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“The safest place to smoke weed in California is still in your home.”

Mic.com
Tobacco and Cannabis Use Policy

- Like tobacco, you cannot consume cannabis in public places, including smoking, eating, or vaping cannabis.

- Property owners and landlords may ban the use and possession of cannabis on their properties.

  – Section 11362.3, California Health and Safety Code
Tobacco and Cannabis use and Smokefree Housing Policy

- Landlords have a right to make their properties 100% smokefree.
  - California Civil Code 1947.5

- Landlords are authorized to prohibit smoking tobacco and medical marijuana on their property or in any building on which it is located.
  - California Health and Safety Code

- Owners may forbid the possession or use of marijuana on their property subject to normal tenant law for renters.
  - California Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA)
Marijuana secondhand smoke spreads throughout multiunit dwellings with harmful health effects.

Heating, refrigerating, and air conditioning standards include cannabis smoke in its definition of “environmental tobacco smoke” or ETS.

Ventilation systems cannot eliminate ETS.

– *American Society for Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning Engineering (ASHRAE)*
## Cannabis Use by Race/Ethnicity - California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Used in Past Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>25.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other single/ 2 or more races</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017 California Health Interview Survey
## Cannabis Use by Housing Type & Race/Ethnicity - California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Family Housing</th>
<th>Used in past month</th>
<th>Multi-Unit Housing</th>
<th>Used in past month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Two or More Race/Ethnicities</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>Other/Two or More Race/ Ethnicities</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017 California Health Interview Survey

*unstable estimate
California Tobacco Tax implications for Cannabis Secondhand Smoke

- California Healthcare, Research, and Prevention Tobacco Tax Act of 2016, Proposition 56 (Prop 56)
  - Additional net state revenue of $1 billion to $1.4 billion in 2017-18.
  - 11 percent of remaining funds invested in tobacco-use prevention.
  - Smokefree housing initiatives expanded under tobacco use prevention programs.
SMOKEFREE HOUSING ENVIRONMENT

- Evaluation of Secondhand Smoke experience and attitudes toward Smokefree Housing among tenants and landlords in 3 Council Districts Oct 2015 to Feb 2016
- 985 Adult Tenants (>18 years old) living in privately-owned multi-unit housing (MUH) in target districts surveyed.
- 93 Property Owners of market-rate MUH in the City of Los Angeles surveyed.
Secondhand Smoke Experience

- 37% reported SHS drifting into their units in the past year:
  - 20% reported SHS from another unit
  - 42% reported SHS from outside
  - 33% reported SHS from another unit and outside
91% believe SHS is harmful to one’s health

Majority prefer to live in a nonsmoking section or in a nonsmoking property
37% of surveyed owners reported voluntary adoption of smoke-free policies

- 800 out of 5,400 surveyed units (15%)
- Approximately half restricted smoking in units
- Less than half restricted smoking in units and common areas
Reported reasons for voluntarily adopting smoke-free policies:

- Creating a healthy environment
- Lower maintenance costs (Smoked in units turnover cost avg $4,935/unit)
- Does not hinder ability to fill vacancies
- Complaints from residents who do not smoke
Cannabis secondhand smoke dominate concerns about tobacco secondhand smoke in MUH.

Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles (AAGLA) and S.A.F.E. organization, UCLA-SAFE partners, reported increasing complaints about “secondhand marijuana smoke” since Prop 64 recreational marijuana passage.

AAGLA sought assistance to help owners implement policy prohibiting marijuana use, especially in rent controlled properties.
Citywide Smokefree MUH Evaluation – LA Dept of Public Health

- Build the evidence base on SFH experience, practices, and attitudes to inform smokefree housing policy development and adoption in the City of Los Angeles.

- Uses UCLA-SAFE tenant and landlord surveys modified to include questions on cannabis and e-cig secondhand smoke and views on policies restricting use in MUH.

