

CITY OF HAMILTON

***PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES
Healthy Living Division***

Report to: Mayor and Members Board of Health	Submitted by: Elizabeth Richardson, MD, MHSc, FRCPC Medical Officer of Health Public Health Services
Date: June 8, 2009	Prepared by: Heidi McGuire ext 6170

**SUBJECT: Smoking and Second-hand Smoke in CityHousing Units
BOH07034(c) City Wide)**

RECOMMENDATION:

- a) That Public Health Services staff be directed to work together with CityHousing Hamilton staff to develop a policy for consideration by the CityHousing Hamilton Board which includes the following:
 - (i) prohibiting smoking in newly acquired CityHousing Hamilton buildings;
 - (ii) prohibiting smoking in existing designated CityHousing Hamilton units as they turn over;
 - (iii) regulating smoking at the entrance and exit to CityHousing Hamilton buildings; and
 - (iv) supporting residents who want to quit smoking.

- (b) That the Item respecting Banning Smoking in CityHousing Hamilton Units, requested on March 25, 2008 be removed from the list of outstanding business.

Elizabeth Richardson, MD, MHSc, FRCPC
Medical Officer of Health
Public Health Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In March 2008, the Board of Health requested staff report on recommendations for banning smoking in CityHousing Hamilton units, taking into consideration smoking cessation programs available for residents.

Focus groups facilitated by Public Health Services were conducted with CityHousing Hamilton residents March to June 2009 to investigate resident attitudes and opinions on smoking and second-hand smoke in CityHousing Hamilton units. Groups were conducted across the city and representation from a range of residents including seniors and families was obtained. Residents unable to participate in the focus groups were able to submit written comments on this issue.

All participants knew that second-hand smoke is harmful and many have health issues exacerbated by exposure to second-hand smoke. Results from the focus groups and written feedback show that many CityHousing Hamilton residents already use items such as weather stripping, door sweeps, fans, and air cleaners to prevent second-hand smoke from entering or leaving their units. Smoking at entrance ways of CityHousing Hamilton buildings is a problem for those who must walk through smoke to enter their home, as well as those who live at the front of the building who have smoke coming into their units through open windows.

Each focus group participant, including both smokers and non-smokers, expressed support for a policy whereby new buildings acquired by CityHousing Hamilton would be smoke-free. There was also support for having existing units being designated smoke-free as previous residents vacated the units and new residents moved in. The concept of separate non-smoking and smoking buildings was supported as well. Non-smoking and smoking floors within the same building was not seen as a viable option by focus groups participants. Non-smokers supported having outdoor spaces around entrances and exits regulated.

Public Health Services is committed to providing a range of cessation options to support CityHousing Hamilton residents who want to quit smoking. This includes enhanced access to the Tobacco Cessation Clinic.

BACKGROUND:

On March 25, 2008, the Board of Health directed staff to report back with recommendations on banning smoking in CityHousing Hamilton units, including but not limited to examining policies in other municipalities and considering the role of smoking cessation programs. An update was provided on November 7, 2008 indicating progress.

CityHousing Hamilton

City Housing Hamilton provides housing to families, seniors, couples, single people and people with special needs in a variety of housing including townhouses, apartments, single and semi-detached dwellings. Most of the housing is available on a rent-geared-to-income basis, however some projects offer market rent units as well. CityHousing Hamilton owns and operates 6234 units, which makes Hamilton the fourth largest municipality controlled housing provider in Ontario and the largest provider of subsidized units within the city of Hamilton. Another 8000 units in Hamilton are owned

and operated by non-profit and co-operative organizations and subsidized by the City. The Board of CityHousing Hamilton is independent from Hamilton City Council.

Smoking Regulation and Legislation in Residential Buildings

Smoking has been prohibited since May 31, 2006 in common areas of condominiums and apartment buildings under the *Smoke-Free Ontario Act, 2006*. Common areas include elevators, stairwells, hall ways, parking garages, laundry facilities and party or entertainment rooms.

Smoking indoors is prohibited by legislation in a number of other types of establishments in Ontario, including all enclosed public places and workplaces; federal and territorial/provincial prisons (including grounds); hospitals; nursing homes and long term care facilities; college and university dormitories; and within private home-based daycare settings. Additionally, home health-care workers are protected from second-hand smoke while they are working in clients homes in Ontario. Other establishments have voluntarily adopted policies making their facilities smoke-free including select hotel chains such as Marriott, Westin, Choice Hotels; and hospitals with smoke-free properties.

Smoking Rates and Household Smoking in Hamilton

In the city of Hamilton, 78% of residents are non-smokers (22% are daily and occasional smokers), according to the 2005 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS). Those who have an annual income of less than \$15, 000 have a daily or occasional smoking rate of 31.5%. The rate decreases to 26.5% for those whose income is between \$15, 000 and \$29, 000 annually. Smoking rates continue to decrease with an increasing income level. Smoking rates for those above age 65 in Hamilton are less than 10%.

In the first half of 2008, 13% of Canadian households reported at least one person who smoked inside the home every day or almost every day, according to the Canadian Tobacco Use Monitoring Survey (CTUMS). Among the remaining homes where someone did not smoke every day or almost every day, 11% of homes still allowed smoking inside. The CCHS found that 22% of those age 12 to 17, 10% of those age 18 to 34, 6% age 35 to 64, and 6% of those above aged 65 were regularly exposed to second-hand smoke at home.

Smoking Cessation

Quitting smoking has several health benefits for individuals. At any given time, 70% of smokers are willing to quit tobacco use, however only four to seven per cent of those attempting to quit will be successful.^{1,2} All of the commercially available forms of Nicotine Replacement Therapy (NRT) such as gum, transdermal patch, nasal spray, inhaler, and sublingual tablets/lozenges can help people who make a quit attempt to increase their chances of successfully quitting smoking. NRT doubles the rate of quitting.² As well, evidence shows that there is a strong dose-response relation between counselling interventions and successful outcomes. In fact, higher intensity individual counselling can increase quit rates by 50 to 70%.²

Second-hand Smoke

Second-hand smoke contains more than 4000 chemicals, about 50 of which are known to cause cancer. Exposure to second-hand smoke causes irritation of the eyes, nose, throat and respiratory system over the short-term, as well as causing headaches. In the long-term it causes increased chronic respiratory symptoms such as wheezing, coughing and breathlessness, middle ear infections, and asthma in children. It can cause asthma in adults, increased risk of coronary heart disease, and lung cancer.

Numerous reputable health and scientific agencies, including the World Health Organization and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have concluded that there is no safe level of exposure to second-hand smoke. Individuals with diabetes, high blood pressure, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD), vascular diseases, asthma, bronchitis and emphysema are particularly vulnerable to exposure to second-hand smoke. Research shows that there is a dose-response relationship between exposure to second-hand smoke and its effect on health. This means that the more tobacco smoke a person is exposed to and the longer he or she is exposed, the greater the health risk. Children and the elderly are more vulnerable to the effects of second-hand smoke.

Second-hand Smoke in Multi-Unit Dwellings

Second-hand smoke in multi-unit dwellings seeps in through open windows and doors (from a neighbour's patio or outdoor common areas), electrical outlets, cable jacks or phone jacks, ceiling fixtures, cracks and gaps around sinks, countertops, windows, doors, floors, walls, ceilings, intake vents and shared ventilation systems. The driving forces which cause second-hand smoke to migrate from one unit to another are the differential air pressures caused by wind-induced air flows around the building, indoor-outdoor air temperature differences and ventilation system air flows.

