners' license to sell cigarettes suspended for repeat violations of the law against selling cigarettes to minors (3)

86% of Central Valley rural and small town voters support having a store owners' license to sell cigarettes suspended for repeat violations of the law against selling cigarettes to minors (3)

81% of Sierra rural and small town voters support having a store owners' license to sell cigarettes suspended for repeat violations of the law against selling cigarettes to minors (3)

79% of Northern California rural and small town voters support having a store owners' license to sell cigarettes suspended for repeat violations of the law against selling cigarettes to minors (3)

84% of California rural and small town voters think that increasing the penalties, such as suspension and revocation of the license, on retailers for each new violation of selling cigarettes to minors is either too mild or about right as a punishment (3)

87% of Central Valley rural and small town voters think that increasing the penalties, such as suspension and revocation of the license, on retailers for each new violation of selling cigarettes to minors is either too mild or about right as a punishment (3)

84% of Sierra rural and small town voters think that increasing the penalties, such as suspension and revocation of the license, on retailers for each new violation of selling cigarettes to minors is either too mild or about right as a punishment (3)

80% of Northern California rural and small town voters think that increasing the penalties, such as suspension and revocation of the license, on retailers for each new violation of selling cigarettes to minors is either too mild or about right as a punishment (3)

---

Legislated Policy

---

As of May 2009, 63 cities and counties in California have a strong local tobacco retailer licensing ordinance (Source 11)

3.2.2	Conditional Use Permits	Legislated Policy	In the 30 counties included in the SOTC report, there are 13 cities and counties with an ordinance that restricts tobacco retail outlets through a conditional use permit (8)
3.2.4	Sampling or Nonsale Distribution	Legislated Policy	In the 30 counties included in the SOTC report, there are 17 cities and counties with an ordinance that restricts nonsale distribution of tobacco products (8)
3.2.7	Pharmacies	Legislated Policy	In the 30 counties included in the SOTC report, there is 1 city with an ordinance that restricts sales of tobacco products in pharmacies (8)

*This material was made possible by funds received from the California Department of Public Health, under contract #09-11173.*