- Use of Key Informant Interviews with landlords.
Citywide Smokefree MUH Evaluation – LA Dept. of Public Health

April 2018 – June 2020

- 4,800 Tenant Surveys in 12 City Council Districts
- 200 Landlord Surveys Citywide
- 50 Landlord Key Informant Interviews
- Dissemination of findings to stakeholders and policymakers
Citywide Smokefree MUH Evaluation – LA Dept. of Public Health: Key Informant Interviews

- Property owners or managers of MUH in the City of Los Angeles.
- Recruited through advertisements in Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles newsletter and snowball recruitment.
- Interviews last approximately 15-20 minutes.
- Owners and managers of different types of MUH in different parts of Los Angeles
  - Buildings ranging from 4 units to 100+ units
Citywide Smokefree MUH Evaluation – LA Dept. of Public Health: Key Informant Interviews

Focus Topics:

- Experience with smoking and SHS on their MUH properties and their opinions about smoke free policy at the property level
- Opinions about smokefree MUH policy at the City level-
  - anticipated challenges
  - advantages and disadvantages of different types of smoke free policy
Cannabis related questions:

Experience with secondhand marijuana smoke exposure and voluntary smokefree housing policy by the owner.

Opinion of a city legislated smokefree housing policy: Should marijuana should be included? major challenges of a city wide smoke free MUH policy
Phone interviews with property owners and managers January 21-25 2019

N=10
Secondhand smoke: Types of Smoke and Policies

- Have a smokefree policy
- No smokefree policy

- Marijuana Smoke Occurs
- Marijuana Smoke Does Not Occur

Does Marijuana Smoking Occur on the Property
Experience with secondhand smoke.

- Common themes:
  - Increased marijuana smoke in the last few years.
  - Difficult to catch someone doing it.

  “[If there is smoke, it’s] marijuana smoke, when I walk through the hall. It’s almost always marijuana. I would say [it’s been increasing] in the last two years. You can’t see anybody do it, but you might walk through one of the common hallways and know someone walked through there [smoking].”
Owner/Manager support for including marijuana in a City level Policy

- 4 of 10 support City policy that includes all types of smoke
- 2 of 10 support City policy that includes cigarettes but does not include marijuana, or allows for use of marijuana for medical reasons
- 4 of 10 would not support any type of smoke free policy at the City level
Arguments for a policy that includes all types of smoke:

- Common themes:
  - Having a policy that covers everything is much easier than having some exceptions
  - All types of smoke cause problems and damage

“\textit{I think it has to be all [types of smoke]. These things have to be all or nothing.}”
Arguments for smoke free policy that does not include marijuana or includes some provisions to allow marijuana in some circumstances:

- Common themes:
  - Medical needs

“There will be people who say they need the cannabis. There are so many people in my opinion who have medical issues. There would have to be exceptions because of health concerns.”
Citywide Smokefree MUH Evaluation – LA Dept. of Public Health: Key Informant Interviews

Arguments against any type of smoke free policy:

- Common themes amongst those against any type of policy:
  - Personal freedom
  - Limiting renter pool
  - Questions about enforcement

“All restriction that is imposed by government, I am not pleased with. If I were to [impose smoke-free policies] myself, that would be fine. I don’t want anybody to tell me that because it simply just cuts the pool of available renters when the time comes. But, you know, most of my tenants don’t smoke. Not many people smoke anymore, so it’s not really an issue.”
Major Challenges: Enforcement

- Common themes:
  - Do not want to be responsible for enforcement
    - Increased time and staffing cost concern
    - Very difficult to determine who is smoking
  - City must enforce and be source of information

“[I wouldn't support a policy] if the city gets involved and says ‘property managers are responsible [for enforcement] and will be fined [if tenants are smoking]. I can’t be the police, and I can see that possibly happening. If they put the property manager or owner as responsible, then I can’t support that.”
What’s to come:

- More detail about MUH landlord experiences and opinions from landlord survey and key informant interviews

- Tenant surveys: CDC Reach Project suggests most tenants are in favor of a policy that bans cigarette smoking in MUH. Will tenants also be in favor of a policy that bans smoking marijuana in MUH?

- What are the disparities in SHS exposure from cigarettes, marijuana, and e-cigs across the Council Districts in City of Los Angeles?