Ninety three per cent of the toxic products in second-hand smoke are colourless and odourless. Concentrations of second-hand smoke constituents decay over time after smoking has stopped, but they can persist at perceptible and/or measurable levels for months or even years in an indoor space where a considerable amount of smoking has occurred (termed "third-hand smoke"). Air quality studies in apartment buildings show that 5 to 60% of air in apartment buildings comes from other units in the building. In one recent study, measurements with smokers in two units were taken one evening in an apartment building. Measured pollutant levels in the parking garage and lobby were very low. Measured pollutant levels in common areas outside both smokers' apartments were high, as were the levels in the bedroom above the smokers' apartments. The study showed persons living in apartments near smokers can be exposed to elevated pollution levels for 8 to 24 hours per day.³

Smoke-Free Multi-Unit Dwellings in Canada and the United States

There are many precedents for setting smoke-free policies in multi-unit dwellings both by private landlords and by public housing authorities, particularly in the United States, but increasingly in Canada too. Public housing authorities have adopted no-smoking policies in many states including Alaska, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, Oregon, New

Hampshire, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin. In Canada, The Greater Edmonton Foundation, Greater Vancouver Housing Corporation and The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation are a few of the housing providers who have policies regulating smoking. The Region of Waterloo, as well as others in Ontario are also investigating smoke-free policies for their housing units. A detailed listing of communities with smoke-free multi-unit dwelling policies is outlined in Appendix "A" to Report BOH07034(c).

Benefits of Smoke-Free Buildings

Smoke-free policies contribute to successful quitting and reductions in the amount smoked. No-smoking buildings provide health benefits to residents, employees and visitors; promote tobacco cessation among residents; reduce health care costs; provide cleaner homes; reduce tenant complaints; reduce safety hazards such as fire risks; reduce cleaning and maintenance expenses; and may reduce insurance costs. There are compelling financial reasons for landlords to make their buildings smoke-free:

Economics - Landlords report it typically costs two to three times more to clean up a smoking unit over a non-smoking unit when there is turnover of the unit between tenants. Smoking also increases maintenance costs- cigarette burn marks, nicotine and tar-stained walls, and carpets that smell of tobacco smoke.

Fire Risk- A smoke-free building reduces the risk of fire. Statistics from the Ontario Fire Marshal's Office show that the number of residential structure fires caused by careless smoking is on the rise. Careless smoking is the number one cause of fire deaths in the province of Ontario. Smoking is the leading cause of fatal fires among the elderly. In households where one or more members' smoke, the risk of fire related injuries to the people who smoke or a family member is five times higher compared to non-smoking residences. In a recent Ontario study, one in four smokers admitted to leaving lit cigarettes unattended in the last 30 days.⁴

CityHousing Hamilton Resident Consultation

Focus groups facilitated by Public Health Services were conducted with CityHousing Hamilton residents March to June 2009. These groups were designed to investigate resident attitudes and opinions on smoking and second-hand smoke in CityHousing Hamilton units. CityHousing Hamilton staff identified locations for the focus groups, with a geographic spread across the city, and with representation from a range of residents including seniors and families.

Ten focus groups were scheduled for March 2009, with a total of six completed. Four were cancelled due to low registration. Four additional focus groups were scheduled for May and June 2009, with one group cancelled due to low registration. CityHousing residents who were unable to participate in the focus groups were able to submit written feedback, and at the time of this report being written, seventeen submissions were received. A total of 33 smokers and 39 non-smokers participated at five locations, and five smokers and 12 non-smokers submitted written feedback.

ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

Is Smoking and Second-hand Smoke a Problem in Multi-Unit Dwellings in Ontario?

An Ipsos Reid survey conducted in Ontario in 2006 showed 46% of respondents who lived in a multi-unit dwelling had tobacco smoke enter their unit within the last 12 months from somewhere else in their building; more than one in ten said it occurs daily. This problem occurred most often among lower educated, lower income, lower rent respondents and was more common in high-rise apartment buildings than any other type of multi-unit dwelling. A survey conducted with 2723 tenants residing in Region of Waterloo Community Housing and Waterloo Region Housing during October and November 2008 reported that 57% of all respondents were exposed to second-hand smoke inside their home. Seventy five per cent of smokers reported that someone smokes inside their home.

Smoke-Free Policy Options for Ontario Residents

An Ipsos Reid survey conducted in 2006 in Ontario found that 64% of multi-unit dwelling respondents indicated they would likely choose a smoke-free building over one where smoking is permitted if such a building were available; and the Canadian Association of Mental Health Monitor in 2007 found that 79% of Ontario adults agreed smoking should not be allowed indoors in multi-unit dwellings. A 2006 Decima survey of 1035 residents who rent showed that 50% of multi-unit dwelling residents would prefer to live in a building where smoking is prohibited everywhere, both inside and outside.

Some smokers would like to live in a smoke-free building, as not all smoke indoors. A survey conducted in 2008 in British Columbia found that of households with smokers, 67% of renters and 84% of owners do not allow residents or guests to smoke inside the home or on the property. In a 2006 survey of Washington residents, disabled respondents had a smoking rate of 39%, but more than two thirds did not allow smoking in their apartment. A random survey in 2008 of Oregon renters found that 38% of smokers would choose a smoke-free unit.

Smoking and Second-hand Smoke in CityHousing Hamilton Units

Highlights from the nine focus groups and written feedback are outlined below and a summary of focus group results can be found in Appendix "B" to Report BOH07034(c).

Is Smoking and Second-hand Smoke in CityHousing Hamilton Units a Problem?

Most smokers smoke every day in their units, with some restrictions, such as smoking in the living room and balcony only; some smokers go outside to smoke, especially in good weather. Visitors are allowed to smoke in smokers' units, with some restrictions, such as smoking only on the balcony (where available), especially if visitors are children or non-smokers. The majority (with one exception) of non-smokers do not allow smoking in their units at any time.

Many smokers and non-smokers use items such as air cleaners/purifiers, ionizers, fans, blankets under the door, weather-stripping and door sweeps in an attempt to prevent second-hand smoke from entering or leaving their unit. Smoke in CityHousing Hamilton buildings enters units through windows, neighbours balconies, through bathroom and kitchen vents, under kitchen and bathroom cupboards/sinks, around pipes, and under

hallway doors. Improper ventilation in buildings was mentioned as a major factor of second-hand smoke in residential units.

People smoking at front entrance ways was identified as a problem because it is often the only entrance to the building and it is necessary for people to walk through the smoke to get into their home. Additionally, cigarette smoke from those congregated at entrance ways enters apartment units situated at the front of the building through windows. Residents of the building, including children, are unable to enjoy the outdoor areas such as the garden because they have to breathe in tobacco smoke, for example, smoking occurs at all tables on the patio. Cigarette butts litter entranceways. Additionally, smoking on balconies was identified as a major source of concern because lit cigarette butts are landing on others balconies (including on furniture, people and pets) and smoke is entering neighbouring units through open windows originating from a balcony.

Participants at the focus groups all believed second-hand smoke is harmful to their health. The majority of non-smokers are bothered, but the smokers are not bothered by smoking and/or second-hand smoke. Non-smokers were concerned because they have to spend 24 hours a day breathing in second-hand smoke in their own home. More than half of non-smoking participants have health problems/symptoms made worse by/from second-hand smoke such as asthma, cancer, acute bronchitis, burning eyes, chest infections, nausea/vomiting, and a cough. Some smoking participants have health problems exacerbated by second-hand smoke such as asthma, bronchitis, COPD, and emphysema. Many participants mentioned that family members and pets are also affected by second-hand smoke. There was significant concern about smoking around children because they don't have a choice in being exposed to second-hand smoke. Concern was also expressed about fire risk and safety when lit tobacco products are being used indoors.

Smoke-Free Policy Options for CityHousing Hamilton Residents

Smokers all agreed that there should not be smoking in indoor common areas of apartment buildings, as is currently the law under the *Smoke-Free Ontario Act, 2006*. There was not support for smoke-free public places when legislation was first introduced, but now it is accepted.

For newly acquired CityHousing Hamilton buildings, smokers and non-smokers unanimously agreed these should/could be smoke-free. This option offers a choice for residents and people know it's smoke-free before moving in. This was seen as the most fair option by both smokers and non-smokers.

There was support from some smokers and a majority of non-smokers for having designated units become smoke-free as residents leave and new residents move into the building. Some residents expressed concern about additional complaints against smokers if more non-smokers move in and that units need to be cleaned after smokers move out. Other residents felt that improved ventilation would be required with this option. Residents felt that this was a better option than what currently exists for them.

Both non-smokers and smokers supported having separate smoking and non-smoking buildings, with concerns raised about having to move (many would move only if the City pays to move them into a comparable building). Both groups felt that this option offers a choice for both smokers and non-smokers.

In terms of having non-smoking and smoking floors within the same building, a minority of smokers supported this option. Non-smokers did not support this option. Concerns with this option included the cost of moving people and the fact that problems that currently exist due to shared ventilation would not be addressed. There was also a concern that second-hand smoke problems at the entrance ways would not be resolved.

Non-smokers would like outdoor areas included in a policy because they must walk through smoke to get in and out of building, and also because of the problem of smoke drifting up into apartment units at the front of the building through open windows. The majority of non-smokers supported having a 9 metre radius around entrance and exit ways that are smoke-free zones. Many non-smokers and children are unable to enjoy the outdoor property and gardens because smoking occurs throughout the property and cigarette litter is also prevalent. Non-smokers suggested having separate sections on the property that are smoke-free. They felt that instead of making the property smoke-free, providing a designated area for smokers further away from the door so non-smokers don't have to walk through it would be appropriate.

All non-smokers expressed that they would like to live in a smoke-free building; some people would move to comparable building/property if it were available. A few of the smokers would move into a smoke-free building because of health concerns, support to quit, or they have no problem smoking outside - if similar building/location were available. Current residents felt they should have first choice to move to a smoke-free building. Two people stated they would move out of their building if it instituted a smoke-free policy.

Experience From Other Areas Where Smoke-Free Policies Have Been Implemented

A survey of 49 private and public apartment owners and managers in Minnesota in 2001 reported almost entirely neutral or positive effects on vacancy rate, turnover, amount of rent that could be charged, and staff time required to manage the building after going smoke-free. Fifty five per cent reported a decrease in staff time due to less preparation of apartments, less cleaning time, less leasing time, and less time handling complaints. A survey of landlords and industry leaders in Washington in 2006 showed that their main concern with residents smoking indoors was the time, expense or experience of cleaning up and repairing units after indoor smokers. Fire hazards are also a substantial concern. Without exception, landlords who did not allow smoking indoors would never go back to allowing smoking in units.

Guardian Management implemented a no-smoking policy in January 2008 for 8000 of its units in the western United States, which prohibits smoking inside apartment units and common areas, including patios and balconies, as well as within 25 feet of any building on the property. A survey was conducted one year after the policy was

implemented, yielding an 82% response rate. Guardian Management's experience with low-income subsidized properties showed that nearly $\frac{3}{4}$ of all residents were happy or very happy with the no-smoking rule. The percentage of non-smokers who reported never being exposed to second-hand smoke in their apartments increased by 75%; and for outdoors on porches, patios or balconies more than doubled. Among smokers, 43% reported smoking less tobacco since the policy's implementation. Nearly half of respondents who smoke reported making an attempt to quit since the policy was implemented.

Cessation Options Available for CityHousing Hamilton Residents

Public Health Services would offer a range of cessation supports to CityHousing Hamilton residents in order to facilitate the implementation of smoke-free housing policies. The Public Health Services Quit Smoking Clinic would offer one-to-one counselling for residents at locations across the city. The service is free to clients, and includes free NRT, if needed. Other services that are available and would be promoted to residents include: the Smokers' Helpline, a one-to-one telephone-based counselling service, available without cost to Ontario residents; self-help resources and referral to physicians and pharmacists for counselling.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:

Below are alternatives to the suggested recommendations which have been considered:

- Designating smoking and non-smoking floors within existing CityHousing Hamilton buildings. The CityHousing Hamilton residents who participated in the focus groups did not support this option. For this reason, this alternative is not recommended.
- Implementing other measures to prevent the spread of second-hand smoke in CityHousing Hamilton units, such as ventilation fans in bathrooms and kitchens, door sweeps and weather stripping on doors. Many CityHousing Hamilton residents have already implemented some of these measures themselves, and still have second-hand smoke entering or leaving their unit. Studies have shown that these measures have limited effectiveness.⁵ In the absence of evidence that such measures would be effective, this approach is not recommended.
- Developing a by-law requiring all multi-unit dwellings in Hamilton, including public and private landlords, to implement a smoke-free policy. Public Health Services currently provides consultation to private landlords who wish to draft a smoke-free policy. Other subsidized housing providers in the city of Hamilton will be approached to work on a similar policy in the future. The City only has the authority to regulate smoking under a by-law in public places as per the Municipal Act.
- Drafting a policy to ensure that those who provide maintenance or cleaning services in the units are not exposed to second-hand smoke. Other employees are protected under the Smoke-Free Ontario Act, 2006, which legislates smoke-free enclosed workplaces. Such a policy is not recommended because of challenges with enforcing a policy of this type.

FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Financial

Policy development and support of the CityHousing Hamilton implementation would be completed within existing the Public Health Services budget.

Staffing

Public Health Services would provide consultation and assist with promotion and implementation of the policy. No Public Health Services staffing increases would be required.

Legal

There is no enshrined legal right to smoke tobacco in or on ordinary residential rental property. Neither the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006 nor the Social Housing Reform Act, 2000 would prevent a smoke-free policy. A residential landlord can decide to limit or prohibit smoking in their residential units and on outdoor areas of their property. Landlords have the right to impose obligations beyond the content of standard leases as long as they do not conflict with federal or provincial laws. Ontario law would limit the landlords ability to add prohibitions to current leases, which would make it unlikely for a landlord to provide smoke-free accommodation for existing tenants immediately. CityHousing Hamilton will need to consider the timing and content of lease changes, as well as their own abilities and obligations when deciding upon a smoke-free policy and their own legal implications.

POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:

N/A

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

- Legal Services
- CityHousing Hamilton Board
- Community Services Staff
- Waterloo Region Public Health
- Other jurisdictions where public housing has implemented smoke-free policies

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

By evaluating the “**Triple Bottom Line**”, (community, environment, economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

Community Well-Being is enhanced.

Yes **No**

This proposal supports people in need with care; puts our best face forward; meets our statutory health obligations; promotes public safety for the community, with the

community. It promotes health and prevents disease and injury, and improves personal health status.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. Yes No

This proposal has the potential to reduce littering and improve air quality.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. Yes No

This proposal incorporates best practices for the best value, given the cost savings in cleaning and maintenance for smoke-free units over smoking units.

Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines? Yes No

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants? Yes No

Protecting CityHousing Hamilton employees from second-hand smoke at their work site makes Hamilton a City of choice.

Public Health Strategic Directions

A policy regulating smoking and second-hand smoke in CityHousing Hamilton units will contribute to the following strategic directions set forth by Hamilton Public Health Services:

Goal A: Implement public health initiatives to improve local air quality.

Goal C: Maximize impact on community health in four key areas of chronic disease prevention: tobacco control, nutrition, physical activity, and mental health.

References

1. Clinical Tobacco Intervention. (2009). Quit Connection: CTI Bulletin. (Online). Retrieved May 21, 2009 from: <http://www.omacti.org>
2. Fiore, MC, Jaen, CR, Baker, TB et al (2008). Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence: Clinical Practice Guideline 2008 Update. US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, May 2008.
3. California's Clean Air Project. Measuring the Seepage of Tobacco Smoke Particles Between Apartment Units. Accessed January 26, 2008 from <http://ccap.etr.org>
4. O'Connor RJ, Bauer JE, Giovino GA, et al. Prevalence of behaviours related to cigarette-caused fires: a survey of Ontario smokers. Injury Prevention 2007. Accessed November 12 2008 from: <http://injuryprevention.bmj.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/4/237>
5. Center for Energy and Environment (CEE), Reduction of Environmental Tobacco Smoke Transfer in Minnesota Multifamily Buildings Using Air Sealing and Ventilation Treatments, Nov. 2004, p vii. Available at www.mncee.org/ceedocs/mpaat/summary.pdf

Attachments (2)

Smoke-Free Policies in Multi-Unit Dwellings

There are many precedents in setting smoke-free policies in multi-unit dwellings, both by private landlords and public housing authorities, particularly in the United States, but increasingly in Canada too. Public housing authorities have adopted no-smoking policies in many states including California, Colorado, Florida, Maine, Minnesota, Idaho, Montana, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, Oregon, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Alaska, Utah, and Washington. The Region of Waterloo, as well as others in Ontario are investigating smoke-free policies for their housing units. An environmental scan of both subsidized public housing and market rate housing for Ontario, Canada and the United States is below.

SUBSIDIZED PUBLIC HOUSING

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
ONTARIO					
Ritz Lutheran Villa Senior Housing, Mitchell		▪ smoke-free units	Seniors	25 units	
Lester B. Pearson Place (owned by Newtonbrook United Church – Taiwanese United Church Toronto Non-profit Homes Corporation), downtown Toronto	2006, upon opening	▪ 100% smoke-free units & property	Mixed ownership including: ▪ Families ▪ Seniors ▪ Singles	▪ 53 unit (4 storey) ▪ 150 tenants with 1, 2, 3 bedroom apartments	
Artscape Non-Profit Housing Corporation, Toronto		▪ ‘green building’		26 units	
Waterloo Region Housing	April 2010	▪ new building will be smoke-free indoors; building received Silver LEEDS certification		30 units	Council to address a policy for all regional housing for subsidized units in June 2009.
CANADA					
Hearthstone Manor, Grande	October	▪ city-owned affordable housing		40 units	

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Prairie, Alberta	2008, upon opening	complex with accessible units; LEED certification			
Greater Edmonton Foundation (city's largest provider of subsidized housing) apartments, Edmonton, Alberta	June 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy ▪ Tenants who smoke can continue smoking in their own units; new tenants can only smoke in outdoor designated areas ▪ 10 apartment buildings non smoking (but 13% are smokers) and 2 buildings allow smoking on designated floors (30% are smokers) ▪ 8 lodges only allow smoking in a designated smoking room directly vented to outside (9% are smokers) and 1 lodge allows smoking on some floors (11% are smokers) ▪ designated smoking areas outside minimum 5 metres away from entrance to building 	Seniors (mostly single, 2% are couples)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ mixture of apartments and lodges and duplexes ▪ 18 seniors buildings smoke-free with more than 2000 tenants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Average 16% smokers ▪ Average age of residents is 81 years old ▪ Have evicted 6 people (gave option to move to another site) ▪ Wait list 550 people for housing ▪ Went smoke-free in some buildings because of health and safety of tenants and workers, unsafe smokers, damage to property ▪ Gave tenants option of moving to a smoking building at their own cost – 2 smokers moved ▪ No NRT or cessation services offered to clients ▪ Gave tenants 6 months notice of policy change ▪ Cost of turnover \$2-3000 for smoking room, \$2-300 for non-smoking room ▪ Will be looking at making all buildings smoke-free
Grafton Lodge (sponsored)	April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoking is not allowed in 	Seniors &	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 39 units 	Kaye Milliship

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
by the Esquimalt Lions Senior Housing Society; managed by Greater Victoria Housing Society) Esquimalt, British Columbia	2004, upon opening	apartment units, balconies or anywhere in the gardens or property surrounding the building	Supportive Living	▪ Mix of market and rent geared-to-income units	kaye.milliship@vschs
Greater Vancouver Housing Corporation, Heather Place, Vancouver, British Columbia	2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pilot project in 2007 at Heather Place, making 86 units in the building smoke-free; expanded to 2 other buildings in 2008 ▪ New tenants are not able to smoke in their apartments and on the grounds of the property 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2 social housing tenants in January 2007 asked the court to force their neighbours to move out of the building or butt out. Smoke drifts from a neighbours balcony into their homes. ▪ Have nonsmoking tenancy agreement
BC Non-Profit Housing Association, British Columbia		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Survey Jan – June 2008 including 192 housing providers representing 533 buildings- 25.6% stated that the entire building including balconies was smoke-free; 3.2% stated that a few units were smoke-free now and more were being phased in 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corp, St. John's, Newfoundland		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tenants will be 'grandfathered' in- current tenants will be able to continue smoking in their unit but new tenants won't be able to smoke indoors 		424 houses & apartments	

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
UNITED STATES					
<i>Alaska</i> North Pacific Rim Housing Authority	September 7 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ all units in all housing in 7 communities smoke-free 			
<i>California</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 22 California communities have adopted smoke-free housing policies – Glendale, Rancho Cordova, Plumas County, Loma Linda, Albany, Alameda, Novato, Woodland, Port Hueneme, Belmont, Oxnard, Calabasas, Oakland, Belmont, Temecula, Sacramento County, Thousand Oaks, City of Sacramento, Emeryville, Rancho Mirage, Dublin, City of Santa Barbara, Madera, El Cajon, Marin County, Contra Costa County, Mammoth Lakes, San Mateo County, Laguna Woods, Arcata, 					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides similar subsidized housing tax credit to Maine

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Healdsburg, Davis					
<i>California</i> Glendale	October 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinance requires landlords must disclose information about the smoking regulations for the property to prospective tenants (if smoking is allowed in the unit, whether previous tenant smoked in unit, provide map of smoking/nonsmoking units & areas where smoking is allowed) ▪ Prohibits smoking in all indoor and outdoor common areas 	All	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Violations punishable under municipal code
<i>California</i> Loma Linda	January 1, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinance requires landlords must prohibit smoking in at least 70% of units of new and existing apartments including patios and balconies by January 1, 2012. ▪ Nonsmoking units must be grouped together vertically, horizontally and in separate buildings to the maximum extent possible. ▪ Landlords must present prospective tenants with a floor plan showing smoking/nonsmoking units and designated smoking areas. 	All	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tenants subject to eviction if landlord receives 2 letters of complaint from different individuals. ▪ Violations punishable as an infraction.

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landlords are required to create an outdoor designated smoking area. ▪ Current residents can smoke past 01/01/2012 deadline if they give notice to landlord. ▪ Smoking is prohibited in all indoor and outdoor common areas except DSA. 			
<i>California</i> Albany	June 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinance requires landlords and sellers of condos must disclose smoking policy of units. ▪ Landlords of apartments must maintain and provide a list & floor plan of designated nonsmoking/smoking units/areas. ▪ Condo sellers must disclose if smoking occurred in unit and smoking policy of building. ▪ Smoking in indoor and outdoor common areas prohibited. 	All	All	Violations are punishable as an infraction and subject to a fine of \$50-500.
<i>California</i> Novato	July 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinance prohibits smoking inside units of new and existing apartments. ▪ For new apartments with 10 or more units, 75% of units must be non-smoking. For existing 	All	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City Manager responsible for enforcement. Public Health responsible for writing initial warning letter. ▪ Penalty for first violation

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
		<p>apartments with 10 or more units, 50% of units must be designated nonsmoking. A unit includes patios and balconies and all nonsmoking units must be grouped together if possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current tenants grandfathered in – continue to smoke in unit as long as they live there. ▪ Landlords can designate 100% of units as non-smoking if they wish. ▪ All leases must state if unit is smoking or nonsmoking. ▪ Landlords must maintain and provide to tenants floor plan identifying smoking/ nonsmoking units. ▪ Smoking prohibited in indoor and outdoor common areas. 			<p>is fine not exceeding \$100 and/or 5 days of community service. Second violation within 1 year is fine up to \$200 and/or 10 days of community service. Third violation within 1 year is fine up to \$500 and/or 15 days of community service.</p>
<p><i>California</i> Calabasas</p>	<p>January 1, 2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinance requires landlord to prohibit smoking in 80% of units of new and existing buildings including patios and balconies by January 1, 2012. ▪ Nonsmoking units must be grouped vertically, horizontally, and in separate buildings to maximum extent possible. ▪ Landlords must show every 	<p>All</p>	<p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subject to eviction if landlord receives 2 letters of complaint from different individuals. ▪ Violations are subject to punishment as a misdemeanor.

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
		<p>potential tenant floor plan of smoking/nonsmoking units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landlords must create outdoor designated smoking area. ▪ Current tenants grandfathered past Jan 1 2012 if they notify landlord. Lease must state whether smoking or nonsmoking unit. ▪ Smoking prohibited in all indoor and outdoor common areas ex play areas, outdoor eating areas, swimming polls, lobbies, etc. 			
<i>California</i> Oakland	December 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinance requires landlords and sellers of condos required to disclose smoking policy of units they manage/sell. ▪ Landlords of apartments must maintain and provide to tenants a list & floor plan of designated nonsmoking/smoking units/areas. ▪ Condo sellers must disclose if smoking occurred in unit and smoking policy of building. ▪ Smoking in indoor and outdoor common areas prohibited. 	All	All	Violators guilty of infraction and punished by a find of up to \$500.
<i>California</i>	September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinance prohibits smoking 	All	All multi-family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each violation is an

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Belmont	31 2007	<p>in all new and existing apartments and condos that share a common floor and/or ceiling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For current tenants who smoke, there is a 14 month grace period during which they can still smoke. ▪ Lease must state if unit is smoking/nonsmoking. Smoking in indoor and outdoor common areas prohibited. 		buildings except side-by-side townhomes	<p>infraction subject to a \$100 fine. Violations are also subject to civil action brought by the city with a fine of \$250-\$1000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Previous policy for Bonnie Brae Terrace in Aug 2003 for seniors
<i>California</i> Temecula	May 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinance requires landlords to designate 25% of units as nonsmoking in all new and existing multi-unit residences with 10 or more units (doesn't apply to condos). ▪ Nonsmoking units must be grouped together horizontally and vertically and in a separate building as much as possible. ▪ With existing housing have up to 5 years to designate units as nonsmoking. ▪ Landlords must submit floor plan to city to identify smoking/nonsmoking units ▪ Smoking in indoor and outdoor common areas 	All	All, except condos	Violations subject to penalties outlined in municipal code.

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
		prohibited.			
<i>California</i> Emeryville	December 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ordinance ▪ Smoking in indoor and outdoor common areas prohibited. 	All	All	
<i>California</i> Plumas County	July 1, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board of Supervisors adopted policy to make all public housing units in county nonsmoking. ▪ Residents can still smoke outdoors on property. 	Seniors & families	200 units	Cessation services offered to residents.
<i>California</i> City of Alameda Housing Commission	2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy to prohibit smoking within residential units, balconies, grounds of properties for all apartments. ▪ Implemented first at Independence Plaza, a 186 unit senior housing complex on August 1, 2008. No designated smoking area on property. ▪ Anne B Diament Plaza with 65 units will be next complex to go smoke-free (also for seniors). ▪ Housing Commission manages 500 units and all will go smoke-free within next year. 	All	500 units	Termination of rental agreement for violations of policy. Residents can sue another resident to enforce the no-smoking policy.
<i>California</i> City of Port Hueneme Housing Authority	July 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy to restrict smoking in 2 public housing properties: ▪ Mar Vista (seniors)-smoking 	Seniors & families		Violation handled like any other lease violation – verbal warning, then

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
		<p>prohibited in all units on lower 3 floors, smoking allowed in units on top 2 floors. Current residents who smoke asked to move to smoking floor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hueneme Village (families), smoking prohibited in all newly leased units. 			<p>written warning, then possible termination from HA program.</p>
<p><i>California</i> City of Oxnard Housing Authority</p>	<p>March 2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy prohibits smoking in 2 senior housing properties – 100% of units, balconies, common areas, within 30 feet of entrances to both Plaza Vista and Palm Vista properties are smoke-free. 	<p>Seniors</p>	<p>150 units</p>	<p>After 3 violations of policy, lease is subject to termination.</p>
<p><i>California</i> City of Thousand Oaks</p>	<p>March 2007/ September 2004</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy requiring developers of new publicly assisted rental housing to set aside 1/3 of new units as non-smoking units. ▪ Updated in 2007 to include 2/3 of newly constructed publicly assisted units and 1/2 of new supportive housing units to be smoke-free. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only applies to new housing
<p><i>California</i> City of Rancho Mirage Housing Authority</p>	<p>December 7 2006</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy prohibits smoking in outdoor common areas of 3 senior affordable housing residential complexes. ▪ Prohibits smoking within units in Santa Rosa Villas and future 	<p>Seniors</p>	<p>4 complexes 228 units</p>	

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
		senior apartment complexes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All new residents of 2 existing senior complexes prohibited from smoking in units, but people who already live their can smoke. 			
<i>California</i> Vista La Cumbre, City of Santa Barbara Housing Authority	November 16 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy prohibits smoking in Vista La Cumbre housing. ▪ Applies to smoking inside units and balconies. ▪ Residents can smoke in designated smoking area outside building. 	Seniors	36 units	
<i>California</i> City of Madera Housing Authority	August 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy to transition 2 of 3 seniors buildings at Yosemite Manor to smoke-free. ▪ New residents moving into buildings A and C prohibited from smoking in their units & on patios. ▪ Smokers that already reside in A and C can continue smoking. ▪ Building B still allows smoking. 	Seniors	2 buildings	
<i>California</i> City of Rancho Cordova	September 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resolution to encourage landlords/property managers of multi-unit rental housing to designate at least 50% of units, including patios and balconies, as nonsmoking. 			

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
<i>California</i> City of Woodland	April 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resolution to encourage landlords/property managers of multi-unit rental housing to designate at least 50% of units, including patios and balconies, as nonsmoking. 			
<i>California</i> County of Sacramento	April 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Board of Supervisors passed a resolution to encourage landlords/property managers of multi-unit rental housing to designate at least 50% of units, including patios and balconies, as nonsmoking. 			
<i>California</i> City of Sacramento	December 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resolution to encourage landlords/ property managers of multi-unit rental housing to designate at least 25% of units, including patios and balconies, as nonsmoking. 			
<i>California</i> Via Pacifica Gardens, Aptos		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Affordable housing units for seniors ▪ Adopted no-smoking rules for new residents. 	Seniors		

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Colorado Housing Authorities: Boulder City Estes Park Boulder County Loveland Fort Collins Wellington	April 2008 2009 2008 Nov 2009 July 2010 Nov 2009 July 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All other seniors units ▪ All other units 	Seniors Seniors Seniors Seniors Mixed Seniors Family	10 buildings 1 building with 24 units 1 building with 49 units 27 units 14 units 28 units	109 residential buildings with 5816 units are covered
Florida Fort Pierce	1996				
Idaho Housing Authorities: Nampa Housing Authority Caldwell Housing Authority	August 8, 2007- January 1, 2008 January 1, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoking is banned indoors and within 20 feet of building ▪ Smoke-free building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seniors ▪ Disabled ▪ Families 	142 units at 9 sites 234 units	
Indiana Kokomo Housing Authority	January 1, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prohibits smoking inside rental units and on property outside of buildings. ▪ No smoking within 50 feet of any entrance. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 560 units in 6 apartment buildings, 2 duplexes and 45 site houses 	
Kentucky Danville City Commission	June 1, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Building and grounds smoke-free 	Disabled	5 units/1 building	

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Maine Housing Authorities: Auburn Bangor Brewer Fort Fairfield Lewiston Bar Harbor Brunswick Southwest Harbor Ellsworth Mount Desert Island Old Town Waterville Tremont Point Pleasant Reservation Westbrook Bath South Portland Sanford	Sept 2004 May 2007 June 2006 Sept 2006 Jan 2008 May 2006 June 2007 June 2006 June 2006 June 2006 July 2006 Mar 2007 Mar 2008 2008 Jan 2009 Jan 2009 Jan 2009 Sept 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoke-free policy ▪ Leases must contain smoke-free clause ▪ Accessible designated smoking area provided on-site outdoors-must be at least 25 feet away from building entrance and not within or immediately adjacent to proposed/existing recreational area or near outdoor area whose principal users are children such as playgrounds 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoking cessation services promoted to all in subsidized housing ▪ Developers who provide subsidized housing receive tax credit if they provide smoke-free housing (within units and common areas) as of November 2006. ▪ 2 Housing Authorities in state remaining without policies & 4 tribal Housing Authorities; 17 Housing Authorities + 1 tribal Housing Authority have smoke-free policies ▪ 72% of Housing Authorities have a smoke-free policy ▪ Approximately 41% private landlords in Maine have smoke-free building 18 housing authorities (out of a total of 25) with smoke-free policies, covering over 2300 smoke-free public housing units (approx 90 000 private units smoke-free)
Michigan		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoke-free policies 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 27 Michigan Housing

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Housing Authorities: Algonac	Jan 1 2009		Seniors Disabled Family	50 units	<p>Commissions have smoke-free policies, which covers more than 6000 units in 65 buildings (over 12 000 market rate units smoke-free as well in 800-1000 buildings).</p> <p>▪ Policies adopted by Cadillac, Plymouth, East Jordan, Elk Rapids, Melvindale, Livonia, Alma, Ishpeming, Belding, Marysville, Bessemer, Bedford Township, Sault Ste. Marie, Traverse City, Evart, Negaunee, Paw Paw, Eastpointe, South Haven, Bangor, Marquette, Grand Rapids, Rogers, Kingsford, Helena, Escanaba, and Allen Park Housing Commissions.</p> <p>▪ Some private apartments which are designated “affordable housing” units are also smoke-free (approximately 3000 units).</p>
Allen Park Alma	Sept 2006 Oct. 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy covers all property, indoors and outdoors. ▪ Grandfathers current residents who smoke for as long as they live in their units. ▪ Grandfathers current smoking tenants for as long as they live in their unit. 		20 units 60 units 2 buildings 59 units	
Bangor Housing Commission	April 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoke-free policy for current and new residents. 	Seniors & Families	44 units	
Bessemer Housing Commission	April 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoke-free policy for new residents 		30 units	
Bedford Township Housing Commission	June 2007		Seniors & Disabled	97 units	
Belding	Jan 2007		Families & Seniors & Disabled	4 buildings 140 units	
Bessamer	April 2007		Seniors & Disabled	30 units	
Cadillac, Kirtland Terrace	July 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy grandfathers current residents who are smokers until lease renewal (approximately 1 year). 		84 units	
East Jordan Housing Commission, Lakeview Manor	June 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ units smoke-free 		20 units	
East Point Housing Commission	May 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy for all new residents, all 	Seniors & Disabled	164 units	

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Elk Rapids Escanaba Housing Commission, Harbor Tower	June 2006 Jan 2008	<p>guests and staff – current residents have a 1 year exemption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Units will be smoke-free, current tenants can continue to smoke in their units until the lease renews June 2008. 	Seniors & Disabled & Families	20 units 175 units in 18 storey building	
Evert Housing Commission	July 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current tenants are grandfathered in for 3 years at which time the buildings will be completely smoke-free. 	Seniors & Disabled	53 units	
Grand Rapids	June 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ smoking 25 feet away from buildings 	Seniors Disabled Families	9 public housing developments with about 900 apartment units	
Helena Housing Authority Ishpeming	July 2007 Jan 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ smoke-free policy in effect immediately for new residents, staff and guests and for all residents 	Seniors & Disabled	366 apartments 1 building with 88 units	
Kingsford Housing Commission	Jan 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For as many as 70% of its 140 units. 	Seniors & Disabled & Families	41 units in 2 buildings	
Livonia Marquette Housing Commission	Aug 2006 April 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grandfathers current residents who are smokers ▪ Grandfathering current smokers until October 1, 2008. 	Seniors & Disabled	388+ units	
Marysville Housing Commission	April 2007		Seniors & Disabled		
Melvindale	July 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For new residents, giving 		132 units	

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Middleville	Nov 2007	existing residents a 2-year exemption until October 2009.	Seniors & Disabled		
Negaunee Housing Commission	Sept 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoking must be a minimum of 20 feet from all entrances, windows and ventilation systems. ▪ Current residents are grandfathered as long as they live in their unit. 	Seniors & Disabled & Families	199 units 50 units 80 units	
Paw Paw	April 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoke-free policy for all residents, guests and staff 	Seniors & Disabled		
Plymouth, Tonquish Creek Manor	Jan 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New residents cannot smoke in their units. 		81 units in two buildings	
Roger City Housing	May 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current residents have until April 1, 2007 	Seniors & Disabled & Families	108 units	
Sault Ste. Marie	Jan 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New residents must have smoke-free units; current smokers have until June 1, 2008 to make their units smoke-free. 		38 units	
South Haven	June 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Units smoke-free. Current smoking residents are grandfathered in. 	Seniors & Disabled	120 units in 3 buildings	
Traverse City	Feb 2007		Seniors & Disabled & Families	80 units	

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Blair Lincoln	Sept 2006 Jan 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Also prohibits smoking 25 feet from entrance 	Seniors	3 buildings 12 units 2 buildings 211 units	
<i>New Hampshire</i> Housing Authorities: Lebanon Claremont Exeter	2004 June 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smoke-free policies 	Seniors & Disabled	1 building 85 units	
<i>New Jersey</i> City Woodbridge	2004 Sept 2007				
<i>Oregon</i> Housing Authorities: Marion County Coos-Curry Housing Authority Housing Authority of Portland (public housing) (affordable housing)	2009 Oct 2005 Aug 2009 Aug 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ all properties and buildings smoke-free ▪ smoking prohibited inside apartment units, indoor common areas, within 10 feet of building including patios, porches and balconies 		37 properties with 1993 units 3760 units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More than 150 buildings with 24, 000 renters are smoke-free www.hapdx.org/resident/P H-leaserevision.html
<i>Washington</i> Housing Authorities: Seattle Housing Authority	2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ smoke-free living policy 	Seniors with disabilities	86 units in 3 buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 4 Housing Authorities have adopted smoke-free policies for their buildings

Name of Development or City or County	Date	Policy or Ordinance Provisions	Population	# Tenants or Units or Buildings	Discussion
Tacoma Housing Authority Vancouver Housing Authority King County Walla Walla Low Income Housing Institute	Summer 2005 April 2008 Dec 2007 Mar 2008 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Building smoke-free ▪ Buildings smoke-free for new residents & April 2009 for all residents ▪ No smoking in units and common areas at 3 properties with plans for more smoke-free buildings. 	Seniors & Disabled Seniors Seniors & families	77 units 11 properties 222 units 300+ units 3 properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One of its first residents was a smoker
<i>Utah</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Buildings smoke-free 			At end of 2008, over 150 communities with 974 smoke-free buildings with 10, 370 smoke-free units
<i>Wisconsin</i> Housing Authority: DePere	Nov 2003				

MARKET RATE HOUSING

Below are a select few private properties that have implemented smoke-free policies for their housing units – there are thousands of units in Canada and the United States that are covered by such policies.

Waterloo, Ontario

- A & M apartments, building and grounds smoke-free except designated area 30 feet from nearest exit

Toronto, Ontario

- Lonsdale in the Village Condos smoke-free, with 70 units

Kenora, Ontario

- Lakeview Condominium became Ontario's first smoke-free condominium in Nov 2007.
- This was achieved by over 80% of the owners voting to amend the declaration.

Saskatchewan, Canada

- Barrington Place, a 146 unit smoke-free building (11 stories) in Saskatoon owned by Colliers McClocklin Real Estate Corporation
- 4 multi-level dwellings owned by Campbell and Haliburton Property Management Ltd. in Regina have smoke-free policies affecting 175 units (Champlain 46 units, Canadiana 104 units, Chalet 12 units, Casa Bella 13 units)

Manitoba & Alberta, Canada

- Globe General Agencies implemented a smoke-free policy for private multi-unit dwellings primarily to reduce maintenance costs as of October 1, 2006
- New tenants are not able to smoke in their suites, on their patios or balconies.
- Existing tenants and their guests will continue to be allowed to smoke until they move out of their suites.
- The policy applies to approximately 75 apartment buildings Globe owns in Manitoba with approximately 5000 units. 450 apartment units in Edmonton are also covered as of February 2007.
- Company president Richard Morantz said that some U.S. rental agencies have even tested drywall and carpet in apartments to show the health risks that lurk in a smoker's home, even after they move out."

North Vancouver, Canada

- ENVY, 50 unit 7 story condo smoke-free upon opening (sold almost all units within one day), LEED certification
- Developer: Wedgewood & Marcon Homes Ltd.
- Tentative occupancy: February 2008

USA

- First Centrum Communities-no smoking in units and common areas at 49 senior housing communities since September 2006, with 5500 apartment units. Their buildings are located in Michigan, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee and Illinois. The firm polled its senior housing residents to see how many actually smoked and discovered it was only 8%. Smoking residents are being grandfathered in. New residents must sign a lease addendum agreeing to the policy.

- Other large companies including the Tower Companies in Maryland adopted a smoke-free policy in 2006 for its 1400 unit apartment building for the elderly. If lease addendum is refused to be signed residents must move out when the current lease expires.
- Guardian Management implemented a no-smoking policy at all 12 000 rental units throughout West Coast. The no-smoking policy established in Jan 2008, prohibits smoking inside apartments and in common areas, including patios and balconies. If smoking outside, people must stay at least 25 feet from buildings. Guardian Management surveyed residents at 17 of its properties in Dec 2008 and discovered that smokers and nonsmokers were satisfied with the policy. Among smokers, 43% reported smoking less since the policy was implemented, and nearly half of all smokers reported making an attempt to quit in the past year. Guardian Management's experience with low-income subsidized properties showed that nearly ¾ of all residents were happy or very happy with the no-smoking rule. The percentage of non-smokers who reported never being exposed to second-hand smoke in their apartments increased by 75%; and for outdoors on porches, patios or balconies more than doubled. Among smokers, 43% reported smoking less tobacco since the policy's implementation. Nearly half of respondents who smoke reported making an attempt to quit since the policy.

Chicago, Illinois

- Smoke-free apt building AMLI 900 in South Loop began leasing in May 2008
- No-smoking inside or outside – termed 'Breatheasy) & used in AMLI communities in Seattle and Atlanta
- 440 luxury units, 24 stories

Long Beach, California, USA

- Livable Places has 58 condominium homes in nine separate buildings that are smoke-free, including outdoor common areas.
- Prospective buyers responded to a survey and 99% said they wanted the buildings and grounds to be smoke-free.

Redwood City, California, USA

- Casa de Redwood housing for seniors adopted no-smoking policy in R & R's.
- Current smokers are grandfathered in.

CityHousing Hamilton Resident Focus Groups on Smoking and Second-hand Smoke

The following is a summary of residents' attitudes and opinions towards smoking and second-hand smoke in CityHousing Hamilton units.

Rules on smoking in the home

- Most smokers smoke every day in their homes, with some restrictions, such as smoking in the living room and balcony only; some smokers go outside to smoke, especially in good weather
- Visitors are able to smoke in smokers homes, with some restrictions such as smoking only on the balcony, especially if visitors are children or non-smokers
- If smokers visit non-smokers, they have no problems smoking outside, or they don't smoke while visiting
- The majority (with one exception) of non-smokers do not allow smoking in their units at any time

Is smoking and second-hand smoke in CityHousing Hamilton units a problem?

- Many smokers and non-smokers use items such as air cleaners/purifiers, ionizers, fans, blankets under the door, weather-stripping and door sweeps to try to prevent second-hand smoke from entering or exiting the unit.
- Smoke enters units through windows, neighbours balconies, through bathroom and kitchen vents, under kitchen and bathroom cupboards/sinks, around pipes, under hallway door
- Hallways smell of smoke – problem is obvious
- Residents smoke in elevator and lobby; light up cigarette in hallway before they're outside the building; smoking in moving room (common room) on first floor in one building is common practice; some smoke outside the laundry room but leave the door open so smoke blows in (these areas should be smoke-free under SFOA)
- All residents mentioned improper ventilation in building; some can't even open windows
- Many residents mentioned they were concerned with fire safety
- Very small windows in all apartments; in summer, smoke comes in from balconies through open window-either have to put up with no air in apartment or second-hand smoke
- In one building, residents are asked to leave apartment doors open in the spring because it is really hot in the building, and smoke from the hallway gets into apartments
- "I can't sit on my balcony because people are smoking on their balcony, and I start choking, and I can't open my windows."
- "It's like I'm smoking myself"

Is smoking and second-hand smoke outdoors on CityHousing property a problem?

- People smoking at front entrance is a problem because it is often the only entrance to the building and people have to walk through the smoke to get into their home; smoke travels upwards into apartments at the front of the building and through windows into units
- People smoking on balconies is a problem because they flick the butts onto neighbouring balconies or below; some articles on balconies have caught on fire because of butts from other balconies; smoke gets into units

- Residents, including children, are unable to enjoy the outdoor areas such as the garden because they have to breathe in tobacco smoke
- Cigarette butts litter entranceway
- “I have been here almost a year and I haven’t even sat in this beautiful garden because they all sit there and smoke and I am confined to my apartment.”

Are CityHousing residents bothered by smoking and second-hand smoke?

- The majority of non-smokers are bothered, but the smokers are not bothered by smoking and/or second-hand smoke
- Participants all believe second-hand smoke is harmful to their health
- More than half of non-smoking participants have health problems/symptoms made worse by/from second-hand smoke –asthma, cancer, acute bronchitis , burning eyes, chest infections, nausea/vomiting, cough; some smoking participants have health problems made worse by SHS – asthma, bronchitis, COPD, emphysema
- Also mentioned family members and pets are affected by second-hand smoke
- “I feel sick with the smoke”
- Non-smokers feel smokers are inconsiderate – they stand at front door and non-smokers cannot get in without walking through smoke; they cannot use the garden because smokers congregate there; smoke from people smoking at front of building comes right into apartment windows
- “People don’t have an issue with other people choosing to smoke, they just don’t want to be exposed to it.”
- Non-smokers have to spend 24 hours a day breathing in smoke in their own home
- Significant concern about smoking around children because “they don’t have a choice”
- Concerned about fire/safety living in building with smokers
- “I have a friend in this building that smokes and when I leave that apartment to come home, I have to have a shower and wash my hair and I am a smoker. It is unbelievable in that apartment, the amount of nicotine that is on the walls.”

What has the property manger/security tenant (s) done about smoke/second-hand smoke in their buildings?

- Approximately 25% of non-smokers have complained about second-hand smoke to building manager; none of the smokers have had a property manager or security tenant address their smoking, but some have had neighbours directly complain to them
- Action not taken or it takes a long time for action (for example it took one resident 3 years to get a ventilation fan in their bathroom)
- The city is not responsive to concerns expressed or to complaints
- Security tenants onsite have no authority/power to do anything about second-hand smoke; previous superintendents did; in most buildings at least one of the security tenants smoke, so nothing is done

Should the city of Hamilton make a smoke-free policy for CityHousing Hamilton units?

What type of policy?

- Agree with some policy options, but not others
- “The only place I feel comfortable smoking anymore is in my apartment.”

- “It would be a dream come true to live in a smoke-free building”; “That would be heaven”; “Can you imagine how that would change the face of housing?”
- One group of participants thought there shouldn’t be smoking around children or any place there is a lot of people
- Smokers all agreed that there shouldn’t be smoking in indoor common areas, as is currently the law
- This is a rights issue for one group of seniors (infringement on rights by government) if not able to smoke in own home, discrimination of smokers
- Seniors want/have a right to enjoy rest of life, including smoking
- A smoke-free policy would give people pride in their home/building, provide a new safe healthy environment for them and the children
- People didn’t support smoke-free public places when by-laws were first made, but now it is accepted

Indoor Areas

- Newly acquired buildings – Smokers and non-smokers unanimously agreed these should/could be smoke-free – it offers a choice, people know it’s smoke-free before moving in; this was seen as the most fair option
- Non-smoking and smoking floors within the same building – Minority of smokers support this option and most non-smokers did not support this option at all. Some say this is not a good idea because of cost of moving people, shared ventilation (same situation as currently exists; this option is no better); others think it would work if they had separate ventilation systems. Concern smoke would still come in through windows and problems at entranceway.
- Turnover- new tenants have smoke-free units – Support from some smokers; majority of non-smokers support this option of having units become smoke-free as people move into the building. Concern raised that there would be additional complaints against smokers if more non-smokers move in; some suggested that you couldn’t get non-smokers to move into previous smokers unit because of smell/lack of cleanliness (smoke stays in apartment building for a long time). Improved ventilation would be required with this option. Concern that city needs to clean units after smokers move out, but this is better than what exists right now.
- Smoking and Non-smoking buildings – Support for this option by both non-smokers and smokers, with concerns raised about having to move (many would move if city pays to move them into comparable building). Expressed that it shouldn’t be only non-smokers who have to move. Feel this option offers a choice for both smokers and non-smokers.

Outdoor Areas

- Non-smokers would like the city to include outdoor areas-people smoke too close to doors in front and back and non-smokers must walk through smoke to get in/out of building; drifts up into apartment units. Suggestion was to have 9 metre radius around entrance and exit ways that are smoke-free zones “It is not something I would like – it is something that is absolutely necessary.”
- Many non-smokers are unable to enjoy outdoors/garden because smokers at every table on patio/children unable to play outside because of smoke & litter; want separate sections that are smoke-free
- Suggested making property smoke-free but providing a designated area on the property for smokers – put designated areas on property further away from door so non-smokers don’t have to walk through it

- Some interest in making property smoke-free, but only if smokers have somewhere to go; majority support 9m rule from entranceways
- Non-smokers would prefer no-smoking on balconies because of fire hazards, smoke coming into units from those smoking on balconies, litter from other smokers ends up on their balcony

Who would move into a smoke-free building?

- All non-smokers would like to live in a smoke-free building; some people would move to comparable building/property if it were available; a few of the smokers would move into a smoke-free building (health concerns, support to quit, no problem smoking outside) if similar building/location were available
- Current tenants should have first choice to move to a smoke-free building;
- Two people would move out of the building if it instituted a smoke-free policy; most stated they would stay because of finances and lack of help to move (would go outside to smoke); a few mentioned they would continue to smoke in unit even with a policy – concern raised about enforcement
- Nursing homes don't allow smoking indoors, and most people are heading there soon; First Place has no smoking on property because of small property lines (9m rule), hospital has smoke-free property

Cessation supports needed/wanted

- The majority don't think that the city should offer cessation support/don't want support
- No use providing them with aids if they don't want to quit (wanting to quit is key)
- Many of the non-smokers are former smokers, so they know how tough it is to quit; many smokers have been smoking for a long time
- Many smokers have quit smoking several times before using cessation aids, able to not smoke during hospital stays
- Suggestions for cessation supports to be covered– laser, patch, hypnosis, acupuncture, money incentive, support group; nobody interested in counselling
- If cessation aids are provided, they need to be provided ongoing, not just once

Other considerations for participants

- One group of seniors supported smoke-free policies in family buildings to protect the children, but not in seniors buildings
- Accessibility is a concern for some who are disabled – cannot go out of apartment building in winter months – would have to quit smoking
- Enforcement of policy
- Marijuana is a concern mentioned in every group, as well as drinking and other drugs
- Need to implement policies in private apartments as well and not just target subsidized housing units
- Cleaning of ventilation system in building is a concern; also residents perception is that there is improper ventilation in building which is often shut down/not turned on; cannot open windows, especially in bedroom – ventilation is an important measure to help deal with second-hand smoke in buildings
- Misconceptions about 9 metre rule at entranceway to buildings – only applies to city employees, not CityHousing Hamilton residents